OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

8-9 GEORGE V, 1918

IN TWO VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1192 Volume II: Pages 1193-2560

VOLUME CXXXIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF MAY, 1918, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
J. DE LABROQUERIE TACHÉ,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1918

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Monday, April 29, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

A return containing copies of letters and telegrams between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Executives concerning the Order in Council of December 22, 1917, respecting the sale of securities by provincial, colonial, or foreign governments, municipalities, or other bodies.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

A return showing payment to certain newspapers since October 1, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

A return giving the names of the officers employed on the staff in Military District No. 5, the salaries paid to them, services performed, etc.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr F. H. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 68, to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

He said: The object of the Bill is to enable labouring men on railways at the divisional points to have their votes registered on election day. In my own riding, where there are so many terminal railway points, a very large number of railway men are disfranchised because they have either to neglect their duty and lay off to vote, or proceed on duty without going to the polling place. The principle of the Bill is one, I am sure, that will commend itself to, and enlist the support of all the members of the House. I hope the Government will, if not during the present session, at any rate during next session, propose a measure and press it through Parliament, which will enable the most representative class of Canadians to have a voice in the election of members to this Parliament thoroughly workable. The Bill as I have framed it is more especially adapted to conditions in my own riding, and I am afraid it would not work in this part of the country, where a railway man starts out and before his run finishes gets into another riding. This Bill simply provides for conditions in my own riding where a man can cast his vote so that he will not be disfranchised.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 69, to amend the Criminal Code. He said:

The Bill proposes to amend certain sections of the Criminal Code. The first of these amending sections deals with offences against morals. It is proposed to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code as it now stands by making it a criminal offence to seduce or have illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character, of or above the age of sixteen years and under the age of eighteen years. As the law at present stands this offence consists in having illicit intercourse with a girl over the age of fourteen years and under the age of sixteen. By the change the age of the girl against whom such an offence may be committed is raised.

The section further provides that proof that a girl has had on a previous occasion illicit connections with the accused shall not be deemed to be proof that she was not of previously chaste character; and by a subsection of the section it is provided that no male person under the age of 21 shall be prosecuted for an offence under its provisions. In view of the raising of the age of the young woman, it was considered that there should be some protection for the young man.

The second provision of the Bill proposes to amend that section which now makes it an offence for certain classes of employers, or persons in authority, to have connection with young women, so as to extend it to all persons occupying the relation of employer,

or being in positions analogous to those presently dealt with.

Mr. BUREAU: What are the classes under the present section?

Mr. DOHERTY: There are different classes of employment specified, but the principal class are girls employed in factories, or workshops and business establishments of that kind. The proposed amendment extends the classification so as to cover any person occupying the position of employer of the girl whom he might be charged with having seduced or having had illicit connection with.

The third section makes it a criminal offence to have illicit connection with, or carnally know any girl under the age of ten, and above the age of fourteen, not being his wife and where he believes her to be above the age of sixteen years. This change, in effect, raising the age of consent from fourteen to sixteen, and making it an offence to carnally know any girl under fourteen years of age. To the several penalties that are provided for that offence it is proposed to add a subsection making it an offence to carnally know any girl between the age of fourteen and sixteen, but subjecting the offender to a penalty not so severe as in a case where the girl is under fourteen years of age.

The next provision is to introduce a section to be known as 221A, making it a criminal offence for persons not being married to register as man and wife at hotels, lodging houses, boarding houses, or places of public resort.

Another provision introduces into the Criminal Code, a section which has been enacted in the Juvenile Delinquency Act of the province of Ontario, and has been found to be exceedingly useful there.

The courts, however, have recently held that it was in substance legislation of the nature of criminal law, and the enactment as contained in the provincial legislation was, therefore, not effective. We have been asked to give effect to it by making it a section of the Criminal Code, thus making it an offence to contribute by indulgence in sexual immorality, in habitual drunkenness or in any other form of vice, to cause a child to be in danger of being or becoming immoral, dissolute or criminal, or to tend injuriously to affect the morals of a child or to render the home of a child an unfit place for such child to be in.

It provides a penalty not exceeding $500, or imprisonment not exceeding one year. It introduces bodily the provisions of the Ontario law into the Criminal Code. There are definitions of what shall be a child for the purpose of the section, that is a boy or girl under the age of sixteen years. There is a further provision that it shall not be a defence that the child is of too tender years to understand or appreciate the nature of the act complained of or immediately affected thereby.

The next proposal is to amend Section 226 of the Criminal Code so as to make come within the definition of a common gaming house any place where the whole or any portion of the stakes or bets or other proceeds at or from such games is either directly or indirectly paid to the person keeping such house, room or place. This is to meet an abuse which is said to exist, or, at least, we have heard more complaint about it from the province of British Columbia.

The next proposal is to increase the penalty presently imposed by section 285B of the Criminal Code for taking motor cars for the purpose simply of using them and then abandoning them for the purpose of what is generally called joy-riding. The present penalty is $50 or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days. It is represented that the offence is becoming exceedingly prevalent, and oftentimes considerable damage is done to the motor car, and it is suggested that the possibility of a heavier penalty would operate as a more effective deterrent.

The next two proposals are to amend sections 985 and 986 of the Criminal Code which provide what shall be prima facie evidence that a house is a gaming house. As the law stands at present it is provided that the presence in the house of instruments used in any unlawful game shall constitute prima facie evidence. It is proposed to substitute for the words "any unlawful game" the words "any game of chance or any mixed game of chance or skill." A similar amendment in section 986 substitutes for the words "unlawful gaming" in the eighth and ninth lines the words "playing any game of chance or any mixed game of chance and skill."

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE WAR.

FRENCH CANADIAN BRIGADE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I wish to ask if it is the intention of the Government to

organize a French Canadian Brigade under the new Military Service Regulations.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Militia and Defence will give a reply at some later date to my hon. friend. I do not think there is sufficient material available just at present to organize a brigade. A suggestion has, however, been made as to more units at the front of distinctively French Canadian personnel. That matter is under consideration.

CANADIAN WAR MEMORIAL FUND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I might make an announcement with regard to some very valuable paintings which have been secured for this country through the instrumentality of the Canadian War Memorial Fund. On March 20th, I gave an answer to a question which is to be found at pp. 52-53 of Hansard, in which the work of the Canadian War Records Office was briefly outlined. It was not then stated that in connection with the Canadian War Records there has been established a Canadian War Memorial Fund, which has acquired fairly large proportions through the services and exertions of Lord Beaverbrook, and also through the assistance of many prominent men in Great Britain, particularly Lord Rothermere, who took over the exclusive rights of reproducing as postal cards, or as cards of similar size, the Canadian official war photographs, under an arrangement by which the entire net proceeds are to be handed over to the Canadian War Memorial Fund. The service and the advertising performed by the press under the directionof Lord Rothermere were given absolutely without any charge whatever.

The purpose of the Canadian War Memorial Fund is by paintings, by photographs, and by the erection of memorials to aid in perpetuating the memory of what Canada has accomplished in this war. I am informed by the Advisory Arts Council of Canada, of which Sir Edmund Walker is Chairman, that recently, through the efforts of Lord Beaverbrook, co-operating with the Advisory Arts Council, the Canadian Government, or the Canadian people rather, have come into possession of three pictures which are said by competent judges to be the three greatest art treasures connected with the history of Canada. It appears that some time ago the Advisory Arts Council had endeavoured to obtain the portrait by Sir Thomas Lawrence of Sir Alexander Mackenzie, the discoverer and explorer of the Mackenzie river which was named for him. The Advisory Arts Council took up the matter recently with Lord Beaverbrook, and he was able, by the arrangements which he had made in connection with the Canadian War Memorial Fund, to secure this valuable painting, which is now the property of the people of Canada.

There is, however, another picture which, as I am informed, the Advisory Arts Council have been seeking to obtain for many years, and that is the great picture of Brant by Romney. The Advisory Arts Council have been in communication with Lord Beaverbrook with regard to that portrait, and they have recently been advised that this picture has also been secured by him and that it is now the property of the Canadian people.

The third picture is a very celebrated painting, West's "Death of Wolfe." The Chairman of the Advisory Arts Council has within the past few days received the following cablegram from Lord Beaverbrook, showing that this famous picture has been presented by the Duke of Westminster, through Lord Beaverbrook, to the Canadian War Memorial Fund. The telegram received by Sir Edmund Walker reads:

> Death of Wolfe received from Duke of Westminister and letter as follows: "I send you the picture of the Death of Wolfe which has hung at Eaton since my great, great, great grandfather purchased it from the painter. Very gladly give it to the Canadian War Memorials Fund in token of my great appreciation for the magnificent part Canada is playing in the great war."

The particulars of the picture are set forth in the telegram as follows:

> Painted by Sir Benjamin West, second president of the Royal Academy and purchased by Richard Lord Grosvenor 1775 and placed in panel at Eaton Hall. This is the first battle picture in which figures were represented in contemporary uniform. Sir Joshua Reynolds implored West to abandon that idea saying it was against all traditions and would thereby lose grace and elegance. West answered "What I lose in grace I shall gain in simplicity." Sir Joshua Reynolds expressed great admiration for picture.

I am also happy to inform the House that the Advisory Arts Council have, through Lord Beaverbrook, secured a portrait of Sir John Franklin. This is said to be a very fine portrait, and I believe it was secured at a very trifling cost. I am sure the members of the House will join in appreciation of the splendid gift which the Duke of Westminster has

made to the Canadian people in the celebrated portrait of Wolfe, and I feel that I may assure him that the thanks of this House and of the people are accorded to him for his magnificent generosity. I have already expressed the appreciation of the Government, and I am now enabled to express, on behalf of the Parliament and people of Canada, their thanks for the splendid gift and their appreciation of the spirit which prompted the Duke of Westminster to present this great historic painting to the people of Canada.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The House in Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Bill No. 37, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Morphy—in committee.

On section 1—short title:

Mr. CURRIE: This Bill is one that caused some trouble in the Railway Committee, and the Minister of Railways was to make a statement in the House as to whether this was a Government Bill or not. I should like if he would present that statement now.

Mr. J. D. REID: This Bill is merely for the purpose of extending the charter of the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, a subsidiary company of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. This company is owned and controlled by the Dominion Government through the Canadian Northern Railway system. In the Railway Committee, representatives of the city of Toronto did raise some objections, until they understood that the clause in the extension of 1916 covered all their objections.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Any value that this has will accrue to the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: About $1,200,000 has been expended on this road in purchasing right-of-way, making surveys and so on. Any benefits that will arise in so far as this railway is concerned, belong to the Dominion Government.

Mr. CURRIE: This railway company, I understand, owns the right-of-way from Toronto to Niagara?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: On that right-of-way, there are two power lines. Is that right?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know about that.

Mr. CURRIE: I want to know if they have bought any additional right-of-way during the last couple of years, because since the Electrical Development Company has put two power lines over this right-of-way, there is no room for a railway, and the railway company has leased to the Development Company the right to put power lines on that right-of-way.

Mr. J. D. REID: The stock of this subsidiary company is vested in the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and on October 1, 1917, five-sixths of $60,000,000 of the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway was vested in the Dominion Government. Prior to that we had $40,000,000 worth of the stock, so that practically the whole stock of the Canadian Northern is owned by the Dominion Government.

Mr. CURRIE: But what is the relationship between this railway company and the Electrical Development Company, which is not owned by the Canadian Northern, but which is owned by the Toronto Street Railway Company, and which has put two power lines over the right of way of this railway company, and is the Government in a position to state the rental paid for the use of the right of way?

Mr. J. D. REID: I never heard of that before. That question was never raised before. At all events, whatever may have been the rights of the Canadian Northern in this railway company at the time the Canadian Northern was taken over, they now belong to the Dominion Government.

Mr. CAHILL: In what position is the Government of Canada with regard to the Canadian Northern Railway Company? Have we anything to say in the management at the present time?

Mr. J. D. REID: The stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company has been vested in the Dominion Government in accordance with an Act of Parliament passed last session. The question as to the value of the stock taken over by the Dominion Government is now being determined by a Board of Arbitrators sitting at present in Toronto. The arbitrators, as I understand it, will complete their work some time soon, and after they have made their report the Dominion Government will take over the absolute control and operation of the railway.

Mr. CURRIE: Does the minister intend to make a general statement to the House in regard to the railway situation, and if so, when, so that we may know if it is going to be debated or not? It has been the custom to make such a statement.

Mr. J. D. REID: It has been the custom for the Minister of Railways every year to make a statement as to the general railway situation at the time he takes up his Estimates, and it is my intention to do so when the Estimates of the Railway Department are taken up.

Mr. CAHILL: If the Estimates are not taken up very soon, we shall have a lot of new railway legislation passed. As I understood the regulations passed last year, they did not provide that the Government should wait until the arbitration was settled before taking over the management. Is the position now that the country own the stock of the Canadian Northern railway, but that until the arbitration is decided, we have nothing to say as to the management?

Mr. J. D. REID: When the stock was taken over, it was understood and arranged with the present Board of Directors that they were not to undertake any new work or enter into any negotiation other than to continue the operation of the road until the new Board of Directors had been appointed. It was expected the arbitration would have been completed long before this. In the meantime, until their finding is made nothing is being done by the Canadian Northern directors except to operate the road.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Is the Government debarred by any understanding it has with the Canadian Northern from proceeding to take over the road and appointing a board of management such as Sir Henry Drayton and his associates suggested?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government are not debarred in any way. It was expected that the arbitration would only take about five or six weeks. As soon as the award is made the Government will take charge of the road and it will be under our absolute control.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The minister must see that even when the award has been made it may not be accepted either by the Government or by the company, and the present status might continue for weeks and months, and, perhaps, for a year. I think, under the circumstances, it would be very dangerous to have it go out to the country that the Government is going to wait before taking any action regarding the operation of the road until the award has been finally settled.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said that as soon as the arbitrators have made their award, that is final so far as the Government is concerned. We will then take over the road.

Mr. EULER: Does this legislation contemplate the granting of additional powers, or merely the extension of powers formerly possessed by the company, but which have now lapsed?

Mr. J. D. REID: It does not add to the powers at all. The original charter of this company has not been changed at all.

Mr. EULER: This is not a road against which protests were entered by the hydro-radial people of Ontario?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Hydro-Electric Commission objected to the extension of this charter two years ago for the reason that the road, when built, would parallel a line the commission proposed to build from Toronto to Niagara Falls, but in the committee the other day the Hydro Commission did not object to the extension of this charter because this railway now belongs to the people of Canada and is subject to the control of this Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Administered by the people of Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: It will be administered by the people of Canada from now on. Anything that is done in connection with this railway will be done by the Government, and we shall first have to ask Parliament to vote the money.

Mr. EULER: They have withdrawn their objection?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, because the Government has taken over the road. The same objection was taken two years ago by the city of Toronto; they felt their rights would not be as well protected by the Canadian Northern railway, which then had control over this road, as they would be when the road was under the control of this Parliament.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the minister be in a position to make a statement on the third reading of this Bill to-morrow as to whether the right-of-way is so fully occupied by the Electrical Development Company, that there is actually no room left on the right-of-way where a railway could be built? He might also inform us whether the company has purchased additional land along the

right-of-way on which this proposed railway could be built.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall certainly be glad to give the hon. member any information he desires in regard to this matter. We are simply taking over the rights of this company. A lot of money has been invested by the Canadian Northern in the purchase of a right-of-way through the city of Hamilton, for instance, and through all the territory from Toronto. As the Canadian Northern has been taken over by the Government this right-of-way will now belong to the people, and if this road is never built there will be a certain amount of money coming to the people of this country in return for that right-of-way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The request that was made by the hon. member for Simcoe seems to me to be very reasonable. He wants to know if the right-of-way has been fully occupied by the Electrical Development Company, and the only answer he gets is that the right-of-way belongs to the Canadian Northern. That is all the more reason why we should have this information. The minister has not answered my hon. friend's question at all.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not the information with me but I said I should be very glad to give him all the information he desired on the third reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let the Bill stand until you get the information.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member did not ask that the Bill stand, but that I bring down the information on the third reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It seems to me that this is the proper time to have the information.

Mr. CURRIE: Apparently the minister has not the information available at present. As I understand it, on the right-of-way of this railway company whose charter we are proposing to extend, the Electrical Development Company originally built one pole line, with the intention of building a railway line along the right-of-way, but within the last two years, owing to the extension of electric power, another power line has been built along this right-of-way some distance from the first one, and the whole right-of-way is now occupied. I am informed, however, that the railway company had purchased additional right-of-way so that they could build a railway if necessary, and I wanted to know whether it was a fact that they would have a right-of-way not cluttered up with the poles of the Electrical Development Company. Otherwise, the Government would have to bring down a Bill later on to take over the Electrical Development Company, who would undoubtedly make a kick if the railway was built along their right-of-way. I think we should know the exact situation before this Bill passes the House as to the rights that have been granted to the Electrical Development Company, what was paid for them, and all that sort of thing. It might turn out that we were taking over a worthless charter here which would be capitalized, if at all possible, by the company when it appears before the arbitration board in Toronto, and without giving full information in respect to the right-of-way. I think this is a very important matter, but I have no objection to the Bill being proceeded with, if the minister will bring down the information on the third reading. If that is satisfactory to me, I think it will be satisfactory to the House.

Mr. BUREAU: I was not in the Railway Committee when the question was discussed on the last occasion. Is this the same question that came up last year, when the Hydro-Electric representatives objected to an extension of the charter, or is this another railway company?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The city of Toronto in regard to which we had the trouble about two years ago. I think the extension was for two years. The two years are up and the charter has to be renewed. Representatives of the Hydro-Electric Commission were before the committee a few days ago.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it the same question that was discussed on the last occasion?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The city of Toronto was represented and the objections were withdrawn when it was explained that this railway and all its rights and benefits belonged to the people of Canada through the Canadian Northern System. It was also explained that the clause protecting the city of Toronto was in the charter that was being extended, and that, before anything would be done in connection with the carrying out of the completing of this line, the people of Toronto would be consulted by the Dominion Government, if the Government decided to proceed.

Mr. HOCKEN: I think the information asked for by the hon. member for Simcoe ought to be furnished. I have information

from Toronto that all the money that had been spent on the right of way by the Canadian Northern has been spent in Hamilton, that they had an arrangement with the Electrical Development Company by which they were to lease the right of way upon which the pole lines are now standing. The hon. member for Simcoe says—and I think he is quite right—that there is now not sufficient room upon that right of way for a railway. I discussed the matter with the Hydro-Electric officials in Toronto, and they gave me the information I have just given to the House, that the company does not own any right of way from Toronto to Hamilton, but that they have spent their money in Hamilton. If that is the case we ought to know it, or if they had a separate right of way contiguous to the pole line, we should know that. I am sure the minister will provide the information asked for by the hon. member for Simcoe.

Mr. J. D. REID: Before moving the third reading, I will give a detailed statement of the situation.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Was it in connection with this Bill that an article appeared in the Financial Post of Toronto attacking Sir Adam Beck—a most viallainous attack upon Sir Adam Beck—because, they said, he was a German? I could not help thinking that if Sir Adam Beck was a German, the King of England was a German. Sir Adam Beck was born in this country, and the work he has done for the people of Ontario in connection with the Hydro-Electric reflects great credit on him. I think it my duty to rise in this House and enter a protest.

Mr. PROULX: Does the hon. member happen to know if that article refers to this particular Bill?

Mr. HOCKEN: The Financial Post does not favour me with a copy, and I am not a subscriber, I therefore, have not read the article.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not a subscriber either.

Mr. MORPHY: The Minister of Railways having assured hon. members that he would give all necessary information, and the hon. member for Simcoe having stated he was willing to let the Bill be reported and to stand for third reading, I would be quite content to acquiesce. It seems to me that many objections are being urged to this measure, which would not be urged if Sir Adam Beck were here. He appeared before the Railway Committee representing the Hydro-Electric. The city of Hamilton delegation and representatives of the Union of Canadian Municipalities also appeared before the Railway Committee and they all said they were perfectly satisfied with this Bill. There is one feature of it which ought to be put before this House, if this Bill becomes operative, and the line of railway built. I understand the franchise has been valued by the Board of Arbitration sitting in Toronto, not as the road will be, but as it was when it came before the Board of Arbitration, and it was stated that $1,700,000 had been put into this charter. No doubt it was valued at that sum, if not more. This Government has taken over the road on behalf of the people of Canada. They will take over the operations of the road when the time comes. The object of the Bill is to form a connecting link between the Niagara frontier and the city of Toronto, so as to link up the lake ports of Ontario, and all that territory in the United States east of Buffalo, with the various United States roads that send freight through Canada, and have it sent through the Canadian Northern, connecting lines at Toronto, and thence to the Pacific Coast. It has been estimated, in the hearing before the Board of Arbitration, by experts who have studied the question closely, that this road is worth $5,000,000 a year as it stands to the Canadian Northern system, and as the Canadian Northern system will be expanded and extended no doubt the value of this road will be a great deal more. Whether there are conflicting interests or not, having read the evidence carefully of all the men who have spoken about it, I formed a pretty strong conclusion that if this Government ever operated the Canadian Northern Railway, the link provided by this Bill will be worth $5,000,000 a year to the people of Canada, I merely want to put that matter before the Committee, so that hon. gentlemen would not be under a misapprehension on account of what has been stated by the hon. member for Simcoe and the hon. member for Springfield. I do not want the House to get the impression that there is anything wrong about it, or that there is anything to hide. I make this statement merely because the Bill stands in my name.

Mr. CURRIE: As the hon. member from North Perth has made a statement as to the value of the road to the country, I would like the minister to bring down some information, which no doubt he can obtain, as to

the amount of securities issued by the Company, the stock and bonds, the amount of money realized to the Company by the sale of these stocks and bonds, and how the money was disposed of. If the road is worth $5,000,000 a year to the Government, we want to know it. We do not want to take from Mackenzie & Mann property worth $100,000,000 and not give them something for it. We want to know how much money was obtained and spent by the company.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think all that information has been given to the Board of Arbitrators in Toronto. I will try and furnish all the information asked for.

Bill reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE-THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 44, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 47, to confirm an agreement made between Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and Northern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Crowe.

Bill No. 45, respecting The Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(As amended).—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 36, respecting Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 46, respecting United Grain Growers, Limited, formerly The Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 24, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Fripp.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 67, respecting The International Bridge and Terminal Company.—Mr. Manion.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT RIVER PORT, N.S.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Who is the customs officer at River Port, Nova Scotia?
2. Was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission?
3. If so, what measures were taken by the said Commission to obtain necessary information with regard to the particular qualifications needed for a person holding this position?
4. Were there any other applicants for the said position?
5. Why was this particular choice made?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Capt. Elisha Wentzel.
2. This employment was authorized temporarily by the Civil Service Commission.
3, 4 and 5. No information.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Is John Fraser the Auditor General of Canada? If so, what is his salary?
2. Is A. A. Fraser employed in the Auditor General's Office? If so, what salary? Is he a son of the Auditor General of Canada?
3. Is Ethel Fraser employed in the Auditor General's Office? If so, at what salary, and is she a daughter of the Auditor General of Canada?
4. Has A. J. Fraser been paid any amount through the Auditor General's Office for services in connection with the recent election, or were there any amounts due him on this account? If so, how much, and is he a son of the Auditor General of Canada?
5. Is W. A. Fraser employed in the Agriculture Department? If so, at what salary, and is he a son of the Auditor General of Canada?
6. Is H. J. Fraser employed in the Post Office Department? If so, at what salary, and is he a son of the Auditor General of Canada?
7. Is R. J. Fraser employed in the Naval Department? If so, at what salary, and is he a son of the Auditor General of Canada?
8. What amounts of public money have been paid each to John Fraser and A. A. Fraser for travelling expenses during the two years ending December 31, 1917?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. (a) Yes; (b) $5,000 per annum.
2. (a) Yes; (b) $125 per month in connection with the payment of election accounts. He is a practising barrister of ten years' standing. (c) No information in the records of the office.
3. (a) Yes. She was appointed by the Civil Service Commission in 1911, after having obtained the highest standing in open competitive examination; (b) $1,250 per annum; (c) no information in the records of the office.
4. (a) Yes; (b) $30 as enumerator in the recent election, and $205 for counting and recording soldiers' votes. Account certified by the General Returning Officer; (c) no information in the records of the office.
5. (a) Yes; (b) salary $2,100 per annum; (c) he is a son of the Auditor General.
6. No.
7. (a) Yes; (b) $1,700; (c) yes.
8. John Fraser, 1916, $720.44; 1917, $1,537.03, authorized by Order in Council. A. A. Fraser, 1916, $245.40; 1917, $135.25.

IMPERIAL MUNITIONS BOARD.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Minister of Militia or any member of the Government, or any official of the Militia Department any knowledge or information in regard to the staff of the Imperial Munitions Board copying during the months of November and December, 1917, lists of the names of soldiers' wives and soldiers' dependents which were in the office of the Assigned Pay and Separation Branch of the Department of Militia?

2. If so, who gave instructions for these lists to be handed over to these stenographers and typewriters in the Imperial Munitions Board?

3. Who supplied the money which paid for the staff of the Imperial Munitions Board for copying these lists?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (for the Minister of Militia):

1. The minister has now been informed that some members of the staff of the Imperial Munitions Board did such copying after office hours, and the lists were made available for the purpose. No public money was paid therefor.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

EGG INSPECTORS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many Egg Inspectors does the Minister of Agriculture propose appointing?

2. In what newspapers are notices being inserted that all applications should be sent to the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, and that all appointments will be made on the basis of competitive examinations?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Five.

2. An advertisement has been inserted, according to regulations, in the Canada Gazette and copies distributed to the total of fifteen hundred (1,500) to post offices public libraries, Y. M. C. A. buildings and other public buildings throughout Canada. The advertisement states that all information can be obtained from the Live Stock Commissioner, Department of Agriculture, or from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, and it further states that the appointments would be made upon the results of a special competitive examination.

PENSION ALLOWANCE TO COL. LABATT.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What pension does Col. R. H. Labatt of the Pension Commissioners draw annually?

2. On what date was this pension granted?

3. Was it before or after Union Government was formed?

4. Does the Board of Pension Commissioners grant a full disability pension to soldiers who have an income from the Government or otherwise of $2,000?

5. Have all soldiers been granted full disability pension whose disease has been diagnosed as valvular disease of the heart?

6. Is there a case on record in the Office of the Pension Commissioners where a soldier who had an income of $5,000 was given a full disability pension?

7. Has Col. Labatt any other income except that provided by the Pensions Board?

8. Is Col. Labatt related in any way to any member of the present Government?

9. If so, what are the names of the members to whom he is related?

10. Do any of Col. Labatt's children draw pensions?

11. If so, what are their names, ages and amount of pension each draws?

12. On what date was the pension granted to his children?

Mr. McCURDY:

1. $1,890 per annum, plus allowances amounting to, in all, $240 per annum for his two children aged 13 and 15.

2. October 16, 1917.

3. Pensions are not granted by the Government, and the granting of pension in any particular case does not in any way come before the Government. This pension, as all others, was granted by the board constituted for the purpose. The present Union Government was formed on October 12, 1917.

4. The income of the person entitled to a pension is not considered in determining the award.

5. In all such cases pension award is made in strict accordance with the Pension Regulations as approved by Parliament.

6. Yes.

7. No information.

8 and 9. No. But he is connected by marriage with Major-General the Honourable S. C. Mewburn and the Honourable J. D. Reid.

10 and 11. Answered by No. 1.

12. Answered by No. 2.

MANUFACTURE OF OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What are the names of the 15 companies who made application to the Government for license for the manufacture of oleomargarine?

2. On what grounds were all except the Harris Abattoir Company and the Swift Canadian Company refused license?

3. Did the Government inquiry, of which Mr. George Henderson of Ottawa was Commissioner ascertain what percentage of stock Sir Joseph Flavelle held in the Harris Abattoir Company?

4. If so, what was the percentage?

5. Who are the owners and shareholders of the Swift Canadian Company, Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. P. Burns & Co., Ltd., Calgary, Alta.; W. J. Bellingham, 376 Claremount Ave., Westmount, Que.; Canada Maple Exchange, 22 Vallee St., Montreal; Household Products Co., 2230 Chateaubriand Ave., Montreal; W. P. Downey, 88 Grey Nun St.,

Montreal; Bel-Air Display Co., 603 Ontario St. E., Montreal; Canadian Oleomargarine Mfg. Co., 57-59 Blvd. Langelier, Quebec; Pure Food Products Co., St. Joseph and Crown Sts., Quebec; J. W. Gorham & Co., 236 Hollis St., Halifax, N.S.; Lambton Produce Co, Petrolia, Ont.; Harris Abattoir Co., Ltd., Toronto; Mandus Margarine Co., Toronto; Swift Canadian Co., Ltd., Toronto; National Broom and Brush Co., 25-29 Latour St., Montreal; M. Andresen, Squirrel Cove, B.C.

2. All except the Harris Abattoir Company and the Swift Canadian Company, Limited, of Toronto, were refused licenses at the time of their application because their establishments did not conform to the requirements of the law as laid down in section 4 of the regulations passed on November 17, 1917.

3. The report of the commission of which Mr. George F. Henderson, K.C., of Ottawa, was chairman does not deal explicitly with the points covered by questions 3 and 4, but statements in the report as to the proportion of stock held by Sir Joseph Flavelle in the Wm. Davies Company, Ltd., and as to the proportion of stock held by the Wm. Davies Company, Ltd., in the Harris Abattoir Company, would indicate that the interests of Sir Joseph Flavelle in the Harris Abattoir Company were on May 12, 1917, approximately twenty per cent. The report in question has been tabled.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. No information.

MILITARY SERVICE COUNCIL.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. What are the names of the barristers or advocates employed by the Military Service Council and their respective salaries?

2. What is the basis of the difference of salaries?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The Military Service Council does not employ barristers or advocates. If the hon. gentleman desires, as possibly he may, to ascertain the names and salaries of lawyers employed by the registrars throughout the country, and if he will modify his question accordingly, I will be very glad to get the information. As the question stands now, the answer is that the Militray Service Council does not employ barristers.

MR. W. F. O'CONNOR, K.C.

Mr. MORPHY:

1. What positions during the twelve months preceding April 15, 1918, has Mr. W. F. O'Connor occupied under the Government?

2. How much has he received from the Government in remuneration or salary during the twelve months preceding the 15th April, 1918, for each of the said positions?

3. What is the total amount he has received from the Government during such period of twelve months?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. (a) Law Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General; (b) Examiner under Order in Council P.C. 2777 of November 10, 1916 (Cost of Living Regulations); (c) General Returning Officer for Canada for General Elections, 1917.

2. (a) Salary as Law Secretary, $5,000; (b) additional salary as Examiner as aforesaid, $2,000; (c) General Returning Officer, nil.

3. $7,000.

RENTAL FOR FRASERVILLE BUILDING.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to continue paying rent to Madam S. C. Riou, of Fraserville, Quebec, for the building which was occupied until recently as Headquarters for recruits under the voluntary system, in the districts of Kamouraska and Rimouski?

2. What rent has been paid to date for said buildings?

3. What amount has been paid to date for repairs of all kinds in order to use this building for such headquarters?

4. What does the Department intend to do at the expiry of lease, with the costly repairs made to said premises and by which a considerable increase in value has been realized?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes.

2. $3,600.

3. $2,211.55.

4. Repairs remain as part of the building.

THE DENTAL CORPS.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. What is the present strength of the Dental Corps in Canada?

2. Are special arrangements being made in the large centres for dental treatment of returned men?

3. At what centres will the large hospitals be placed?

4. Have any promotions been made in the Dental Corps where officers have been granted the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel?

5. How many have been given the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel west of the Ottawa River, and how many east of there?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. 457 all ranks.

2. Yes.

3. The large hospitals (Class A) will be placed in the following centres: Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

4. Yes, five.

5. (a) Five west of the Ottawa river; (b) none east of the Ottawa river.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, DUTIES AND DRAWBACKS.

Mr. JOHN F. REID:

1. What is the percentage of duty charged Canadian Manufacturers on raw materials imported and entering into the manufacture of agricultural implements?

2. What is the percentage of drawback allowed to Canadian Manufacturers on imported raw materials manufactured into agricultural implements for export trade?

3. What is the percentage of drawback allowed to Canadian Manufacturers on imported raw materials manufactured into agricultural implements for domestic trade?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The full duty as specified in the Customs Tariff.

2. 99 per cent of the Customs duties on imported materials is allowed to Canadian manufacturers when such materials are manufactured into other articles and are exported.

3. The following are the provisions of the Customs Tariff respecting drawback on materials manufactured into agricultural implements for domestic trade:

Item No.	Goods.	When subject to drawback.	Portion of duty (not including special duty or dumping duty) payable as Drawback.
1002	Rolled iron, rolled steel and pig iron	When used in the manufacture of mowing machines, reapers, harvesters, binders and attachments for binders.	99 p.c.

CLERGYMEN IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Are certain clergymen in Canada paid as Immigration Agents, or for services in connection with Immigration or Repatriation?

2. If so, for how many years have such payments been made?

3. Does the Government intend to continue to employ these men in the service mentioned?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Yes.

2. Since December 15, 1911.

3. They will be retained unless when reorganization of Department of Immigration and Colonization is made it is found advisable to dispense with their services.

Mr. BLAIR:

1. Did the Government employ clergymen, or priests, residents of the province of Alberta, in connection with the work of immigration and colonization during the years of 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

2. If so, what are their names and addresses?

3. If so, how much was paid to each during the years of 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to continue to employ clergymen and priests in this work?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Yes.

2. Rev. J. B. H. Giroux, Grouard, Alberta, (headquarters at Montreal); Rev. J. A. Normandeau, Edmonton, Alberta, (resigned April 30, 1917); Rev. J. M. Boucher, St. Albert, Alberta, (headquarters at Montreal).

3. Rev. J. B. H. Giroux:

	Expenses.	Salary.	Total.
1914-15. . .	$1,534 72	$600	$2,134 72
1915-16. . .	1,784 31	600	2,384 31
1916-17. . .	1,549 77	600	2,149 77
1917-18. . .	1,305 31	600	1,905 31

Rev. J. A. Normandeau:

	Expenses.	Salary.	Total.
1914-15. . .	$1,891 13	$600	$2,491 13
1915-16. . .	1,604 30	600	2,204 30
1916-17. . .	1,466 38	600	2,066,38
1917-18. . .	136 04	50	186 04

Rev. J. M. Boucher:

	Expenses.	Salary.	Total.
1917-18. . .	$1,493 75	$504 84	$1,998 59

4. Clergymen and priests will be continued in present work unless when reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization is made it is found advisable to dispense with their services.

"THE PARASITES" PROHIBITED.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government suppressed, or forbidden, the circulation of a book written by Arthur Mee, on Temperance, called "The Parasites"?

2. Did the said book contain the picture of one of the present members of the Union Government?

3. If so, was the said book printed with official sanction, and at the public expense, in the first instance?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No.

VICTORY LOAN ADVERTISING.

Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the item of $2,919.60 contained in the Return brought down on April 24, 1918, as the amount paid the Toronto Globe for Victory Loan advertising,—

1. How much space in lines or inches did the said advertisement occupy in the Toronto Globe?

2. Did the said advertisement occupy the same amount of space in the columns of the Toronto Star and the Toronto World as it did in the Toronto Globe?

3. If so, why was the Star paid only $2,757.40 and the World only $1,946.40?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. 32,440 lines.

2. Yes; Toronto World Sunday edition, 1,400 lines extra.

3. Payments to each paper were made on the card rates respectively: Toronto Star rate 8½c a line, Toronto World rate 6c a line, Toronto Globe rate 9c a line.

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the item of $1,615.95 and the item of $1,613.17 contained in the Return brought down on April 24, 1918, as being the amounts respectively paid to the Ottawa Citizen and the Ottawa Journal-Press for advertising the Victory Loan,—How much space in lines or inches did the said advertisement occupy in each of the newspapers mentioned?

Hon. Mr. REID: Ottawa Citizen, October 3,055 lines, November 1,990 lines, December 100 lines. Ottawa Journal, October 2,215 lines, November 28,648 lines, December 100 lines.

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the item "News Editorial and Feature Service, $5,762.38," contained in the Return of amounts paid for Victory Loan advertising,—

To whom was the said amount paid, and what services were rendered therefor?

Hon. Mr. REID: Paid to Canadian Press Association Incorporated for news editorial and feature service as follows:

Salaries	$ 829.00
Special articles, cartoons, etc.	1,693.25
Printing	778.00
Stereos, mats, account British & Colonial Press, Limited	530.97
Outside stenographic work "Might Directories"	251.72
Rent of office—Dominion Bank Bldg., Oct. 10 to Dec. 1, 1917	101.40
Winnipeg Newspaper Union List	260.00
Dominion Press Clipping Agency	200.00
Office supplies	57.05
Miscellaneous	131.44
Travelling expenses of Advisory Board of Publishers	929.55
	$5,762.38

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the item "Service Fees of the following Advertising Agencies, A. McKim, Gibbons, McConnell and Ferguson, Norris and Patterson and Desbarats, $16,452.01," contained in the Return of amounts paid for Victory Loan advertising,—

1. What portion of the said amount was paid to each of the agencies mentioned?

2. On what basis was the amount so paid in each case calculated?

3. Why was the work in question not done, as formerly, by the staff of the King's Printer, at the Printing Bureau?

Hon. Mr. REID:

(1)

A. McKim, Limited	$3,222.51
J. J. Gibbons, Limited	3,423.90
McConnell & Ferguson	3,399.58
Morris & Patterson, Ltd.	3,588.49
Desbarats Advertising Agency	2,817.53
Total	$16,452.01

(2) 10 per cent on advertising.

(3) Victory Loan Organization handled all advertising.

WAR-TAX—FARM IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. MACNUTT:

1. What total revenue has the Government derived yearly from the imposition of the 7½ per cent. War Tax to date?

2. How much from the importation of farm implements?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Total "War Tax."

	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	Total.
1915.	$ 402,182.87	$ 2,236,290.16	$ 2,638,413.03
1916.	3,442,072.70	21,814,715.19	25,256,787.89
1917.	4,733,368.23	33,097,059.16	37,830,427.39
1918.	4,024,896.14	40,993,666.13	45,018,562.27

2. War Tax on "Farm Implements and Machines."

	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	Total.
1915.	$157.35	$ 17,554.57	$ 17,711.92
1916.	773.55	246,392.70	247,166.25
1917.	910.45	546,063.90	546,974.35
1918.	325.55	939,845.77	940,171.32

Farm Implements and Machines included above are:—

Cultivators and weeders and parts of; drills, seed; farm, road or field rollers; forks, pronged; harrows, and parts; hay loaders; hay tedders; hoes; horse rakes; knives, hay or straw; knives, edging; manure spreaders; ploughs and parts of; post hole diggers; potato diggers; rakes, n.o.p.; scythes; sickles or reaping hooks; snaths; spades and shovels of iron or steel, n.o.p.

Parts of agricultural implements, n.o.p. paying 12½ p.c., 17½ p.c. and 20 p.c. All other agricultural implements, n.o.p:—

Fanning mills; grain crushers; hay presses; fodder or feed cutters; horse powers, for farm purposes; portable engine with boilers in combination, and traction engines for farm purposes; threshing machine separators; threshing

machine separators, parts of; including wind stackers, baggers, weighers and self-feeders therefore and finished parts thereof for repairs, when imported separately.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Has the King's Printer a special department to contract for any supervise newspaper advertising for different departments connected with or controlled by the Government?

2. What part, if any, of newspaper advertising is handled through the Director of Public Information?

3. Is newspaper advertising being placed by departments or Commissions independent of these two offices?

4. If so, to what extent and under what circumstances?

5. What outside firms or advertising agencies handle this, and on what terms?

6. What are the amounts paid to these agencies, and what proportion of these amounts was paid to the newpapers carrying the advertising?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

Copy of all Orders in Council and instructions given by the minister in charge in connection with the work of Mr. M. E. Nicholls, Director of Public Information for Canada; along with a copy of all telegrams, letters, statements and articles sent out by Mr. Nicholls since assuming the position of Director of Public Information; and also copy of the mailing list of the individuals or companies to whom this information was sent.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Copy of all correspondence between the city of Quebec, the Quebec Board of Trade and the Government with regard to the claims of the city of Quebec for terminals of the National Transcontinental Railway and other matters.

Mr. BUREAU:

Return showing, (a) whether the Canadian Government Railways Employees Magazine, published at Moncton, N.B., is owned by the Government; (b) if so, the names of the Editor, Business Manager, Advertising Solicitor, and of other persons engaged in connection with the magazine and the amounts of salary or other remuneration paid to them, respectively, since its establishment; (c) the positions, if any, such persons also occupy in the Canadian Government Railways Service, and what salaries they receive in such service; (d) the revenue and expenditure in connection with the publication of the magazine from its inception to December 31, 1917, showing separately the amounts received from advertising, subscriptions, and from other sources respectively; also separately the amounts disbursed for personal service, printing and other expenses of publication; (e) the sums of money paid by the Government or by the Canadian Government Railways in connection with the publication of the magazines with dates and amounts showing for what purposes such payments were made; (f) a copy of the correspondence between the Minister of Railways and Canals, and officials of that Department, particularly the Purchasing Agent, the General Manager and other officials of the Canadian Government Railways and any officials or employees of the Magazine and of all correspondence from the minister or from any officials of the Department or from any officials of the Canadian Government Railways for the purpose of inducing manufacturers and others to advertise in the magazine; and (g) whether the Post Office Department has admitted the Magazine to second-class postal privileges, and if so, on what date, and whether such privileges extended only to copies sent to bona fide subscribers or if they include copies supplied gratuitously to Canadian Government Railways officials and employees.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 21, to amend the Penitentiary Act.—Hon. Mr. Doherty.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, Bill No. 62, to amend the Insurance Act, 1917, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The other day there was confusion in names attached to Bills, one being on the Order Paper over the name of the Minister of Finance which should have been over the name of the Minister of Justice. I made the mistake of thinking that the present Bill was the Bill of the Minister of Justice, whereas it turns out that it is not. The present Bill is over the signature of the Minister of Finance and has to be put through by him. However he is not here, consequently I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, Bill No. 19, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (vegetables, eggs, food containers, firewood and cement) was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—Vegetables may be sold by the pound.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A careful inspection of the Inspection and Sale Act shows that there is nothing in that Act at the present time to prevent vegetables being sold by weight, so that this section is not necessary for enactment, and I move that it be dropped.

Section dropped.

On Section 2—Weight of dozen eggs.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It transpires that with reference to the sale of eggs and the

regulations for their grades and size, in pursuance of an Act passed last year, I think, the Agriculture Department has made somewhat elaborate regulations for the grading and marking of eggs, which regulations have passed council within a very short time, and seem to cover the situation to the extent that it is not necessary to enact this clause. I am not going into an explanation of what has been arranged for under those regulations by the Department of Agriculture, but am simply stating the fact, and, on account of that, it is not necessary to pursue any further legislation with regard to the weight or grading of eggs. I therefore move that the amended section shall read:

2. Section three hundred and thirty-nine of the said Act is hereby repealed.

The whole business of regulating the size and grading of eggs under the Inspection and Sales Act has gone through these regulations I have spoken of into the hands of the Department of Agriculture.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How does Section 339, which we are repealing, read?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Section 339 of the present Act reads:

When eggs are described as sold by the standard dozen, the dozen shall means one pound and a half.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is repealed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. STACEY: Have these regulations been made from the standpoint of the producer or the dealer or the consumer?

Mr. BUREAU: Or the layer?

Mr. STACEY: Because it is of vital importance to a very large section of some portions of Canada, and it will tend to allay any fears that may exist in their mind if they were assured that the interests of these three parties, or at least two of them, the producers and the consumers, were taken into consideration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no doubt at all that the Department of Agriculture has taken a wide survey of the whole question and has acted in the best interests, I should say, of the producer and the consumer. The Minister of Agriculture is not in the House, but, as a matter of fact, at the present time these regulations are in force. They cover the grading, weight and soundness of eggs, in fact, everything about eggs that one can think of. They deal with the marking of the cases in which eggs are packed for export, how they shall be packed, the number of eggs they shall contain, their inspection before exportation, the sanitary condition of warehouses or rooms in which they are stored, and there is a caution to Collectors of Customs throughout Canada that they shall not allow any Canadian eggs to be shipped for export that are not marked in accordance with these regulations. The regulations come into force as soon as they are published in the Canada Gazette, and in so far as they affect shipments from one province to another, they shall come into force on June 1, 1918. That is all extra information that I am giving of what has been done by the Department of Agriculture, but it does not affect this legislation at all. If my hon. friend will apply to the Minister of Agriculture he will get full information.

Mr. SEXSMITH: May I ask when these regulations were made and under what authority?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Under an Act of Parliament passed last year which gave authority to the Minister of Agriculture to make regulations by Order in Council. They were published not more than three or four weeks ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As I understand, these regulations only affect interprovincial trade?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Export trade, and after June 1 next the regulations also affect shipments from one province to another province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then the regulations are in force now so far as interprovincial shipments are concerned?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They come into force on the 1st of June next. I am not able to say whether these regulations are in force in any sense, but I just find, in my explanations, that with reference to interprovincial trade they come into force on June 1, 1918.

Mr. STACEY: Can the minister say whether provision has been made for the selling of eggs by weight, irrespective of their size?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I gather from these regulations, a digest of which I have here, that eggs, as graded, must satisfy certain conditions of size, weight, cleanliness and soundness of shell. Those seem to be the different factors which enter into the grading.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Those regulations are, I understand, applicable only to eggs for export? They will not govern transactions as between local buyers and local shippers? I understand the Food Control Board has made regulations with the view of eliminating the waste in connection with the egg trade; that is, they have regulated the quality of eggs that can be offered for sale, limiting to one per cent the number of stale eggs which can be offered for sale by anyone. Is legislation included in this Bill covering that action of the Food Control Board, and do those regulations govern anything except the export trade?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is asking me somewhat of a double question. He is asking me a question as regards the legislation and regulations which are carried out by the Department of Agriculture. I am not in a position to give him full information in respect to that, but I find here that class 1 includes fresh gathered eggs which have not been held under artificial refrigeration or subject to artificial preservation, and that all of this is preceded by this sentence:

> Eggs for domestic consumption or for export, but not including eggs intended for incubation, shall be classified and graded as follows:

That, I think, gives as full information as I can give in regard to the matter. If my hon. friend has any more questions with regard to that, he must fire them at the Minister of Agriculture and not at me.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I just made the suggestion because the Agricultural Department is apparently regulating the egg trade, and the Food Control Board is also passing regulations with regard to that trade. It would be well if the whole of the legislation in regard to this commodity were embodied in one Act. There is a good deal of confusion in the country over many of these new regulations, and the idea should be to simplify legislation as much as possible so that confusion need not arise. Here are two bodies regulating the same article. The one, I think, governs export, and the other governs transactions locally.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think they intermingle too, but my hon. friend may rest assured that the Department of Agriculture and the Food Board must be working very closely together. There is also one fact which makes it impossible for us to do by legislation what is done from time to time by the regulations of the Food Board. Your legislation is made, and it is fixed, and it cannot be changed again until another session comes round, but the circumstances of the war make it necessary for the Food Board to make, from day to day, and from week to week, regulation after regulation with regard to foods, so that it is impossible for them to go on exactly formal lines. I do not want the committee, on my Bill which does not have anything to do with eggs, to get into a discussion on the regulations of the Minister of Agriculture. Cannot we dismiss eggs and go on with the rest of my Bill?

Mr. SEXSMITH: The minister has stirred up some questions about which the House and the country have a right to have some knowledge. Do we understand that the House and the country are not to know anything further about those regulations until they are published in the Canada Gazette, and that it does not matter how radical they may be, the public have to abide by the regulations which the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to make law? I never was and I am not now in favour of leaving too much power in the hands of a department to make regulations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear. Sound doctrine!

Mr. SEXSMITH: It is a great mistake to carry this principle to the extent to which it has been carried in the past. The Department of Agriculture, if they see fit, may say that a dozen eggs shall weigh one pound or two pounds or five pounds, and they may make one hundred different regulations in regard to marketing eggs. Perhaps they may have something to say even as to the eating of eggs. Those regulations become law the minute they are published in the Canada Gazette. Surely the committee has a right to know something about them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall ask the Minister of Agriculture to give all the necessary information, and again I put in a plea not to be pestered in regard to this business about which I do not know anything from personal administrative knowledge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: While nobody wants to interfere with the passage of this Bill, the point just brought forward by my hon. friend (Mr. Sexsmith) is worthy of attention. As I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce, those regulations are now law. They have been published in the Canada Gazette. The Canada Gazette is a paper which is not generally read

by the public. I doubt if there is one man in the House who knows the regulations. I doubt if the minister himself knows them. The minister may proceed with his Bill if he promises that, say to-morrow, the regulations will be laid upon the Table so that we may have a look at them.

Mr. SEXSMITH: My reasons for speaking and making objections are that we have so many regulations. We set a price on bran and shorts, and what was the result? My information is that the farmer cannot buy any bran or shorts at $40 a ton, but the big milling trusts of the country grind the bran a little finer and mix it, along with shorts, with a little barley or screenings, and sell that mixture under a different name at $64 or $65 a ton. That is an example of the results of the regulations made by our boards and commissions. Such regulations are very detrimental to the country and to the farmer. Men have been asked to produce more bacon. I hardly dare go home because, if I go near the farmers of my constituency, they are after me at once. They cannot now buy a pound of bran or shorts, whereas previous to the fixing of the price they could secure them. The setting of that price has been a detriment rather than a benefit. We should have some knowledge as to what the regulations are going to be.

The CHAIRMAN: This discussion is not in order. The clause under discussion is to repeal section 339 of the Inspection and Sale Act, and I would ask hon. members to confine themselves to this clause, particularly as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has promised that all information desired will be given when the estimates of the Department of Agriculture are before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Minister of Trade and Commerce has told us he is withdrawing section 339 because certain regulations have been substituted for it. Nobody knows what those regulations are, and I think it is quite germane to the clause under discussion to inquire about them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Any information that can be given by the Minister of Agriculture with reference to the regulations that have already been passed has really nothing to do with the legislation I am trying to put through. I am simply withdrawing section 339 of the Inspection and Sale Act because the matter it deals with has been disposed of by the Minister of Agriculture in another way.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Minister of Agriculture has done that by substituting regulations, and I think it would be quite in order and simplify matters very much if we could be acquainted with the causes that have led to the withdrawal of this section.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Is it because the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce found there was such antagonism to this section that they realized it could not possibly be put through the House and thought the matter had better be dealt with by way of regulations by the Minister of Agriculture?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is an awful insinuation, to suggest that the Minister of Agriculture and myself, two Christian gentlemen, have been conspiring to fool the House in that way. That has not been the case.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I hope not, but it looks very suspicious.

Mr. GLASS: The minister said that the object of this Bill was to benefit the producer as well as the consumer. Now the producer will not be benefitted unless similar standards are established in the export market. For instance, one man might send a dozen eggs to the export market weighing two pounds and another man a dozen weighing one and one-half pounds. There is that difference in the weight of eggs because the hon. member for Wentworth told me two days ago that in order to satisfy himself he went into a store and had several dozens of eggs picked at random from the different baskets lying around and weighed, and he found that on account of the difference in weight there was a variation in price from 44c. to 80c. a dozen. This is certainly an extraordinary variation in the price of eggs that are marketed in the ordinary commercial way through the country stores day by day. If the man whose fowl produces an egg that weighs two pounds to the dozen gets no better price in the export market than the man whose fowl produces an egg that weighs only one pound and four ounces to the dozen, there can be no possible advantage to the producer. Our standards should conform to the standards adopted in the export market.

Mr. ROBB: The minister is proceeding to duplicate his tactics of last week. Then he brought in a Bill to amend the Hay Act and immediately began to move amend-

ments so that the Bill left this House practically useless. It looks to me as if the minister to-day after bringing down this Bill is proceeding to cut out clause after clause, and I think he ought to tell us at once how many clauses he intends to cut out.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am going to make two or three amendments with the consent of the committee. I know my hon. friend's regard for system and order, and I think we will get along better if we deal with each clause as we come to it.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 339 of the Inspection and Sale Act was enacted by this Parliament as a protection for the consumer. The Minister of Trade and Commerce now proposes to do away with that section and to give entire control to the Minister of Agriculture to make regulations by Order in Council as to the weight of a dozen eggs. This is not the first time I have risen to protest in this House against that sort of thing. Why should we repeal this clause which has been enacted by Parliament and give the Minister of Agriculture power to go ahead and make regulations without consulting this House? Certainly the minister is not taking this action without first having consulted with the Minister of Agriculture, and I should like to know what reasons have led the minister to withdraw this section, which I think was passed in the interest of the consumer. They must surely have deliberated over the matter and have arrived at this conclusion after mature consideration. I want to know why it is proposed to repeal legislation enacted by this Parliament and to put in the hands of one man power to regulate these matters by Order in Council.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My answer is this: Parliament last year passed certain legislation giving certain powers to the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture and his department, after giving their best thought to the matter, have matured certain regulations with respect to the grading and weight of eggs. That being the case, we certainly should not have any conflicting legislation in the Inspection and Sale Act, and it would certainly be improper for me to follow those regulations with duplicate or correlative legislation.

Mr. BUREAU: That is no answer. We have given power to the Minister of Agriculture to pass regulations, but those regulations were to be subject to the laws on the Statute Book at that time. We never intended to give the Minister of Agriculture power to annul legislation which had been enacted by this Parliament.

My understanding of giving power to any minister to make regulations is that he may pass these regulations subject to any law enacted by Parliament and in force at the time that the power to make regulations was given. What do we see now? We see the Minister of Trade and Commerce asking us to repeal a statute because it might interfere with the Minister of Agriculture, and he says, "You have given this power to the Minister of Agriculture to make regulations." I say, certainly we have, but subject to all regulations and restrictions imposed by law at the time the power was given to make the regulations. I consider the answer of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is no answer to my objection. I am not satisfied with it, and I would like to know if there is anything besides what he has stated that influenced them, in their joint wisdom, to come to the conclusion that, in order to give a freer hand to the Minister of Agriculture, he has to repeal statutes already enacted by Parliament.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I will ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce—and I see the Minister of Agriculture is also present—if the new standards which they purpose to put in force are the standards adopted at the Third Annual Convention of the Canadian Produce Association held at Guelph, January 11th and 12th, 1915, where they adopted the following definitions of grades:

Specials:—Eggs of uniform size weighing over 24 ozs. to the dozen or over 45 lbs. net to the 30 dozen case; absolutely clean, strong and sound in shell; air cell small, not over 3/16 of an inch in depth; white of egg to be firm and clear and yolk dimly visible; free from blood clots.

Extras:—Eggs of good size, weighing at least 24 ozs. to the dozen or 45 lbs. net to the 30 dozen case; clean; sound in shell; air cell less than ⅛ inch in depth; white of egg to be firm and yolk slightly visible.

No. 1's:—Eggs weighing at least 23 ozs. to the dozen or 43 lbs. net to the 30 dozen case; clean; sound in shell; air cell less than ¼ inch in depth; white of egg to be reasonably firm; yolk may be quite visible but mobile, not stuck to the shell or seriously out of place; air cell not necessarily stationary.

No. 2's:—Eggs clean; sound in shell; may contain weak watery eggs and eggs with heavy yolks, and all other eggs sound in shell and fit for food.

Is that the regulation that is intended to be put in force if this section is repealed? This matter is under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CRERAR: The regulations the hon. gentleman has read were promulgated by

the Department of Agriculture under power given by an Act passed, I think, at the last session of Parliament, entitled, The Live Stock and Produce Act.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: That is this standard that I have read.

Mr. CRERAR. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What are the regulations now in force passed by the Department of Agriculture in regard to the sale of eggs?

Mr. CRERAR: I could read them to the House. There are three pages.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: It would be well to have them on Hansard.

Mr. CRERAR: Shall I read them?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: These regulations have been published in the Gazette, and nobody in the House seems to know what they are. Publications in the Gazette do not reach many people. If they were placed on Hansard, we would be able to read them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Place them on the Table.

Mr. BUREAU: Do the regulations in any way come in conflict with the legislation which existed in the Inspection and Sale Act with reference to eggs as to the weight per dozen?

Mr. CRERAR: I am informed not.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. minister deem it necessary that we should repeal the former section of the Act, in order to give him a freer hand in the making of his regulations, and if so, why?

Mr. CRERAR: I have not followed the discussion, but does my hon. friend's question refer to this Act under consideration for amendment? Because these regulations have been promulgated under another Act altogether.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that, but to-day we have the Bill before the committee. This Bill amends Section 339 of the Inspection and Sales Act, and that has reference to the weight of eggs. This is amended to make twelve eggs weigh a pound and a half. Not only is the existing section repealed in this Bill, but they take advantage of the Bill to repeal the section in the Inspection and Sales Act, doing away with all control whatever by this Parliament, or taking away from this Parliament the regulation which is there established as to the weight of eggs. I want to know if the Minister of Agriculture suggested that, and if so, why?

Mr. CRERAR: The suggestion did not come from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BUREAU: Then why does the Minister of Trade and Commerce desire to repeal Section 339 of the Inspection and Sales Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is in an asking mood to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is not in an informing mood.

Mr. BUREAU: We have to be in an asking mood if we want to obtain information.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I find in my notes that it is suggested by the department that Section 339 should be repealed, inasmuch as the regulation with reference to the grades, standard weights and colours of eggs, has been provided for in the legislation passed last year, under the Inspection and Sales Act, and the regulations have been promulgated since by the Department of Agriculture. On looking into the matter, I do not see any very great reason why Section 339 should be repealed, if the House wishes to retain it.

Mr. BUREAU: I think we should keep it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No Prussianism is being introduced into the House. An Act of Parliament is passed by the consent of the House, and the repeal of an Act can only be accomplished by the consent of the House. The committee can determine whether it should be repealed or not. I looked over these regulations as they came to me, and I saw that they were very explicit, and that they provided, as I have said, for the different grades, the weights of the eggs, and all these other particulars that I have already explained to the House.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: You have got to repeal that section.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It does not appear to me that we require two pieces of legislation in regard to the grading and packing of eggs.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: If the Government is going to adopt the regulations which have been already adopted by the Canadian Produce Association——

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The legislation I am proposing in this Bill does not adopt these. That matter is already settled by legislation on the statute-books.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The minister will have to repeal the section in the former

Act, in order to enact the provision in the Bill before us.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says he can only do this with the consent of the House. That statement is correct. But the House will not assent without sufficient information. Why not drop this section of the Bill, and let the former section stand?

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I will tell the hon. member why; because the new regulations call for a dozen eggs of a different weight than that provided in the section which is being repealed. The old Act gives the weight of a dozen eggs as a pound and a half. The Bill the Minister of Agriculture has introduced calls for different weights, according to the grades of eggs. Extras are eggs that weigh 24 ounces, and No. 1 weighs 23 ounces. So that, unless you repeal the clause the Minister of Trade and Commerce is proposing to repeal, you will have a contradiction in the law. One calls for a dozen eggs to weigh 24 ounces, and the other calls for a dozen eggs to weigh 23 ounces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is that view and I have no doubt it was responsible for the recommendation that that section be repealed. We will take that matter into consideration. We will let this clause stand and go on with the other clauses. I shall look up the matter and see whether there is a clash or not, and on that will depend whether this will be pressed to repeal or not.

Section as amended, allowed to stand.

On section 3—Packages of food and containers to be marked:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to make some explanation and to suggest some amendments which have been rendered advisable after further consideration. The object of this section is to assure the consumer that when he makes a purchase of something, his purchase is based upon the standards of weights and measures. The old system by which an article was measured, or weighed out, from bulk has been modified of late years very largely by the practice of putting up in containers or cartons different articles of food. These are not marked at present with the weight contained, or with the measurement, if it be other than weight, within the carton itself. This opens a very large field for fraud against the consumer. When a purchaser goes in and buys a certain quantity of commodities of different kinds, he knows the price per pound and he knows what he is getting if it be measured or weighed out to him. If it be placed in a carton or a container, he is not buying, in fact, by standard weight or by measurement; he is buying by the package. It has been shown that buying food in this way is an expensive method. A number of apt illustrations have been given in different exhibitions and in different ways in Canada where they have been placed side by side with what you get as a pound, or the measure in weight or capacity, when the article is measured or weighed out to you from the bulk, and what you get in comparison in buying the same commodity when put up in the cartons, or containers. The disparity is very marked. It is therefore an extravagant method of buying food and it also facilitates fraud in not giving the proper amount as to weight or measurement in the carton. Nothing is promised, and therefore there is no contract. You buy a package and pay so much for it. This provision is simply to make it necessary that every container shall bear upon it legibly the net weight or measurement of the article that is contained therein. It is also made necessary by this legislation that the name of the packer or person who puts up the product, or of the person for whom it is put up, shall be marked on the container. There is an amendment I wish to make to the latter part of paragraph (b) which will make the meaning a little clearer. I beg to move:

That after the word "standard" in line 11, there be inserted these words "avoirdupois weight or the measure in Dominion standard".

The clause will then read:

"The name of the article or articles of food or other commodities in such container, and the net weight in Dominion standard avoirdupois weight, or the measure in Dominion standard capacity measure, or the numerical count of such food or other commodity."

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose the contents were half water, although the can contained the proper weight?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is whatever is contained within the carton if it is well and properly packed outside of the weight of the carton itself.

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose that in a can of tomato there was a large quantity of water, what protection has the public?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would have the protection of having the name of the

packer upon it and if a packer proposed to put in a little piece of tomato peel and the rest water, he would not do much business.

Mr. BUREAU: That is an extreme case.

Mr. FIELDING: That is all right as far as the name goes, but I intended to ask a question similar to that asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy). Take a can of fish: only part of the can is solid fish, and part is water, brine, pickle, or whatever is used as a preservative. Will you know the amount of fish in the can, or merely the weight of the contents of the can?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It means the contents of the can.

Mr. FIELDING: These are difficult things to deal with, but it is just as well in the interests of all that these difficulties should be expressed. If it is the contents only, it does not mean the amount of food that is in the can, and it does not give an assurance to the public that they are getting value in the amount of fish contained in the can; they are not getting value because the contents are largely water.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not see any other way by which we can attempt to make an improvement. At the present time there is no check and the same objection exists in reference to cans or cartons unmarked. These are additional checks. The desire of the maker, to put up standard goods and to continue to do business, acts much more strongly under these safeguards than it does now.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister define what is meant by human food? For instance, milk and cream are delivered to houses in small bottles, and other commodities such as maple syrup, butter, bread, come to the consumer's house in wrappers. Is it the intention that the farmer who furnishes that milk or cream should go to the expense of having printed labels put on the bottles, and is it also to be required on the wrappers of butter, cream, maple syrup, delivered to the consumer's house?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The definition in the clause is as conclusive as can be given. A succeeding clause defines what is excepted, and it is necessary to take that into account as well in appraising the full meaning of the enactment. Paragraph 358D mentions the exceptions:

The provisions of this Act shall not apply to,—

(a) any article manufactured or packed for export.

[Sir George Foster.]

As the section reads it also goes on to state:

or imported into Canada.

I propose to ask the committee to delete those words and make the section apply to imports into Canada as well—

but the onus of proof such article is manufactured or packed for export from Canada shall rest upon the owner or holder of the container.

It does not apply to goods sold in bulk or broken packages, and it does not apply to fresh fruits or vegetables. It is proposed also to add certain other exceptions. The Bill is not to apply to any article held in stock by a wholesale or retail dealer prior to the coming into force of this Act. That is to enable him to get rid of the stock that he has in hand before the Act comes into force. Then there are the following other exemptions to which the Act will not apply:

(e) To packages containing two avoirdupois ounces, or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of weight;

(f) To packages containing the fluid ounce, or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of measure.

That refers to very small packages, which are however largely sold:

(g) to any article the sale of which as regards the weight of marking thereof is already provided for under other statutes.

In the Inspection and Sale Act there are a great many articles enumerated and this does not apply to such articles. Special provisions are made for those. That takes in, for instance, fish, flour, potatoes and vegetables of different kinds. To continue the exemptions:

(h) those food commodities which may at the time this Act comes into force, or which thereafter may be subject to any regulation or order of the Canada Food Control Board as respects the weight of such commodity or the weight or proportion of ingredients used in the manufacture of such commodity.

(i) those food commodities held in stock at the time that such regulations of the Canada Food Board referred to in paragraph (h) become inoperative.

These are the amendments which it is considered necessary to make under the present disturbed conditions. For instance, the Canada Food Board is making regulations from time to time and these have to vary; you cannot make them subject to a fixed law. So that while the present conditions hold, and the Food Board is making its regulations from time to time, those regulations will be operative and are excepted from the workings of the Act. It is

a very difficult subject to legislate about, as my hon. friend quite understands, but the object is to make a commencement, along what is considered to be the right line, for the protection of the consumer, to go as far as we possibly can, and make way gradually.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not see that there is much protection for the consumer in the language used here unless the minister protests against the use of water or other preservatives. For instance, one may have fifty per cent tomato and fifty per cent water. It is not fair to the public that they should be forced to buy water, although it is expensive enough in this city. Now the ramifications of the law extend over the whole country, and it seems to me that the minister could insert in the Bill some such provision as this:

> That such container shall have within it at least ninety per cent of solid material, free from all other liquids except the natural juice of the fruit or vegetable.

Or require in the case of canned fish and all other commodities "the necessary ingredients." Give the purchaser, who all over the country goes looking from day to day for food products, no cause for complaint. I do not know whether anybody in this House puts up shrimps, but a can of shrimps has vastly more water in it than a can of lobster or a can of salmon, either of which is perfectly dry. It may be that the shrimps must be preserved in some way by an inordinate quantity of water, but unless the public knows that, the tendency would be to suspect fraud in the putting up of the commodity. The proportion of liquid in such a case is entirely out of proportion to the size of the can, and I think there should be in the Bill some safeguard for the protection of the consumer. A person who buys by retail a can of this, or a can of that, suffers, and while it does not seem to that individual worth complaining about, the practice has within it the element of fraud. The whole country is suffering from it in a moderate way, and the producer of the goods is practically robbing the whole country to the extent of his trade. It does seem to me that there should be some settled quantity fixed, not only for fish, but for tomatoes, corn, peas, etc., and the phrase "net weight," to my mind, rather tends towards encouraging fraud than preventing it.

Net weight might mean three-quarters of the article, or three-quarters of water. I ask the minister to consider carefully putting something drastic in there to protect the people when they are paying forty or fifty cents for a can of food, especially in these days when everything is so high. There is no reason why water within the container should take the value of the food article. I would like the minister to ask his officers if they cannot find some provision to insert there in fairness and equity to the consuming public.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it not already covered in the Bill by the term "net weight?"

Mr. MORPHY: I do not think it is. There is nothing to prevent the contents being half water. It is the weight of the contents of the container which is referred to. The minister has said that the only remedy, as I understand, if the public find there is three-quarters of water in any line of canned goods, is to quit buying those goods.

Mr. BUREAU: If water is not part of the food it should not be counted. But if the interpretation given to that section means that water is a part of the food, as in the case of the juice of the tomato, why not force the packer to put the exact contents of the package on the label, and if the exact contents are not as represented, then fine the packer?

Mr. FIELDING: It does provide for a fine, but it also specifies net weight of the contents.

Mr. BUREAU: Or of the food in the package?

Mr. FIELDING: That is debatable. It says "article or articles of food or other commodities in such container, and the net weight." Presumably that means net weight of the articles of food, but it leaves room for debate as to whether the liquid in the can is or is not part of the article of food. The object of this legislation is to protect the consumer, and we can sympathize with it. I think there is room for the criticism of my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) respecting the term "net weight."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: With reference to my hon. friend's suggestion that a system be adequately framed and put into universal practice which would be a scientific system, you would have to go back to a scientific analysis of the food packed. That is what my hon. friend suggests would rather be got at by regulation as to what were the proper ingredients to enter into a food as such, and a tabulation of those ingredients. I do not see, when we are trying to put through legislation to correct in part an evil which at

present exists, how we can do that completely without going back, framing up the particular ingredients that go into each food, say canned fish or canned tomatoes and then having a thorough inspection system to see that these goods are packed accordingly. I quite agree with my hon. friend that we have not got at the bottom of this whole matter through this legislation. All that I am contending is that we do to a certain extent put an instrument into the hands of the consumer by which he is protected very much more than he is at the present time.

Mr. HENDERS: Is it the intention that this Bill shall apply to packages put up by farmers, say pound packages of butter, and cartons of a dozen eggs, and that they should be marked as provided in this Bill?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not the intention at all. I do not think the Bill covers that.

Mr. NICKLE: Before we leave this question, I do not want to embarrass the Minister, as he has had considerable criticism to deal with but I believe there should be a provision excepting bottled milk. The section reads: "Every can, carton, bottle, and so on shall have the name of the person on whose behalf the container is filled, and also the weight of the article of food. Certainly you cannot put the weight of a bottle of milk on every bottle of milk, because the weight of milk will vary in proportion to its richness. Does this legislation apply to milk?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Milk comes under paragraph (b) under the term "the measure in Dominion standard capacity measure."

Mr. NICKLE: That clause does not contain the name of the article?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It divides them into classes by weight, measure or count.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

Mr. KAY: With reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Kingston, we on this side were not favoured with the explanation which the minister gave to that hon. member. But I might point out that the farmers often bottle milk and sell it themselves, and it would be almost impossible for them to label the bottle explaining that it is milk or that it is cream, and to have the net weight stated. They would require to have different bottles for milk and cream, because these weigh a different amount per gallon or per quart. Would the minister tell us if he has any intention of exempting bottled milk from the provisions of this Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend did not catch the explanation that I made to the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. BUREAU: It was made with the soft pedal, we could not hear it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not proposed to apply the test of weight to milk. That is a measure of capacity, and the quantity contained, the net contents are given in the section in three ways, by the avoirdupois weight, or the liquid measure standard, or the count, whichever it may be. This Bill is not meant to cover packages of butter that are brought in by farmers and disposed of on the streets or in the market-place. It refers to what may be called standard goods, and methods of disposing of them in containers of different kinds without breaking the bulk. The farmer makes up a dozen pats of butter, brings them into the market and sells them a pound here and a pound there, that is, in the broken package; those are not cartons under the meaning of this section. The amendments which I am proposing here are quite numerous, and I did not propose to pass the Bill through committee at this time, but rather to go through the sections and propose the amendments. Such of them as we can carry, we will do so. Others may be allowed to remain till the committee has a chance to look them over. My object is to make progress with the Bill to get it to the stage where we can finish it up later on.

Mr. KAY: I think the minister should have the exemptions specified in the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That may be.

Mr. KAY: Line twenty-one of section 358A, reads: "containing human food or any other commodity manufactured, produced, sold or offered for sale in Canada." It appears to me that these words cover not only food but everything that is manufactured or sold in Canada. They give very wide powers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has to read this in connection with the exceptions that are made. He will be able to do that better when he sees them all in print.

Mr. NICKLE: The explanation of the minister covered the first point I was endeavouring to make; but he should have the attention of his officials drawn to the

fact that, if this Bill goes through in its present form, it is, in my judgment, going to necessitate the destruction of tens of thousands of milk bottles throughout the country, because those milk bottles are not as a rule stamped with the name of the man who uses them. They are supplied in huge quantities. Some of them have just the quantity marked on them, such as quart, pint or half-pint, and they are used interchangeably for milk or cream. There are thousands of bottles that do not have on them the name of the man using them, and those bottles will all have to be destroyed. Some exception should, therefore, be made in regard to milk. I cannot speak in regard to other articles, because I do not know as to them. It can hardly be the intention of the department to require, from one end of the country to the other, the destruction of all the milk bottles in use, and there could not be a more unfortunate time than this for such a regulation, because as glass is scarce and the price is increasing, this would mean a substantial increase in the cost of milk to the consumer. The cost of milk is high enough now.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: The hon. member will note that, with regard to milk, a little pasteboard cover, with the name of the dairy company and the quantity on it, is put into the top of the bottle.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not part of the container; you throw that away.

Mr. HALLADAY: That applies to larger cities and towns, not to the rural districts.

Mr. ROBB: The minister intimated that he had a number of amendments. He should read those amendments so that we may know what they are. That would facilitate the passage of the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have read them.

Mr. ROBB: The minister must, sometimes, become a little annoyed at the staff of his department, because every time he brings in a Bill, we have to proceed to mutilate it, and when it passes this House, it is scarcely recognizable as being related to the Bill introduced.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Does the heading "fresh food and vegetables" include potatoes? Potatoes are put up, in Canada, in eighty or ninety pound bags, and, in the United States, in 100 pound bags.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is included in the Act itself, and is one of the exceptions. It is not the intention that this legislation should apply to sales of milk as they are carried on in country places or in towns. A man comes in with a can and he goes around and supplies his customers with milk from that can. Another man supplies his customers with milk in bottles. It is not intended to apply this Act to transactions of that kind. An amendment may have to be made expressly to exempt certain lines of that kind. We can make that later. As regards the taking out of use of cartons and packages, the Act is not to come into force immediately. Time is given so that those changes can adapt themselves gradually without destroying either cartons that are in use or packages which have already come into the trade.

Mr. BOYCE: Is any change to be made in regard to milk bottles?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not the intention of the Act to interfere with the customary system now prevailing.

Mr. BOYCE: If it did, it would create a great hardship.

Mr. KAY: Is it the intention that this legislation shall apply to milk dealers in cities?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In that respect there would be no difficulty in making an amendment which would effectually protect that business.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I can easily understand how the objection raised by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) can be got over. The dealer or seller can have his name and so forth put on the pasteboard cover that is put into the mouth of the bottle, and some already do that. All such matters, however, tend to increase the price of milk. This winter I was speaking to a milk dealer who supplies some 300 or 400 bottles of milk a day to a village. I asked him if the war affected his business. At that time he had on hand boxes containing one or two hundred bottles. He told me that the bottles themselves practically doubled in price, but he said: This is where the war has affected me; this little bit of pasteboard has gone up in price over 600 per cent. If the Government is going to make regulations so that that piece of pasteboard will have to pass through a printing press so as to have printed on it the name of the dealer and the quantity of milk contained in the bottle, that is going to increase the price still further. This man who has thirty or forty cows and who is by himself, as both

of his sons have gone overseas, has a big enough job as it is to fill three or four hundred bottles of milk. If he has to separate out his covers in accordance with the size of his bottles, and if his name and the quantity of milk have to be on each of these covers, it is going to mean a great deal more work for him, and more expense, and he will accordingly have to charge more for the milk.

Mr. PELLETIER: How will this legislation operate in rural districts where a farmer is coming into a city or town or village with four or five or six dozen eggs, or ten or fifteen pounds of butter?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It does not affect such transactions at all.

Mr. PELLETIER: What about a dealer who receives butter from a number of different farmers through the mail, and who puts that into a large receptacle such as a tub? Has that to be marked? The dealer does not know where this butter comes from. It is made up from butter from fifteen or twenty farmers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All he has to do is to sell it out as required, by the pound or in packages, as he pleases. That is a broken package.

Mr. PELLETIER: Suppose he were to ship it, what is the result? He would take the responsibility of marking the container.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If he exports or sends it away in large lots in containers, then he comes under this legislation. If he, after buying butter from different places, puts it into containers or packages, he has to put his name and the weight on them.

Mr. KAY: The minister should, before this clause passes, let us know what exceptions he is going to make.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The exceptions are:

Any article manufactured or packed for export, all goods sold in bulk or broken packages, fresh fruit and vegetables, all articles which are provided for elsewhere in the Inspection and Sale Act, all articles held in stock by wholesaler or retailer prior to the coming into force of this Act, packages containing two ounces avoirdupois or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of weight, packages containing one fluid ounce or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of measure, any article the sale of which as regards the weight or marking is provided for under other statutes, food commodities which may at the time this Act comes into force or which thereafter may be subject to any regulations or order of the Canada Food Control Board as respects the weight of such commodity or the weight or proportion of the ingredients used in the manufacture of such commodity, and all food commodities held in stock at the time such regulations of the Canada Food Board referred to in paragraph (h) become inoperative.

Mr. ROBB: I want to emphasize what has been said by the hon. member (Mr. Sexsmith) that all these regulations have the effect of increasing the cost to the consumer. The regulations passed from time to time by the Canada Food Board ever since its organization have done nothing but help to increase the cost to the consumer. They have recognized themselves that some of their regulations are so foolish they have withdrawn them two or three weeks after they have been passed. Let me give an instance. The Food Board some time ago pointed out that the expense of putting up goods in cartons was excessive and passed regulations that no retailer should sell less than twenty pounds of oatmeal, rolled oats, or flour in a carton. It was ridiculous on the face of it, because in many families twenty pounds of oatmeal would spoil before it could be used, and many other families could not afford to buy so much at a time. The Food Board recognized that eventually and withdrew those regulations. The minister comes here to-day at the request of the Canada Food Board and attempts to pass regulations which one of his supporters points out is going to increase the cost to the consumer. I endorse that view, and I think the minister should carefully consider before imposing further restrictions which will have the effect of increasing the cost of living.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will admit that food boards and all other people have to learn by experience and that we all make mistakes. I dare say my hon. friend, looking back over his own business career, can see where he has made mistakes. I deprecate wholesale criticism of the value of the work of the Food Board. It is almost impossible to protect the consumer without adding something to the expense, but you have to take into account the ultimate gain to the consumer, which is far and away above the small additional expense entailed. It is with that purpose that this legislation has been introduced. My hon. friend will admit that there has been great imposition upon the consumer in respect to carton and container sales, and it is impossible to rectify that without taking some measures of precaution, and

though labels and the like of that add somewhat to the expense, the expense is trifling compared with the benefit that accrues to the consumers as a body because of these precautions.

Mr. ROBB: Take the case of milk. Are the bottles going to contain any more milk than they do at present. They are filled now; you cannot get any more into them, and if less be put into them the people will not buy. How is the label going to give the consumer any more milk?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It gives the consumer a guarantee as to the quantity he is getting. He knows he is getting what he pays for, whereas if there is no label he does not know.

Mr. ROBB: The minister loses sight of the fact that most housewives have a measure into which they dump these articles, and they can tell whether they are being fooled or not. If they are being fooled they quit dealing with that man.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There may be housewives shrewd enough to do that, but I think the majority of them do not take that trouble.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 358B—penalty for not marking:

Mr. ROBB: Who is going to prosecute in these cases?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Any one may prosecute.

Mr. ROBB: Not the department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Inspectors have not been appointed for that purpose.

Mr. MORPHY: I understand the minister is going to except milk.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, in some way protect it.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 358C—containers not marked, etc., to be seized:

Mr. ROBB: That brings out the point raised by the hon. member for Kingston that some of these containers may be seized and destroyed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To make the Act thoroughly effective we must have the power of seizing the illegal instrument. It does not say that it will be destroyed.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 358D—exceptions:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I desire to amend this clause so that it shall apply to imports. It does not seem to be just to our packers, dealers and consumers unless this is done. If we compel our own people who are putting up foods, for instance, in cartons to put on their names and the weight or the measure, whatever it may be, it would then be unfair to allow similar goods to be imported into this country, which might be done up in exactly the same kind of carton, but would not have the weight, the capacity marks or the name of the packer upon them. Sufficient time is given in the Act for these changes to be brought about by the importers of any such goods into this country. The Act will not go into force for a year, and these changes can be brought about by persons who are importing that class of goods into this country.

Mr. FIELDING: You retain the right to cheat the farmer, if you wish.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not understand my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING: It does not apply to export. Therefore, we can cheat the farmer if we are smart enough, and he is dull enough; I merely want to understand the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The man, for instance, who is exporting goods into Russia or Germany—if we ever get on peaceful trade conditions with Germany—or the man who is importing into any other foreign country, does not want the Canadian weight marked upon them. He wants them marked in his own way, with his own weights and measures. In fact, it would destroy the export business to foreign countries in the vast majority of the articles if we insisted upon marking them according to the terms of our own Act. We had to make an exception in regard to barbed wire and various other things.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 358E—Variations of weight, etc., allowed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: After more thorough consideration and conference with the business men, it has been found advisable to change the clause. Discrepancies in weight or measure due exclusively to differences in atmospheric conditions and so on, will occur, and some provision must be made for them. The provision we had at first was calculated on a percentage of the original weight, but that works very unfairly. In some cases

it is a great deal too much. In no case that we have examined is it any too small. I think the United States sections are preferable, and I propose to substitute them therefor. They read:

> The following tolerances and variations from the quantity of the contents marked on the container shall be allowed.
> (a) Discrepancies due exclusively to errors in weighing, measuring or counting, which occur in packing conducted in compliance with good commercial practice,
> (b) Discrepancies in weight or measure due exclusively to differences in atmospheric conditions in various places and which unavoidably result from the ordinary and customary exposure of the packages to evaporation, or to the absorption of water.

That is scientifically correct, and it allows the court, or whoever is giving the judgment, to decide whether these go beyond or fall within these limits of discrepancies. To make it an absolute percentage is a very awkward way of getting at results. In the case of bulky articles 5 per cent would be too much, and one-half per cent might be too much, and in other cases might be about right.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 359—to be sold by cord defined.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I propose to amend that by adding after the word "cord" the words "or fraction thereof."

Mr. CROWE: Most of the wood sold in my district is sold by the load. It is largely mill refuse or slabs. People bring in cordwood and resaw it in stove lengths of 16 inches, and sell it in competition with the mill refuse. Will the people who bring in the wood and sell it in competition with the mill refuse have to sell it by the cord?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The matter of firewood is difficult to legislate upon. A great many complaints have come to the department, and especially in the last few years, as to the impositions in regard to the sale of wood, and a very persistent demand has been made that there shall be some standard fixed by which wood shall be sold or bought, or may be sold or bought. It is proposed, therefore, to make the cord the standard of measurement. From that there is exempted mill-scrap, kindlings and other mill refuse, and from that there will also be the exemption which I propose to move later on, that notwithstanding anything in this Act, wood may be sold other than by the cord, unless the cord be stipulated at the time of purchase. This, therefore, practically fixes a standard by which wood may be sold with the exception of mill-scrap, kindling and other mill refuse; so that, if a person wishes to contract to deliver wood, and another person wishes to contract to purchase that wood to be delivered by the cord, the standard is set and the measurements have to be made, and the quantity delivered by the cord or fraction thereof.

But, if agreed between the purchaser and the seller that they will conduct their operations on the basis of the load or in any other way, then it becomes a case in which the standard does not apply. It is a matter of agreement between the purchaser and seller. For all those who wish to know that they are doing it upon a fixed basis, where measurements can be applied, the standard to be named a cord, is made the standard for such transactions. In that way it will not inflict any hardship on the trade and will protect in a good many cases the buyer where now there is absolutely no protection. Cases have been brought to the attention of the department where wood, purporting to be sold by the cord, has been very much below the cord. There is some remedy, I suppose, but unless you have a standard fixed it is difficult to apply the remedy.

Mr. CROWE: You are protecting the man who buys by the cord, but you are not protecting the man who buys by the load. Most of our fuel is bought by the load. The mill refuse is cut up into sixteen-inch lengths and sold by the load. There is no protection for the buyer. If the person who is selling that wood were obliged to have a standard size for a load, or if he were required to inform the purchaser how many cubic feet there were in the load, there would be some protection. But, there is no protection here. I repeat that you are protecting the man who buys by the cord, but you are not protecting the man who buys by the load.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You are protecting the man who buys the most expensive kind of wood but it would be almost impossible to fix a standard for kindling wood, mill scrap and the like of that.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Is it not a fact that wood has always been sold in Canada by the cord? If I ordered a cord of wood, and a man brought it to my place, would I not exact from him 128 cubic feet?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. If you had made your contract in that way.

Mr. SEXSMITH: They said a great deal about this in the newspapers last winter, and what I saw astonished me. A man would go down to the market square in Peterborough and say: I will give you $10 for your load. When the load was delivered and it perhaps was not just a cord the purchaser commenced to kick. The law was not at fault, nor was the man who sold the wood? When I order a cord of wood I want to get 128 cubic feet and if I do not get it I should not be required to pay for it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CROWE: I am in favour of this clause, but I think that when legislation is being framed to meet the case of people buying cordwood, something should also be done with respect to those who buy wood by the load. I would suggest that the minister frame an amendment to the effect that when wood is sold by the load, there be marked on the bill which is given to the purchaser the amount of the contents of that load in cubic feet, or that the quantity should be marked on the outside of the wagon when the wood is delivered. The purchaser would then know exactly how much wood he was receiving.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There would be some difficulty in doing that I am afraid. However, I shall be very glad to take the suggestion into consideration, and the next time we proceed with the Bill see if we can arrange a clause that will meet the hon. gentleman's wishes. I move an amendment to section 359A, to add, after the word "contents," the words "of a cord or the requisite fraction thereof." This will bring the section into unison with the cord standard.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Why exempt the millmen who sell mill scrap, kindling, and so on? In my opinion, if there is any reason at all for complaint in this matter of wood, it is more about the way the millmen sell their scrap than about the method of the ordinary wood dealers. The millmen run around little loads of wood on wagons in villages, cities and towns, and charge so much for it. In such cases there is no thought of the quantity sold, and they charge practically any price for it that they can get. I think that is one of the main reasons for the kicking that has been done throughout the community.

Mr. GLASS: I think there should be a distinction between mill scrap and slabs that are sawn off in a sawing mill. The ordinary mill scrap, or kindling, which is generally used for lighting fires, is not a matter of very material importance, because it is sold at a very low figure any way. But in many mills in small towns where large timber is sawn, slabs are taken off the sides that are cut into ten and eighteen-inch wood and delivered for fuel, and the same regulations should apply to wood of this character as to ordinary cordwood. One great difficulty in forming an idea as to what the contents of a load should be is that often the load is thrown in loosely and without piling. If the woodman were required to pile his wood on the wagon, it would be a very easy matter to estimate, and estimate very closely, the actual cubic contents of the load, but where the load is thrown in roughly, without piling, it is a cause of deception to the purchaser and a very serious loss to poor people who have to buy their wood in that way.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The difficulty in making any standard for that kind of scrap, or of fuel, is this: The millmen sell the wood out as they can, and it is generally picked up by all kinds of small dealers who take it into their yards, and it goes through the summer process of being dried out to some extent, and afterwards sold to the consumer. There is no exact measurement; it is delivered in all kinds of packages. The difficulty is to get a standard which will suit every place without being burdensome to any; you cannot do it. However, I am going to see whether or not we can frame an amendment which will reach to some extent the difficulty which has been spoken of.

Mr. GLASS: There would not be so much difficulty in dealing with slabs from large logs.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There would be less difficulty than in the case of mill scrap and small chunks of wood, but, as my hon. friend sees, it is very difficult to fix a standard that could be applied all through the country.

Mr. SEXSMITH: My reason for mentioning the matter is, that there are hundreds of small portable mills operating throughout the country which cut thousands and thousands of cords of slabwood into two-foot or four-foot lengths, which wood is hauled into the villages and sold at so

much a load. If some provision is not made under this Bill to meet the case of such sales, the men selling that wood would be exempt; they could bring their wood in in any shape they please, and sell it, of course, to the best advantage.

Mr. McKENZIE: The punishment provided in this section seems rather severe. A person selling wood may have a very small quantity on his sled, perhaps not more than one-eighth or one-tenth of a cord, and may in good faith think he has more. Now if the quantity turns out by exact measurement to be less than that required by the law, and if the seller is not guilty of intentional deception, he ought not to be hastily dealt with. A man who wrongfully or fraudulently represents the quantity in a load of wood is properly liable to punishment. But this legislation does not say that the wood-seller's action must be wrongful or fraudulent; if the load turns out to be even a fraction less than he thinks it is he incurs a penalty of $25 or $50. I would suggest that the penalty be applied if there is fraud or intention to deceive. As the clause is now drafted, a magistrate before whom an offender was brought would have no discretion at all, and could not inquire whether or not he acted in good faith.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What does my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. McKENZIE: There should be something to show that there has been a fraudulent intent in imposing upon the buyer something that is to the knowledge of the seller improper. The words "wrongfully tries to pass off as a larger quantity of wood a smaller quantity," express my idea. The minister might send the Bill back to whoever drafted it, and he will understand exactly what I mean when I say there should be something to show to the court that it is not the intention of the law to punish a man unless he wilfully misrepresents his goods. It should also be made clear that the magistrate shall have option as to the amount of the fine. The present Bill provides a penalty not exceeding $25 in the first instance and $50 in the second. The court should have discretionary power as to how much the fine should be.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is something in the point which my hon. friend raises. We do not want to go so far as to render the clause nugatory by allowing the real offender to get off. If there is a very small disparity in the measurement, done without wilful intent, it seems rather hard to put the full penalty upon the seller. I have made a note of that suggestion, and I will see if the clause can be modified.

Mr. FORTIER: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that there should not be a fixed penalty, so that the magistrate may fine, according to the circumstances, as low as one dollar if he sees fit. I think that this Bill is going too far, as it seems to have been the intention of the party who drafted it to make it compulsory to sell wood by the cord. I am of the opinion that the seller should be permitted to sell wood by the load. Moreover, I do not think there is any reason for passing any legislation upon this matter. I think the Government, in restricting the selling of wood to cord measurement to be consistent should impose a penalty for selling food or other commodities not up to similar definite standards.

It may be argued that the Bill aims to establish what should be the content of a cord of wood, but that has been done already by previous legislation. I submit that the clauses concerning firewood should be struck out.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Fortier) that this legislation is quite drastic. In the district I represent, and, I think, throughout the province of Ontario, a custom has grown up where wood 20 and 22 inches in length is accepted by the consumer, and in fact, requested by him. I was discussing this matter last winter, and one man in the wood business instanced to me where he sold 20-inch wood. If that wood had been 18 inches, he could have sold it without difficulty, because the people of the town had been in the habit of getting wood that length, which suited their particular stoves better. In fact, 20 and 22-inch wood has been asked for and accepted for quite a long time. Several dealers told me last winter that they would be satisfied to give 128 cubic feet, but they would have to charge a little extra, but that the demand to-day is for wood cut not longer than 18 to 22 inches. One would think from reading some of the newspapers of the country which have been discussing this matter that it was the man who sold the wood who was to blame for the shorter length. That is not so at all. There is a demand for 20-inch wood, and people are willing to take that wood in preference to a 24-inch length, as it is more convenient for their use. As wood has become very expensive, people are commencing to kick

about the measurement, and that is one of the reasons, I suppose, why we have these provisions in this Bill. It has always been considered that 128 cubic feet constitutes a cord of wood, and if it is found on actual measurement that a cord of wood does not contain that cubic quantity the seller is liable. I think that law has been in force during all my lifetime. If a man sold me a cord of wood, and claimed to deliver a cord of wood, I would expect him to deliver me 128 cubic feet, unless I said to him that I would accept 22-inch wood as if it were 24-inch. It is the consumers, not the dealers, who have requested their wood cut a certain length. I have never had any experience myself as a dealer in wood, but I know that it is not the dealer who is to blame. It is what the consumer actually has been getting in the way of length that has probably been the cause of all this disturbance. To impose a penalty such as is provided in these clauses will put some people to great inconvenience, and perhaps get them into trouble, because through the newspapers publishing articles advising people to go out and cut wood for next year, thousands of cords have already been cut in the bush all over the country of 20 and 22 inches. I have no doubt that the dealers in that wood will be absolutely satisfied to sell 128 cubic feet, but they will ask a little more in price, so the consumer will get no advantage.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I wish to add the following section as 359 B.

Notwithstanding anything in this Act wood may be sold other than by the cord, unless the cord be stipulated at the time of purchase.

That is to say, agreements can be made to buy and sell wood in any quantity, by the load or in any way at all, provided such is the agreement between the buyer and the seller.

Section agreed to.

On sections 360, 360A and 360B—Portland cement:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have had a good deal of correspondence with reference to these three questions in respect to Portland cement. Objections have been taken on several grounds and have been very carefully considered, and the opinions of experts, engineers and others, have been obtained by the department. As a result of all this, I purpose making certain amendments. Section 360 as it stands in the Bill reads:

Every bag of Portland cement sold or offered for sale in Canada shall contain ninety-four pounds net weight, and four such bags shall constitute a barrel.

I wish to substitute for that this section:

All Portland cement shall be sold by weight, and 94 pounds shall constitute a bag, and four such bags shall constitute a barrel.

That establishes that cement shall be sold by weight, and that the standard container shall contain 94 pounds. The bag, or something corresponding to the bag, is used as a container, and four of those bags constitute a barrel of 376 pounds. This principle has, with few exceptions, been practically agreed to. These changes have been canvassed by a committee of four of the Council of the Society of Civil Engineers—a cement manufacturer, a cement consumer and two engineers. As a result of their joint deliberations, I have the agreement of all the members of the committee, with the exception of one, and in accordance with that view, I have introduced this substitute clause. Objection is made that the present bag holds somewhere about 87½ pounds, and that if you now make a 94-pound standard weight, you cause a great deal of trouble and possibly a good deal of waste in connection with bags which are already ordered or which are on hand being used for putting up the cement at 87½ pounds to each bag. There is also a second objection, that other containers than bags are being used. Section 360A in the Bill reads:

Every bag in which Portland cement is filled and delivered shall be made of good strong fibrous material closely woven and in good repair when filled, and shall have plainly marked thereon the brand and name of the manufacturer and the net weight.

I think we can get over that difficulty, almost entirely, by substituting a section which I propose, as follows:

Every container in which Portland cement is offered for sale shall be made of suitable protective material, in good repair when filled, and shall have plainly marked thereon the brand and name of the manufacturer.

I understand that paper bags are being more and more used as a container for cement. It is also proposed that this Act shall not come into force until one year after it has received the signature of the Governor General. That will be sufficient time to make any adjustments that are necessary in the way of bags. The present bag, which is running at 87½ pounds to the bag, is, in most instances, sufficiently large to hold 94 pounds. Only

about 6½ pounds would have to be added. That fact, coupled with the year's grace in the coming into operation of this legislation, will almost entirely avoid the waste of the bags.

Section 360B imposes a penalty. It is proposed to leave that penalty out for the present. Cement, I understand, is bagged by machinery, and it is very difficult, in bagging by machinery, to have the exact weight in each bag; there is sometimes more or sometimes less, so that what will be done by the Bill, if it passes as I propose, is to affirm the principle that cement shall be sold by weight; that the bag shall ultimately contain 94 pounds and that the barrel shall comprise four bags. This is in exact accordance with the conditions and the law in the United States. For a number of years the United States standard bag of cement has been 94 pounds, and the barrel, four bags or 376 pounds. Taken altogether, that is about the best solution we can find for legislation with regard to cement. I, therefore, beg to move the amendments I have stated.

Mr. MORPHY: My information is that the United States standard bag of cement holds 86½ pounds.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That statement, which was made to the department, was thoroughly investigated. I have the Act, and I have also the assurance, obtained by wire just the other day of the department at Washington, that that is the standard; that it is in force, and that there is no intention of putting it out of force.

Mr. MORPHY: Is section 4 to be dropped from the Bill?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: Then I understand it will be lawful for a man having eight or nine thousand sacks on hand to continue using them until they are worn out?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As long as they are usable.

Mr. MORPHY: The question is one of sale by weight?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The manufacturer or dealer will find that, in a great many cases, he can easily get 94 pounds into the bag. If so, he comes up to the measure more quickly.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I wish to represent to the minister on behalf of a number of manufacturers that this legislation will mean a very heavy loss on account of thou-

[Sir George Foster.]

sands of sacks which they have on hand at present. The minister says that, by packing down the cement, you may possibly get 94 pounds into the bag.

I understand that it is not possible to get the quantity of the new standard in the sacks. The old standard was 86½, and the new standard is 94; you are changing from the less to the greater quantity. I do not know that there have been any strong representations, except perhaps from architects and builders, that the standard should be changed. Previously four sacks constituted a barrel but now you have to change the standard of your barrel to meet the difference in the sacks, and that will cause some difficulty until the machinery is set up to turn out the standard-sized barrels. This means considerable to the man manufacturing barrels and to the man manufacturing sacks. The large manufacturers in the West spoke to me about it, and I advised them to have a conference with the minister. Whether they have made representations to him I do not know, but they certainly appeared to have a grievance. It is immaterial to the architect or the builder whether the standard is 87 or 94 pounds, but it is of consequence to the producer who is turning out hundreds of thousands of barrels. We are not so very much concerned about the standard on the other side of the line, because the great majority of the cement we use is our own product, and we should therefore not be guided by the size of the standard sacks or barrels on the American side. I should like to know whether representations have been made to the Government as to the very great loss the manufacturers may sustain.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps my hon. friend did not catch exactly what I said. These representations were all made on the original clauses of the Bill, and as the Bill then stood it might have been open to the objections my hon. friend has mentioned. But the Bill, after the amendments that I propose are made, meets every difficulty. They can go on using their 87½-pound sacks until their stock runs out. These sacks will wear out after a time, and then they can get the new 94-pound sacks. There is not the slightest tendency here to cause a loss either to the manufacturers or to the sellers on their present holding of sacks.

Mr. BOYCE: I have used a few barrels of cement for a number of years. My experience has been that there will be no

trouble in getting 94 pounds of cement into the sacks we are now using; I think there is room for 10 pounds more.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I suppose that the object is to have a sack of uniform size as between Canada and the United States?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is well to have uniformity.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I can see that uniformity is desirable, as we are getting closer and closer to the United States in trade and other matters. I am told that a short time ago the United States endeavoured to have the weight of a sack of cement raised to 100 pounds, but the opposition was so strenuous that the idea was abandoned. I am also told that the tendency in the States now is to reduce rather than increase the size of a sack of cement and that there is an agitation on in the United States with that object. The larger the sack the greater the waste, on account of sifting; the cement comes through the pores of the sack. In the early part of the discussion the minister spoke of the necessity for marking packages with the name of the maker and the weight, but this amendment will make it unnecessary for those details to be placed on the container. The cement will be sold on the basis of a sack of 94 pounds or a barrel of 376 pounds. The old sacks, so long as they are used, will only hold 87½ pounds. The price will be based on a sack of 94 pounds, and the price to a buyer will be eighty-seven ninety-fourths of the price of a bag of cement. When it is remembered that there are fifty thousand retail merchants in the Dominion of Canada handling cement, it can at once be seen what annoyance and confusion would result if this became the law. I repeat, in the earlier clauses of the Bill the minister is providing that the weight shall be marked on every container, but in this particular instance the weight need not be specified. The uniform weight was 87½ pounds, but now it is proposed that a container can hold any amount and the weight need not be specified at all. That is inconsistent. I am told that the present sacks will not hold 94 pounds, and if that is the case the small sacks will have to be thrown into the discard ultimately. I understand that cement sacks in use at the present time are valued at $2,000,000 and at this time when everybody is being urged to do everything he can to save and conserve, it seems to me that by this change we would be foisting a tremendous loss upon the people of Canada, and the loss would ultimately fall upon the consumer and nobody else. I would suggest to the minister, in all humility, that he withdraw the whole Bill. If the Bill were reprinted as it now stands, with all the erasures and the amendments and the amendments to the amendments, I doubt very much if the minister would recognize it. The modern tendency is to simplify business: this Bill complicates business. I would further urge upon the minister that Bills of this kind—legislation compelling people to do things they do not like, or restraining them from doing things they want to do; legislation seeking to cure only minor evils—should be avoided. Almost every day a new order is issued by the Food Control Board. I am not criticising that board in its entirety, because I believe it has done a lot of good. I can point to an instance in which the Food Control Board has saved in one branch of Canadian trade and industry the whole amount paid in salaries to that board.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman apply the same freedom of treatment which he is now laying down to the merchandise we use, or to the Coinage Act?

Mr. CASSELMAN: I would have to consider that. I am not familiar with the Coinage Act, but I have a knowledge of the cement trade, and the produce trade of Canada, and I am speaking from that knowledge. When so much new legislation is necessary, I say that legislation only curing minor evils should be avoided; and I would, in all humility, suggest to the minister that he withdraw this Bill.

Mr. CURRIE: What line of business does the hon. gentleman refer to, when he speaks of that great saving?

Mr. CASSELMAN: The egg trade.

Mr. McKENZIE: I agree entirely with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman), as he understands this business, and if he says we are going to throw away $2,000,000 worth of bags—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not so.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would not undertake to say that is not so, but if the hon. minister makes the statement I suppose the hon. member for Dundas will accept it. I do not wish to join issue on the question of fact. The hon. gentleman has made a statement—and he appears to know something about it—that we are going to forfeit bags to the value of $2,000,000, and if the statement be true, it is a matter for the

very serious consideration of the minister in war time. I received a little courage from what the minister did in regard to section 360B, which he is dropping out altogether. He says, in effect, that the millionaire who is selling carload upon carload of cement can do so with impunity and have short weight, but he is not to be punished. This is another case where the big influence has found its way to the power house somewhere. I would not suggest for a moment that the minister would be influenced in that way, but some parties who have the power of switching and turning and twisting this Act have been influenced, so that where the big interests are concerned they are not punished, but the poor man who comes along with an ox load and half a cord of wood has no protection and no back road to the power house; nobody cares whether he loses his ox or not. I can see the greatest possible chance of this poor man, who has half a cord of wood and an ox team, walking home.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You are behind the times.

Mr. McKENZIE: And if it is a second offence, he will have to go home and get the other ox to pay the balance of the fine; the wood, sled and oxen will have disappeared, and the man will be left with nothing, simply because he happened to be half a stick short in a cord of wood. I am sure that in a moment the minister will see that he has let the millionaire out. He can come with half or three-quarters of a bag of cement and call it a bag, and there is no punishment. I feel confident that when the minister sees he is letting the millionaire out he will be only too happy to apply the same principle to the poor man with the ox team and half a cord of wood.

Mr. HENDERS: I am quite prepared to accept legislation that will give sixteen ounces to the pound to the millionaire and the poor man. As I understand the amendment to this Bill, provision is made that the law as to marking the number of pounds on a sack does not apply. I venture to say that about twenty-five per cent of the cement made use of through the country passes into the hands of men who have no opportunity of weighing it. They have to take the weight as it comes to them. It is a generally understood thing that the sack will contain so many pounds. They accept that as being a law and are governed by it. If there is no marking on the sack, they are simply at the mercy of the man at the other end. The fact that a certain quantity of sacks are now in use does not seem to me a justification for not marking. If they have decided only to put 87 pounds in these sacks, it is not a difficult matter for them to mark 87 pounds on the sack, and then no matter where they go each bag carries its character on its face, and everybody will get fair play. I therefore think it would be well to reconsider that amendment with regard to the weight. The same thing would obtain in regard to the cordwood. I am not in favour of doctoring up the law so that one man will be subject to one law and another subject to another law governing the handling of the same article. If 128 cubic feet is the right measurement for a cord of wood, then let it be so provided, and let it apply to mill woods and every other kind of wood. If I buy a half cord of mill wood I expect to get half of 128 cubic feet, and if I buy a quarter cord I expect to get a quarter cord. The same rule should obtain with regard to cement. Let it be enacted that 100 pounds, or that 94 pounds, shall constitute a sack, and let it be shown on the sack how much it contains.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. minister has dropped the words "net weight."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The difficulty in putting in the net weight is that it is all done by mechanical packing, and it is impossible to have absolute uniformity in the weights. If you are packing the cement by hand in a bag and fill the bag to 94 pounds capacity, put the bag on a scale, and find that there is 94 pounds there, you can mark that weight on it, and you are sure of it. When cement is machine-bagged and bag after bag passes under the machine, sometimes a little less goes in and sometimes a little more; it is impossible to get a uniform weight. You might say: Go over every one of these bags, weigh each one, fill in the deficit of one, and take out the surplus of another so that each will contain 94 pounds, and then mark your net weight. That is mechanically and physically impossible; it cannot be done. But you have the name of the manufacturer on the bag, you have the standard of 94 pounds to a bag and, if it is not a 94-pound bag, you pay the fraction of the price, whatever it may be.

Mr. MORPHY: The Minister will realize the position in which he is going to put the public. Cement is sold by the bag.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is sold by the weight.

Mr. MORPHY: A farmer comes in to get a bag of cement, and there are two kinds of bags. He does not know about the law making a bag of cement 94 pounds. Such a bag is sold at a certain price. A merchant, with a little quirk, or trick,—and there are some of that kind—sells a bag of cement and the farmer thinks he is getting a 94-pound when he is only getting an 87½ pound bag. Is it not a fact that the weight has been stamped on cement bags in the United States at 87½ pounds, and have they not been found in this country? If that be so, where does the difficulty come in? If they have done it once, they can do it again. I think it greatly in the interest of the public that the weight should be put upon a bag of cement, the same as it is put upon a bag of flour. The sacks are stamped with the number of pounds they contain. It is quite true that it may put a little more work on the manufacturer, but supposing it does, the public are assured of proper weights. Will not the minister look into this and ascertain if the weight is not stamped on the bags in the United States?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think they are marked, but I am not certain about that. I will make enquiry, and let my hon. friend know before we pass the Bill.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to call attention to one feature of the discussion that has been referred to by the minister, and that is measuring and weighing. I happen to have had considerable experience in both. When done mechanically, measuring or weighing is much more accurate than when done by hand. When the human element enters, the result depends largely on the temperament of the individual at the time the operation is performed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To a certain extent I think my hon. friend (Mr. Pedlow) is right, but against that is the actual fact, borne out by the testimony of manufacturers and dealers in cement, and architects, that under the mechanical system of bagging cement you cannot get a uniform weight in each bag. Whether it is mechanical temperament or human temperament, it varies.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the minister consulted the manufacturers of cement on this question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do they approve of this change?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Some of them do. The whole of the opposition offered by the manufacturers of cement has been based on the idea that they would be subjected to loss and particularly to loss in bags. I beg to assure my hon. friend that under this legislation the bags are not a loss in any way. The bags may hold 94 pounds, or they may not hold quite 94 pounds; or they may hold 100 pounds, yet the bags can be used until they are used up. I am told that a very large proportion of the bags in use will hold sufficient to reach the 94-pound standard.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has argued at considerable length in support of the view that cement, being bagged mechanically, the manufacturers were unable to insure a uniform weight, and that therefore it would not be fair to impose a fine, and I understand that the provision for a fine has been eliminated. Before six o'clock, in the very same Bill, the minister passed certain clauses providing that food products be stamped with the name of the packer and the net weight, and he provided for a fine if the weight was not as indicated on the package. I am sure the minister knows that most of these food products are packed in identically the same way as cement, by machinery, and if it is wrong to impose a fine on the manufacturers of cement, what justification has he for imposing a fine on those who put up foodstuffs, putting them up in the same way and with identically the same machinery? This automatic machinery is probably made in the same factory as that in which they make scales for weighing cement. The minister could not have been right this afternoon and also right now. He was either right then, and wrong now, or he is right now and he was wrong this afternoon.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think that follows at all. I might be right this afternoon and right now. My hon. friend has had an experience of that kind, I am sure.

Mr. ROBB: What explanation has the minister for this discrimination between those who put up foodstuffs and those who put up cement?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The only explanation I have is the difference in the method of bagging and in the machinery. You have machinery arranged for mechanical work along certain lines which acts just as definitely and certainly as the human hand and even with less fallibility, but

that is not characteristic of all mechanical bagging machines. I am told—and I take my facts from those who seem to know—that it is impossible in bagging cement to get a uniform filling.

With reference to the other articles with which we dealt to-day and in regard to which we have imposed a penalty, it must be remembered that there was an allowance made for discrepancies.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the minister give us his authority for that? I have had a long experience in both measuring and weighing and I know whereof I speak. I have measured and weighed for forty years, and in the light of that experience I assert that mechanical weighing and measuring is much more accurate than any weighing or measuring done by the human hand. That being the case, I fail to understand why allowance should now be made for bagging flour or vegetables, or canned stuffs of any kind. The underlying principle is the same in every case, and it would apply in one case the same as in another. My hon. friend sitting beside me says that it is a matter of political efforts. I shall not illustrate or elucidate that statement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is an unworthy assumption.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that section 360 provides that cement shall be sold by the weight and that you are doing away with the bags. Is that right?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, no, the bag remains, to put the cement in.

Mr. BUREAU: But cement is not bought by the bag, it is bought by weight.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Certainly.

Mr. BUREAU: What weight is going to be fixed? Will it be the weight when sent out by the manufacturer or the weight that the cement will scale when taken off the cars? I do not think the bag is going to cut any figure. Cement will be sold at so much a ton or so much a hundred pounds, just the same as coal.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is provided in the Bill that there shall be a proper bag to hold the cement.

Mr. BUREAU: You cannot control leakage from a bag. Why force a man to pay so much for a bag of cement when the weight, not the bag, is the measure of the transaction? I repeat my question: What weight is to be accepted? Is the purchaser to pay for the weight of the cement when it reaches its destination, or for its weight when it left the manufacturer? If there is any discrepancy where is the purchaser's remedy? I suppose it will be a matter of contract as to whether the purchaser buys the cement f.o.b. at the place of manufacture, or delivered at a siding; and if the cement is short in weight the manufacturer will have to make it good? But as regards the marking of the bags I cannot see any necessity for it when the cement is bought by weight.

Mr. TOLMIE: I understand there is something like $1,680,000 worth of cement sacks now held by the cement companies, and it is a very difficult matter indeed for them to get new sacks at the present time. Therefore, I want to know if it is made perfectly clear in the Bill that the sacks now on hand will be permitted to be used?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Absolutely clear.

Mr. MORPHY: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister in a specific and undoubted way certain statements contained in a letter written to me by a gentleman who thoroughly understands the cement business. The first statement is as follows:

> What is mystifying to those of us in the cement business is the underlying cause for what appears to us a perfectly foolish piece of legislation. Who stirred it up and what actuated it? Where was the demand that Sir George acceded to? It certainly did not come from the manufacturer. It surely could not have come from the consumer, because the 87½ lb. sack comes nearer filling in a rule of thumb way specifications for the use of cement than any other way could possibly do. Why is there to be a 94 lb. sack in Canada and an 87½ lb. sack all over the United States? Are contractors who take contracts here and in the United States to be faced with a different sack weight in making their mix?

The writer speaks of the matter in other respects. He is a gentleman who is in the cement business in a large way, and his statements are very specific. I would like to ask the minister where he gets his authority for the statement that the 87½-pound sack is not the standardized sack in the United States, but that the 94-pound sack is?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I got it from the circular of the Bureau of Standards, which, on inquiry, was sent to me. I got it also in answer to a telegram sent to the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, in Washington. The answer to that telegram was this:

> Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, advise that the weight of bag and

barrel of cement is indicated on page 10 of their circular No. 33, January 18th, 1917; re legal weights at present in United States.

With that was sent a copy of the Bureau of Standards and on page 10 there is the regulation No. 9:

The cement shall be delivered in suitable bags, or barrels, with the brand and name of the manufacturer plainly marked thereon, unless shipped in bulk. A bag shall contain 94 pounds net. A barrel shall contain 376 pounds net.

There is no doubt at all that that is the legal standard in the United States, and has been for years.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the minister say that it is not the practice throughout the whole of the United States to use 87½ pound bags?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know how far that practice goes.

Mr. MORPHY: I will tell the hon. minister something more about the matter and have it put on Hansard for guidance.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is as stated by the hon. member it does not affect the principle of the standard being 94 pounds to the bag and 376 pounds to the barrel.

Mr. MORPHY: The minister will readily see the difficulty that will be created by a change in our law, if the cement manufacturers in the United States and in Canada are using an 87½ pound bag. As a matter of fact I understood the minister to say that one reason for the introduction of the present Bill was to assimilate the standards?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: But this legislation is going to change the practice apparently. If the Bill is merely for the purpose of fixing a standard which is not going to be used, I do not see very much necessity for such legislation. Now, to quote from another letter:

When you realize that the consumer has every mix regulated for an 87½ lb. sacp and he tells a gang of Dagoes how many sacks to put in a mix, you can see what it will mean to allow for 6½ lb. extra in each sack, particularly if you remember that the 87½ lb. balances the cubic footage upon which all formulas are based better than any other weight, and again remember that the mixers of cement are frequently labourers who come from the United States and, for that matter, go from Canada to the United States, and are used to the 87½-lb. sack all over the Continent.

Now, if that is so the minister is hinging the merits of the Bill upon a practice that does not exist, and taking an academic standard from some Bureau of Standards in the United States which has not been followed by the practical workers in dealing with cement, so his justification for the Bill absolutely falls to the ground. I think, therefore, the minister ought to consider the suggestion made here and hold the Bill until he finds a little further about the existing practice.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will inquire what the practice is.

Mr. MORPHY: Besides, I agree with the apparent general consensus of opinion that this is no time to disturb trade conditions. The minister has not shown to the House any reason for bringing in this Bill, except probably it might be founded upon the suggestion of a man who never dealt in cement or never mixed cement in his life but was in the minister's office here and got the minister to bring forward the Bill in order that he might get some kudos out of it. All the practical and technical knowledge of the House is against the Bill, and I think it should be held up and left over until some further reason is shown for its enactment.

Mr. CURRIE: Might I make one suggestion which might, perhaps, clear away the difficulty? I suggest to the minister that he put the word "standard" in his amendment, making it read a "standard bag," or a "standard barrel." The whole question is one of contract. I engage to purchase a thousand bags or barrels of cement from a manufacturer. By specifying standard bags he would be obliged to furnish that quantity of cement. If I did not, he could supply any lesser amount he might choose. The question of standardization has been acute in the United States and Great Britain. A great many articles of commerce were not standardized. For instance, the standards for sheet iron in these two countries were not the same. In Great Britain there was the Birmingham gauge and the London gauge, and all that sort of thing, and the same thing applied in the United States, where, for sheet iron, there were various gauges and thicknesses. The ultimate result was that the purchaser was always getting the worst of it. The United States have established a Bureau of Standards, and have fixed standards for sheet iron, wire, bar iron, boiler plate and everything of that kind. These standards are fixed in collaboration with all other countries; it is an international movement. I think the minis-

ter is absolutely right in trying to standardize cement, because anybody with common sense knows that if a manufacturer of cement wished to palm off 86-pound bags as 87½ pounds, which is the prevailing standard, there is nothing to prevent his doing so. For that reason I think it is well that this legislation should pass. But I would suggest that the word "standard" be inserted, because that is used in legislation in other countries. When you buy sheet iron, standard gauge, for instance, you know exactly the gauge thickness you are going to get, and when you buy 1-inch bar iron standard gauge, you know it will be a standard inch, and the same applies to boiler plate, sheet iron, tin and everything of that description, which are all standardized now. There is, therefore, no reason why cement, which is an article of common, every-day use, especially by farmers who have no means of weighing it, or who do not generally know what quantity a bag should contain, should not have a standard assigned to it. I agree with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) in that respect. The consumer should be protected; the manufacturer can take care of himself. It has been argued that the weighing machine cannot take care of the weight. The machine will weigh these bags, if it is anything like the automatic weighing machines that I have seen in operation. Without a standard, manufacturers may be tempted to put their hand in the bag and palm off a smaller quantity of cement, just as a hen will turn out a light-weight egg and ask the same money for it. Insert the word "standard," then if a man does not specify a standard bag or barrel of cement, and gets a light weight package, the manufacturer can say: "you did not ask for a standard bag or barrel." I hope the minister will see his way clear to accept my suggestion.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that there is no complaint about the way things are being carried on with the present standard of 87½ pounds. The proposed change will be rather confusing. The minister says that cement shall be sold by weight, 94 pounds to the bag and four bags to the barrel. If we are going to wrangle over it, why not drop the clause. We are told that these are war times. We on this side do not want to be accused of bringing war into Parliament for the sake of a few pounds weight in a bag of cement. I would not object to dropping these clauses, or in fact of dropping the Bill. We have already dropped several sections under various pretexts and I would suggest that the law be left as it stands, as both consumers and manufacturers seem to be perfectly satisfied with it.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Before the clause passes, I wish to protest again that this is a retrograde move. It is making a complicated system in what is now a simple system of handling cement. I agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that there should be a standard weight for a bag of cement. There is a standard weight of 87½ pounds, which has been the weight of a bag of cement ever since cement was manufactured in Canada. If the minister can offer one single reason why that weight should be changed to 94 pounds, other than that our bag should weigh the same as that in the United States, I may change my mind. The minister gave such a reason for the Daylight Savings Bill. I can see a reason why our time should be the same as that of our neighbours across the line, and I agreed with him. But I do not know why we should change the weight of a bag of cement in Canada because our American cousins have a larger bag, particularly when the tendency there is to decrease rather than to increase the size of the bag. We have a standard now—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is a standard of custom.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But we have no legal standard.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Then make it 87½ pounds as it has always been, and stamp the bag. If you cannot have uniformity in the weight of each bag, this is what will happen: When a carload of cement is shipped to a dealer—and most of the cement goes through the hands of dealers—he will have to weigh that whole carload to see that he is getting his correct weight. Then he puts it in his warehouse, and as he sells it out to consumers he will again have to weigh it. The custom now is to load on twenty-five or thirty bags; you sell cement by count. The Bill makes a complicated affair out of what is a simple affair; and, further, there is not one single clause in it which will remedy any real evil. During this time we should not have legislation of this kind, and I would suggest to the minister that he withdraw the whole Bill, and we can consider it next year perhaps when we have more time.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the purpose of changing the weight from 87½ pounds to 94 pounds? I have not heard that explained.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The purpose is to have a standard by which cement can be sold.

Mr. CAHILL: Eighty-seven and a half pounds is the standard now?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no legal standard now. A legal standard establishing the weight of 94 pounds fixes also the standard for a barrel as 376 pounds, equal to four bags. If what is delivered to you does not come up to that, then you do not pay that much. In all this legislation under the Inspection and Sale Act, we have standards. If we do not need any standards in the country at all, you might just as well abolish your weights and measures. I cannot see why there should be any objection to establishing a standard in cement, and as the standard in the United States is 94 pounds, it seems fair to us to establish the same standard here. If there could be some method devised by which in the bagging of it you could have a uniform amount in each bag, and then stamp that on each bag, there would be no great difficulty, but I am told that that is impossible, and that therefore you cannot stamp the correct weight on the bag unless you submit it to manual test after you have done the mechanical work.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Bags have been uniform before.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no standard with which to compare it.

Mr. KNOX: Has the 87½ pound standard not been adopted because in mixing cement that is considered a cubic foot? I have always understood that quantity to be a cubic foot, and that is why it was put at 87½ pounds.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There must have been some good reason why the Bureau of Standards, which is an institution in the United States which fixes all their standards of weights and measures, has adopted this standard. I do not know much about the mixing of cement, but I am informed that, in proportioning concrete, a bag of cement of 94 pounds net can, for all intents and purposes, be looked upon as a cubic foot. The usual mixture ror concrete is one cubic foot of cement, two cubic feet of sand and four cubic feet of gravel.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says: "For all intents and purposes," but my hon. friend (Mr. Knox) says that 87½ pounds is an actual cubic foot of cement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But it is not.

Mr. BUREAU: It is for all intents and purposes. It is not an actual cubic foot. It may answer the purpose of an actual cubic foot. My hon. friend (Mr. Knox) says that 87½ pounds is an actual cubic foot of cement. The minister says that he wants to standardize this measurement. Who is going to be benefited by this legislation?

Mr. CAHILL: The United States.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think it will benefit them all. What does the Customs Department do now? Supposing a bag of cement goes across the border, does the Customs Department charge for 87½ pounds, or 94 pounds, to the bag, or is there any standard by the bag, or is the duty charged according to the actual weight?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Customs Department, I suppose, imposes a tax upon the cement which is imported according to its weight.

Mr. BUREAU: It will not make any difference whether our bag is 87½ or 94 pounds. If we are going to imitate the United States, we shall just continue a process that has been started. When our cement goes to the United States I suppose, it is weighed. I understand from hon. members who have spoken to-night that $2,000,000 has been invested in bags that are marked "87½ pounds."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not marked.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, which contain 87½ pounds. They certainly will not hold 94 pounds, or if they are made to hold 94 pounds, they will be packed so tightly that there will be a danger of explosion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a difference of opinion on that.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the fate which I would like this Bill to have to-night. Let it explode and let us be done with it. If this Bill was to serve any purpose of the consumer, or even if it were to aid the manufacturer himself, we could feel that at least it was going to be of service to somebody. The minister is asked: why make the weight 94 pounds? He replies: To make a standard. Why not make the standard 87½ pounds?

Mr. KAY: The United States.

Mr. BUREAU: If you jump at a chasm you do not have to go a mile beyond. Let

us leave the United States alone for a while, and let us save money to our people by allowing them to use these sacks. Let us either drop this section or take a vote in regard to it. I move that the clause as amended be dropped.

Mr. CURRIE: I hope that the hon. member will not press his motion. He has given a long argument endeavouring to prove that no good purpose is served in having this standard weight. The Bureau of Standards have certainly given this matter great consideration. One reason for this standard is that in the United States there are a great many text-books used by engineers—

Mr. BUREAU: Are we legislating here under the President of the United States and to please the United States, or are we legislating for our people?

Mr. CURRIE: We are not legislating under the president of any cement company, as my hon. friend wants us to do; we are legislating for the people of Canada. The text-books that are published in England and the United States are used by cement companies and they are used by engineers in estimating the cement work they do. There are some engineers here who know that very well. There are certain specifications laid down for certain work. There are buildings erected of cement; even ships are being made of cement. The American text-book says that you must make a cement of a certain standard, and that when you use so many barrels of cement to so much weight of sand and so much weight of gravel, you get a certain specified product. When you put that in a wall or an arch, you put a certain strength there that will stand up to a certain weight; but if you have only 87½ pounds instead of 94 pounds to the bag, your work will not stand up. The inspector will come along and pick out a piece of concrete to see how much cement is in it, and he will say: You have not the correct quantity. The result is that your work is condemned and you lose a great deal of money.

Mr. MORPHY: I am told on very good authority that, notwithstanding anything in the text-books about standards, the common practice throughout the whole of the United States is to use a standard bag of 87½ pounds, not 94 pounds. Will the hon. member dispute that statement? The minister will not.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. CURRIE: Nothing of the kind occurs. The standard text-book in the United States is Trautwine & Kent's text book, and Trautwine & Kent are the authorities used by every young engineer or old engineer, and the standard there is 94 pounds to the bag of cement.

Mr. MORPHY: I am not speaking about what is written in a text-book. I am asking the hon. gentleman if he will deny that the practice throughout the United States is to work to the standard of an 87½-pound bag, and not a 94-pound bag?

Mr. CURRIE: That may be the practice on sidewalks and other work in which it is not necessary to have standard cement, but throughout the whole of the United States the standard laid down in the text-books is the standard laid down by the Bureau of Standards, and that is the weight laid down in this Bill. The two parties who are going to suffer on account of short weight in cement are not the hon. gentlemen who want to have this section thrown out, they are the public and the dealer. If I ask a dealer to sell me five barrels of cement, I shall certainly insist on getting that weight, but the cement companies will short-weight the dealer five pounds to the sack. Is that fair to the dealer? I say, it is not. A man who does not know enough to weigh his cement will suffer, and not the dealer. The reason for standardization is apparent. We have standardized in almost everything now, and there is no reason why cement should not be standardized. Why should one company which plays the game honestly, which manufactures cement and puts it into bags to the proper weight, have to compete with a concern which is short-weighting everybody? Short-weighting in cement should be stopped so far as the farmers and the rest of the people are concerned. It means a great loss. The people do not get full value for ten per cent of the cement that is sold.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) asked me to withdraw my motion and to think it over. I asked him for whom we were legislating, and he said: The people. I agree with him that we are legislating for the people, but by this Bill we are legislating for the people of the United States. If you cause a loss of $2,000,000 on account of wastage in bags, who is going to pay that? The American manufacturers? It is the consumer who is going to pay it. My hon. friend is looking at this from only one angle. He may have behind him all

the standard text-books, but that will not cheapen cement, if the manufacturers have to lose $2,000,000 just for bags. This legislation will also entail new machinery to bag the cement, because the present machinery will pack only 87½ pounds to the bag. So far as presidents of cement companies and manufacturers of cement are concerned, let me tell my hon. friend that I do not own any stock in any cement company, and that I am not interested as a solicitor in any cement company. I am speaking in the interests of the people. I am a free lance, not the agent of any text book, or here to boom any text book author. Whatever I think will be in the interests of the people, that I will stand by. I have a lot of respect for the United States; I think we ought to have followed them long ere this in many things. But just because we have delayed we should not now try to go too fast to make up for lost time. The present weight of a sack is 87½ pounds, and if no manufacturer or consumer objects to it why should we change the standard? The Americans are not asking for a change. If they were I might even go the length of saying we should consider it. But nobody is asking for a change. A week ago the minister introduced a Bill and left the famous egg section on the Table for a week, and now today after a week's consideration he drops the egg section. If the minister leaves the present Bill over for a week he may change his mind on this matter too. I have no doubt his intentions are good; standardizing the weight of sacks may be all right, but when I see a general clamour against it, when somebody is going to lose by the change—and if the manufacturer loses in the first instance, the consumer will have to bear the loss eventually—and when nobody is complaining about the present weight why should we change? I have heard my hon. friend go all over the land saying, "Let well enough alone." Let him let well enough alone in these times of stress. Let the Bill stand over until he has got more information upon it.

Mr. CROWE: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion. I have used a little cement in my day. The cement that came into Canada many years ago, and has been coming in ever since, is from Great Britain. There the standard is 350 pounds to the barrel. The standard weight of a sack is 87½ pounds. Great Britain is the first producer of cement and why should we change our standard to conform with the United States?

Mr. TOLMIE: The question was asked some time ago why it was necessary to have a standard of 87½ pounds. I have a letter here from the managing director of the Portland Cement Company of Victoria in which he states that the present weight of a sack of cement is 87½ pounds, and that 87½ pounds is as near a cubic foot as any weight that could be specified. As cement is all used by measurement, this writer says that there is a lot to be said in favour of retaining the 87½-pound sack.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is some other business that we want to do to-night. I have listened carefully to everything that has been said and have made notes of the various suggestions. I still am of the opinion that we ought to have a standard weight; I think that would be in the interest of the consuming public. I do not see any force at all in the argument of my hon. friend from Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Mr. Bureau), whom I respect very highly, when he takes as his two premises that there would be a loss of $2,000,000 if this legislation went through, and, secondly, that there would be no gain to the consuming public, who have made no request for this legislation. Two premises like those do not heighten my respect for the conclusion he has drawn, because neither premise is correct. There will be no loss on the bags, and there has been a widespread demand for this change. The idea of having a standard for our products in this country is an absolutely sound one. That was the reason why this clause was inserted in the Bill. I now beg to move that the committee rise and report progress. I shall take into consideration the suggestions that have been made, and in a day or two shall come to the committee with my conclusions.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—THE FLAX INDUSTRY.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this House, in view of the universal world shortage of flax and other fibres used in industry, resultant from the devastation wrought in those countries which have hitherto been the world's largest producers, and in view of the peculiar adaptability of the soil and climatic conditions in many parts of Canada for successfully growing flax and

hemp fibre of the best quality, as is evidenced by the success already attained by Canadian growers; and further, having in view the enormous possibilities in economic industry, not only in the fibre produced but in its many and varied by-products, it is desirable that the Government should give consideration of ways and means necessary to further increase the production of these fibres and to generally lend such co-operation as may be required to permanently establish the industry in this country on a stable basis, to the end that its full economic value in its many and varied uses, may as far as possible be conserved within the Dominion."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel, in view of the great national and international importance of increased production of flax fibre, owing to the conditions which prevail at the present time, that I owe this House an apology at this late hour for introducing a subject which, in my opinion, is entitled to the most serious consideration of this Government. The subject of flax fibre production has been more generally drawn to the attention of the nations of the world, in view of the increased use for it, and of the new methods of use, and by reason of the fact it has been found impossible to find any other material to adequately take its place. Sir, at the present time the governments of all the nations which are at war practically are striving to use every means possible within their power to increase the growth of flax fibre in their various districts. Russia, which in the past has been a large world-producer of flax fibre, not by any means of the best quality, but in volume the largest producer, is shut off from that trade. Her markets are absolutely closed at the present time to Canada or to any of the allied countries. France and Belgium, which have been the producers of the higher grade of flax fibre for many years back, are practically devastated and overrun, and production there is almost out of the question. Ireland, which has been for almost centuries a large producer of flax, was also a very large importer of the raw fibre. While Ireland to-day produces in domestic linen one-third of the production of the whole world—in other words while Ireland possesses about one-third of the spindles that are being used in the world—she does not by any means, and has not in the past, produced anything like the proportion of raw fibre that she spins into yarns and uses for other purposes. Ireland has been a big importer of fibre from Russia of the coarser grades, and a big importer from France, Belgium and other countries which produce high grade fibre for the spinning of yarn and the weaving of linen. In view of the extraordinary conditions that prevail in Belgium and France, and owing to the conditions which prevail in Russia at the present time, the world's productive markets of flax fibre are practically closed to Great Britain and her Allies. Already the Food Board of Britain have been so strongly impressed with the necessity of increasing the production of this commodity that they have under Government direction appropriated, it is stated, some £2,000,000, or $10,000,000, to encourage the larger production, and Great Britain has directly under her control two large areas, which are set aside, of 10,000 acres each, in which, to produce fibre for the purposes of the Government, which, generally speaking and strictly speaking, are for the purpose and manufacture of aeroplane wings. The use of flax fibre and flax linen in the construction of aeroplanes is an entirely new industry, and I understand it has been impossible to get any other material which will take the application of whatever formula may be necessary to cover the cloth to resist the atmospheric effects while being used in flying. Therefore, Great Britain, in view of the urgency and the emergency, has seen fit to practically commandeer the entire production of the fibre of Great Britain. She does not to-day allow a dollar's worth of fibre to be sent out of the country. In Canada, while we have weaving mills, and while we, ourselves, have been able to grow a fibre of excellent quality, and have been able to send the fibre to the United States and Ireland to be spun into yarn, we have not got any industry in this country which connects up that important part of the industry in Canada—that is the spinning of the yarn from the raw fibre, producing the yarn from which the weaving mills may weave their linen. We had a discussion on the subject of flax fibre in this House just exactly two years ago, and at that time the development of the industry was not as far advanced as it is at the present time, and I want to say to the House candidly that in my opinion, due to the efforts the Government put forth at that time, to the influence of the higher prices which have prevailed since that time, I repeat to the stimulus of increased prices, and to the stimulus of the fibre department of the Department of Agriculture, the development of fibre production has gone forward at a very reasonable pace; in other words, the productive value for the year 1917 represents more than six times the total productive value of the fibre in the year 1915. That is due to a certain ex-

tent to the higher price which prevails for the raw fibre. The flax industry has been a difficult one to handle. It has been difficult all down through the ages. It dates back many, many years, in fact two thousand years ago, when flax was produced by methods very much similar to those which prevail to-day. I have pointed out that the industry is one of very ancient origin, and if I may be permitted to draw the attention of the House to the historical side of the facts, I trust I may be pardoned, because I feel that the subject is one of very great interest and one of very great importance, especially to the district in which I live, and as I will be able to show to the members of this House, of very great interest to almost every district within the Dominion. The cultivation of flax and manufacture of its fibre is the most ancient of all textile industries dating back to the early period of the world's history, very distinct traces of its existence during the stone age have been preserved to the present day. The great value of the plant has been known and appreciated for thousands of years, but in matter of preparation generally it stands almost where it was 3,000 years ago. It is said that it was a well established industry in Egypt at the dawn of the Christian era. Three thousand years ago the Phoenicians devoted much attention to cultivation of the plant, and subsequently the Greeks and Romans made the working of flax fibre a part of the household duties. Hon. members who are familiar with the volume of Sacred-Writ, (I hope all are) will remember that one of the plagues sent to Pharaoh and his people and referred to in the book of Exodus was the plague of hail, and it is there recorded " that the flax and the barley was smitten, for the barley was in the ear and the flax was bolled " the wheat and the rye were not smitten; for they were not grown up.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that much the same methods of cultivating flax prevail to-day as those which were followed three thousand years ago. In the growing of this crop almost the same system of rotation is followed; that is a flax crop succeeds wheat or barley. In the book of Joshua it is recorded that Joshua sent out two spies to view the land, even Jericho, and the king sent his men to search for them. They came to the house of a woman named Rahab. She took the spies up to the roof of her house, and hid them in the stalks of flax which she had laid in order on the roof. The flax was spread out on the roof, exposed to the weather, and retted in the same way as it is now spread out on the lawn, or on the grass in the fields, exposed to the rain and in this way retted.

I have further references to the historical side of this question, but it is too late to elaborate on them. I wish to draw the attention of the House, however, to the fact that in bringing gifts in those olden days they always associated fine linen with gold, silver and precious metals. All through the Holy Book we find frequent mention of flax and linen.

It is apparent that the flax industry is of very ancient origin, and thousands of years ago people manufactured the finest and best grades of linen. This in itself is not so much a matter of amazement as is the fact that throughout the centuries there should be so little advance in the methods of preparing a commodity that was classed amongst the most valuable in merchandise. It practically stands to-day very much the same as it stood over three thousand years ago, in as much as the method of retting is generally substantially the same as it was when linen was first manufactured by the Egyptians, and this notwithstanding the fact that the preparation of flax for the market is a highly scientific and technical process.

The history of flax in Canada dates back about three hundred years. Records show that the earliest settlers on this continent brought with them the seed of the flax plant. In the year 1617 the first farmer who landed in the province of Quebec occupied and cleared that piece of land where now stands the court house of the city which bears that name, built himself a cabin and commenced farming. Some thirty or forty years later, about thirty-five miles below the city of Quebec on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, at a place called St. Joachim, was established a sort of experimental farm, and on this farm one of the principal crops, in an experimental way, was flax. Professor Grisdale, Director of our Dominion Experimental Farms, referring to this incident at the flax convention held in London, Ont., on the 28th of February, 1917, said that he had had the pleasure of visiting this old district in the autumn of 1916 and had come across some French farmers from whom he learned that they had been growing flax not merely for the grain but for the fibre ever since they could remember; further, that there was a history or legend in their family, that this was some old flax brought over by the

family of Hebert some three hundred years ago. The habitants throughout these many years, and the settlers in many other parts, scutched out, heckled and spun as well as wove their yarns into linens, and some of the linen is to be found in the homes of these people to this day.

Flax, therefore, it is proven has been grown and manufactured in this country ever since the country was first settled. Before the invention of the cotton-gin cheapened the production of cotton fabric, flax spinning and weaving was a common household industry. The older generation of the present day can remember the spinning wheel and distaff wound with flax in the corner of the country kitchen.

The importance of the industry was early recognized and in the United States was carefully fostered by legislation. As early as the year 1640 the Massachusetts General Assembly passed an Act to encourage the production of flax, which was followed by similar action by other states, including Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia. In the year 1719 a large immigration of Scotch-Irish from Londonderry improved colonial knowledge of the cultivation and manufacture of flax. Encouragement was given to its manufacture in a household way, and in the year 1791 it is recorded that in the two states, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, 25,265 yards of linen were manufactured in the homes, and that in the year 1810 the production in families throughout the United States was 21,211,262 yards, the flax being mostly grown by the families who made the linen. Experience, however, later showed the invention of the cotton-gin and the consequent cheapening of cotton cloth, to a large extent destroyed this household industry in the United States as well as in the Dominion, but by no means killed the linen industry. For certain purposes linen is indispensable. In strength, beauty, and durability it so far surpasses cotton that it maintains its place in spite of all competition. It is significant that at the time of the civil war in the United States the production of flax was less than five million pounds. To be accurate, in the year 1860 records show the production of fibre to have been 4,720,145 pounds, and ten years later this had jumped to 27,133,034 pounds. By 1880, the production had shrunk to 1,565,546 pounds. In 1870 thirty-two states of the Union were producing flax fibre, so that it was shown the soil and climatic conditions were favourable in many parts, though the statistics also showed that 26,484,319 of the amount was produced in nine states—Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Of this amount Ohio produced 17,880,624 pounds. But the real reason why, on this continent, flax has not occupied that foremost position amongst the fibre and weaving industries that it formerly held is due primarily to the disadvantage under which we are in this country with regard to labour. We are in competition with the cheap labour of Russia, Belgium and other countries.

Flax, although grown in a rotation, and although grown like any other field crop, is rather complex and difficult to handle and the labour cost of production is very much greater than that of any other crop. Flax has to go through various processes in order to produce a marketable article in the shape of fibre. The people on this continent have not given serious consideration to the proper tilling and preparation of the soil necessary to produce the best results. Very frequently it has been considered that an old pasture which has to a certain extent played out is a suitable field on which to grow a crop of flax. Besides, where it has been grown that serious attention has not been paid to fertilization which is given to other crops, and consequently the yields have been dissappointing. It has been reported that in the West, where flax is largely grown for seed, the yield per acre runs from a ton to a ton and a half. On the other hand it is quite a common thing in Belgium, France and Germany to produce a crop of three and a half tons, and even as high as four tons per acre. I think, however, that a fair average crop in those countries where flax has been successfully grown is about three tons to the acre.

In this country the method of encouraging the culture of flax has been something along this line: Certain groups of men, who have established flax mills, say to the farmer, "We want you to grow so many acres of flax each year; we will give you the seed free, you plough the land, put the seed in and deliver the crop; we will provide all the necessary labour, after furnishing the seed to you." After the flax is grown the process has been to pull it by hand, but that is only possible profitably where you have cheap labour. In western Ontario we have used a great many Indians. Sometimes boys and young girls have been able to earn a little money in this calling; but whereas in days gone by a field of flax could be pulled at a cost of

about $4 per acre the price has rapidly advanced and at the present time it costs about $15 per acre for hand pulling, which is a very great detriment to the development of the flax industry in this country, because if as high as $15 per acre has to be paid for pulling the flax it is not possible to compete with the countries where it costs only $4 per acre for pulling.

As the flax is pulled it has got to be cured. It has to be de-seeded and in the absence of a mechanical contrivance it practically means that all this work has got to be done by hand. When the de-seeder has removed the seed the flax is laid out on the ground again and exposed to the dews and the rains until, in a very short space of time, the outer woody substance which must be separated from the fibre itself before it can be used, has retted. Now after the retting is done the flax has to be dried again and then gathered up and taken to the mill. I am pointing out the disadvantages under which we have suffered from the standpoint of hiring labour. The flax is delivered by the farmer to the mill and the miller then takes charge if it, but nearly all the processes within the mill have been, to a more or less extent, of a primitive nature and have not enjoyed that development in mechanical devices which almost every other industry of a similar character has experienced. Therefore it has been a costly commodity to manufacture. The different processes which flax has had to undergo on the way to the spinner have been of the old-fashioned character, and as a result the cost has been so great that it has not been, up till recent years, so attractive a proposition for the farmer who is the producer, or for the miller who produces the fibre. It is an old-fashioned saying, however, that necessity is the mother of invention, and when we discussed this subject two years ago in the House we were in this position: There had been no machine discovered which could suitably pull that flax in the field. The old method of hand labour went on, and until last season old methods were still in vogue: The flax was pulled by hand and retted on the ground. Two years ago we had a man in the city of Ottawa who had been working for some years on a machine, and who devised one that in a way did—not altogether effectively by any means, for it was not mechanically perfect—in an imperfect way perform the work of pulling flax. In the year 1916 I visited the flax fields in western Ontario during the harvest season and the most astonishing thing to me was that there was a machine invented in 1837, and bronght into the country in the year 1857, and sixty years after its introduction into Canada was still working in the fields of western Ontario and in a way doing the work of pulling flax. Notwithstanding that the inventor of that machine knew the principle and the idea called for, human ingenuity and the skill of scientists had failed to evolve a perfect machine whereby flax could be economically pulled to meet the competition of cheap labour.

But, as I have said, necessity is the mother of invention, and I am glad to say that now—I have it on the authority of the flax producers of western Ontario—that a gentleman who formerly lived in Montreal, Mr. J. H. Tombyll, has perfected a machine which effectively, efficiently, and satisfactorily performs the work of pulling flax. If such is the case that machine will be of incalculable value to our flax growers and to our farmers, because it will solve once for all the problem of cheap labour in connection with the pulling of flax. The countries of France, Belgium and Russia will never in all likelihood hereafter have the same opportunities of cheap labour that they have enjoyed in the past, but even should this anticipation prove to be unfounded we have now in Canada a satisfactory method of meeting their competition. The best evidence that the machine in question is satisfactory is that it worked in the fields most successfully last year. One western Ontario grower has bought sixteen of the machines for operation next year, and another has purchased eighteen. I have it from men who are producers and growers in that part of Ontario that the machine is working satisfactorily. Therefore, I figure it is safe to assume that we have practically solved the difficulty of pulling flax economically. I am also told, strange as it may be, that almost concurrently with the development of this device in Canada they have perfected a machine of the same kind in Ireland, and that they have not only perfected a pulling machine but also a scutching machine. The very need which has been pressed home upon growers in Ireland, just as it has been pressed home upon our growers here, has driven them to a solution of the problem which has disturbed them and which they had not been able to solve for a period of hundreds of years back. Had we nothing else to encourage us at the present time in developing the growth of flax than the fact that we have solved the problem of cheap labour for the har-

vesting of it, it would still be a great incentive and encouragement for us to go on and develop the industry in this country, because the product of flax outrivals in value per acre at the present time any cereal that we grow.

I am at liberty, I presume, to make that statement here, because I visited the Experimental Farm the other day, and told Prof. Grisdale that one prominent grower in western Ontario, who is a very large producer, Mr. Howard Fraleigh, of Forest, told me that he had sold his flax fibre this year at the rate of $1,400 a ton, and his average production on the ground he cultivated was 400 pounds of fibre to the acre. The average production of seed was from eight to nine bushels to the acre. That seed of western Ontario to-day has established such a reputation in Great Britain and Ireland that it is practically the only seed being used for the fibre they are expecting to produce for their æroplanes next year. Now, Prof. Grisdale told me, when I thought that was an extraordinarily good price, that they have samples of fibre from Quebec, Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, and practically from all parts of Canada sent from experimental farms and stations where they have been grown to be put through the appliances for scutching and heckling in the flax mill at the Experimental Farm, Ottawa, and to be put in shape for the market. Here is fibre, drawn from all the districts of Canada, making a conglomerate collection of various qualities no doubt, and grown under different conditions, yet the total product of all that fibre this year has been sold by the farm at the price of $1,400 per ton. I do not know how far that goes. I would suggest, however, that the product of this year gathered at the Central Experimental Farm would mean that the overhead cost of operation had been almost covered by the sale of fibre this year. I hope that is a condition which does prevail, because it would be a justification for what has already been done, as well as a substantial reason why the Department of Agriculture should even go further than they have gone.

I said that the seed grown in the province of Ontario to-day is practically the only seed that is being used in Ireland in the production of fibre with which the British Government next year propose to construct their æroplane wings. I understand it is also used in the body of the machines. Two years or so ago, at a large world fibre show held in Ireland, flax grown in Ireland from Canadian fibre seed won first prize against the competition of the whole world. In Ireland last year or the year before, it is stated—and I have it vouched for by those who have seen it—that if you go through the country in the districts where this commodity is grown, the reputation of Ontario flax seed has made such headway that along the farms on big signboards you will see in strong outstanding letters the words "Flax Fibre from Canadian Seed." In Ireland at the present time the value of Ontario seed for fibre is $10 a bushel. I submit that we have established a reputation that it is our duty to carefully guard and protect against the inroads of other countries and of other seeds which may be brought into competition with ours.

Just here I want to draw the attention of the minister to a certain matter, and I have no doubt he is fully apprised of it and may have taken action. The British Government have found difficulty in getting seed. Notwithstanding that in Ireland they produce a very good quality of fibre, I am told that they cannot allow the straw to mature sufficiently so that the seed will be sufficiently ripened to be used for another crop. For that reason, in the past, Ireland has largely depended for her seed on Holland. We in Ontario, or in Canada, have been using Dutch seed; we have grown it here, for the general practice has been to continue its growth in Ontario for a period of four years, and experience has shown that it gradually runs out, and must be replenished with new seed. Now, the seed we have sent to Ireland is a Holland seed we have grown for one year in this country, and then shipped to Ireland to meet the needs of this year. Were it not for the seed supplied by Canada, notwithstanding the need for fibre in the armies next year, there would not have been seed available in any part of the world to meet the need. To that extent we have helped the Mother Country and the Empire, and we can well congratulate ourselves and the department on our foresight in stimulating this industry, so that instead of growing the few thousand acres we did in 1916, our increase for last year was practically equal to almost double the product of two years ago.

Now, Great Britain was bringing over from Japan, or some one was bringing from Japan, a large amount of seed, which came across from Vancouver as far as Montreal. I am speaking of this as reported in the papers, and as the press shows it by advertisements, about which I am going to

say something later. Of this seed, some 400 tons got as far as Montreal, where it was put into the British war stores. Owing to the fact that it could not come forward in time, and that when it did come forward Canadian seed had already preceded it to the old country, and as therefore the need of it was not so great in the old country, it was held in Canada, as well as for the reason that transportation for it could not be procured. Now, the British Government has sent out to Canada—I would like the House to pay careful attention to this, for I think it is a matter of vital importance that must be protected—Col. Wayland, of Winnipeg, who represents a Winnipeg firm, to arrange for the distribution of this seed amongst our farmers, not for fibre, because the straw and fibre goes to the farmer, but for the purpose of reproducing seed which they are going to grow in Ireland and Great Britain next year for fibre. I do not know what this seed is; I do not know whether the Government knows what it is; I do not know how good and substantial it may be for fibre. But these are the terms on which it is being peddled out to the farmer to grow this year in Canada. Col. Wayland comes here under the authority of the Home Government, and he has a department at work in Toronto under the direction of Col. Pratt, who has put double headline columns in the papers advertising the distribution of this flaxseed. If the farmers of Canada grow this flax this year, they get the seed free; the only condition is that from the crop grown they shall return bushel for bushel advanced them for seeding; any crop over this they are guaranteed a market for at a fair price of $4.50 a bushel. That seed is being grown in the province of Ontario and in western Canada. I do not know, but I think it is being grown practically wherever farmers will take it and grow it. I submit to the minister most respectfully, that wherever that seed goes it should be carefully earmarked. Now that we have established the reputation in Ireland for producing a seed from which a fibre of the highest quality can be produced, and which commands the price of $10 a bushel in the home market, there is an opening for an immense amount of injury to ourselves and to the grower at home if these seeds I have referred to become mixed with our own, which can quite easily be done unless they are carefully marked.

I do not pretend to suggest how the interests of Canada will be protected, but it might be in this way. If a farmer should grow seed from Canadian flax seed which has been demonstrated to be sound and good for fibre, and for which the British Government is prepared to pay ten dollars a bushel, that seed should be kept separate from any other seed that is grown, and used as seed for next year, because, if our production increases in the same ratio as during the past two years, we shall likely have a hundred thousand bushels of fibre seed for export instead of forty or fifty thousand. There is, however, the possibility of this other seed going to Ireland as Canadian fibre seed and, grown there, being found to be absolutely unfit for fibre. In that case, the reputation which we have built up over these years is going to be seriously damned. We must guard our interests in that respect. I do not think it is necessary to point out the difficulties that present themselves any further than to suggest to the minister and the department that this matter should be very carefully watched.

I want to tell my hon. friends from Quebec that, on my visit to the Experimental Farm the other day, while I had always been under the impression that the farmers of Ontario had the reputation of growing the best fibre on the continent of America, I was told by the fibre expert at the Experimental Farm and also by Professor Grisdale that the best fibre produced under experimental conditions in Canada last year was that grown in Gaspé, Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are far ahead.

Mr. GLASS: I was also told that in Annapolis Valley, Nova Scotia, a quantity of flax not second to that grown in Quebec, was produced.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The old Acadians—the same thing.

Mr. GLASS: We grow a large quantity of fibre in Ontario. I do not know what success my hon. friends would have if they put in a large crop. I can appreciate how a few acres properly tilled and cultivated might produce much better results than a large area of several thousand acres. We, however, envy the people of Quebec the reputation they have made, and they can be close competitors with us in developing this industry which in the future, will have great bearing upon the economic conditions of our country.

In many of the provinces of Canada it has been demonstrated that we can produce fibre of excellent quality. That is true of the lower provinces, of Ontario, and of British Columbia. I am not prepared to say just how far the western provinces produce a high-grade fibre, but even in those provinces very great improvement could be made if an honest effort were made

to produce straw for its fibre. But in the West they have largely been content to produce flax for seed purposes only, and that has proved a very profitable business. We make the fibre, and we are shipping nearly all the fibre we produce to the mills of New Jersey and Massachusetts. There it is spun into yarns, and with those yarns they make coarse cloths. They spin it into twines and yarns for shoemakers threads and harnessmakers threads, and into twine for fish nets and gill nets. We have shipped some fibre to Ireland where it is spun into yarns and manufactured into cloth. The Belfast linen mills, the largest spinning mills in the world to-day, have men engaged in controlling some thousands of acres of land in Ontario where they are growing this flax for the purpose of their spinning mills in Ireland, because they cannot get the quantity they want there. They are growing fibre here, retting it here, and shipping it to Ireland. If the Irish mills, which control one-third of all the spindles of the world, can send their men out here to produce in Canada fibre for the raw material for their mills, why can not we establish spinning mills in our country and connect up our weaving industry? We produce the raw material, the fibre from which the yarns are spun. That fibre has to go out of this country to be spun into yarn, and then the yarns spun from it are brought back here to be woven into linen cloth. In Guelph we have the only linen weaving industry on the continent of America. We can produce the fibre and we can weave the cloth. Why should we allow ourselves to remain in the ridiculous position of not being able to spin the essential material for our weaving mills, which is the yarn spun from our fibre? I merely suggest how this should be done. In the past we have seen fit to grant bounties for the development of zinc and iron, and for other purposes. If a small bounty spread over a period of two or three years would result in the establishment of spinning mills in this country, it would be a good business policy to give encouragement in that way. At the present time we produce in this country enough raw material to keep five substantial spinning mills running. If our production this year increases in the ratio that is already promised, we shall almost double our capacity during the present year.

[Mr. Glass.]

During the last discussion of this question in the House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who spoke, drew attention to the objection farmers had that flax was injurious to the soil. In connection with this discussion, I desire to put on record the opinion of some men who are competent to upset any such opinion, and to deny any such charge as that. During the discussion of the subject of flax at a convention held in the city of London in the spring of 1916, amongst others who spoke there was a Mr. Leitch, a practical farmer, who had been growing flax for some years for the mills in that district. This is what Mr. Leitch says as to the effect of flax on soil:

> I have grown flax for a number of years. After flax I always sow wheat and taking the wheat crop into consideration, it will pretty nearly pay for both crops. I have threshed 42 bushels of wheat to the acre after flax with straw five or six feet long. After yields like that we do not worry about flax being hard on the land. That year I grew 3½ tons per acre.

Professor Zavitz of the Experimental Farm writing in the Farmer's Advocate a short time ago, said:

> The actual amount of fertilizing constituents taken from the soil by different crops is an important matter from the farmer's standpoint. To secure this information it is necessary to have a knowledge of both the yields and the chemical composition of the crops. Unfortunately, the statistics gleaned by both the Dominion and the Provincial Governments do not furnish sufficient data for these calculations. For instance, the Ontario Bureau of Industries has not collected information in regard to yields of seed and straw of flax or of straw of cereals. At the Agricultural College, however, accurate determinations are made from year to year of the yields of both grain and straw per acre of the different farm crops.
>
> Flax, winter wheat, oats and barley have been grown under similar conditions in the experimental grounds at Guelph in each of the past twelve years. The varieties used for these determinations of the comparative exhaustiveness of soil fertility were Common flax, Dawson's Golden Chaff winter wheat, Banner oats and Mandscheuri barley. In each case the chaff was included with the straw. The flax was grown in duplicate plots each year with an average of 77 pounds of seed per acre, and the average returns, therefore, represent twenty-four tests in the twelve-year period.
>
> For the chemical composition the figures used were obtained from the 1915 edition of "Feeds and Feeding" by Henry and Morrison with the exception of those of flax straw which are not given in that publication. For the chemical composition of the flax straw use has been made of the figures determined by Kennedy in his thesis prepared at the Ontario Agricultural College. The flax was obtained from the Field Husbandry Department, and it was analyzed in the Chemical Department of this

institution. The following table gives the average annual yields for the twelve-year period and the amount of fertilizing constituents obtained through the sources previously indicated:

Varieties.		Yield per Acre.		Nitrogen N.		Phosphoric Acid P205.		Potash K20.	
		Bushels and tons.	Pounds.	Per Cent.	Total in Crop (Lbs.)	Per Cent.	Total in Crop (Lbs.)	Per Cent.	Total in Crop (Lbs.)
Common Flax	Seed	18·3	1024	3·62	37·1	1·50	15·4	·95	9·7
	Straw	2·45	4900	·72	35·3	·31	15·2	1·02	50·00
Dawson's G. C. Winter Wheat	Seed	43·2	2590	1·87	48·4	·85	22·0	·52	13·5
	Straw	2·22	4440	·50	22·2	·13	5·8	·74	32·9
Banner oats	Seed	75·0	2550	1·98	50·5	·81	20·7	·56	14·3
	Straw	2·07	4140	·58	24·0	·21	8·7	1·50	62·1
Mandscheuri barley	Seed	63·4	3043	1·84	56·0	·85	25·9	·74	22·5
	Straw	1·98	3780	·56	21·2	·18	6·8	1·20	45·4

The yields of all four crops are considerably larger than the average yields of the province. It should be clearly understood, however, that the experiments have been conducted under uniform conditions. The crops were grown during the twelve years immediately previous to 1917. The land received a four years' rotation during which three crops were removed from the soil. Farmyard manure was applied every four years at the rate of twenty tons (about twelve good sized loads) per acre. No commercial fertilizers were used with any of these crops throughout the period. If the yields here given were divided by two they would more closely correspond with the average yields of the Province.

The following summary gives in a more concise form the average amounts per acre of fertilizing constituents taken annually by the four crops and in accordance with the yields and the compositions given in the previous table:

Varieties.	Pounds per Acre.		
	Nitrogen N.	Phosphoric Acid P205.	Potash K20.
Common flax	72·4	30·6	59·7
Dawson's Golden Chaff winter wheat	70·6	27·8	46·4
Banner oats	74·5	29·4	76·4
Mandscheuri barley	77·2	32·7	67·9

Of our four individual crops, winter wheat took a less amount of each of the fertilizing constituents from the soil than of the others. Barley required the largest amount of nitrogen and phosphric acid and oats the largest amount of potash. The comparative exhaustion of these crops on the soil is largely a matter of the disposal of the crop after it is grown. Both the grain and straw of oats and barley are principally consumed on the farm and much of the fertility is returned to manure. In the case of wheat, the grain is sold and the straw is largely retained. In the growing of flax, however, both the seed and the straw are frequently sold outright. The market value of these crops per acre, however, are usually the lowest for oats and barley and decidedly the highest for flax. It is interesting to note that the number of acres of flax in Ontario was approximately 4,000 in 1915, 5,200 in 1916, and 8,000 in 1917; and that the value of fibre per ton and of seed per bushel for the same period was as follows: 1915, $400, $1.60; 1916, $600, $3.00; and 1917, $1,100. $5.50. As there is a strong demand for both the fibre and the seed the probabilities are that the acreage of flax for 1918 will be still greater than that of the past year.

The quotation I have read shows that the opinion that flax reduces the fertility of the soil is not justified. I have here the Farmer's Bulletin of the Department of Agriculture, Washington dated May 25, 1915, and edited by Frank C. Miles, Scientific Assistant, Fibre-plant Investigations. He says:

It has been found upon investigation that an average crop of flax removes less plant food from the soil than does a crop of corn or oats. Flax plants have delicate root systems which occupy only the upper few inches of the soil, while the plants of oats and corn have more vigorous root systems which may penetrate the sub-soil. Hence, oats and corn may obtain from the sub-soil a portion of the food materials essential for plant development, but flax plants necessarily must obtain practically their entire nourishment from the upper few inches of surface soil which the roots occupy. Undoubtedly then, more of the available plant food in the upper 5 or 6 inches of soil is removed by flax than by the deeper rooted crops. Therefore, in preparing flax stubble for the succeeding crop care should be taken to plow deep enough to bring up some of the sub-soil in order to replenish the surface soil with available plant food.

Professor Saunders, who made investigations at the Experimental Farm in 1896, says:

Doubtless there are many prejudices in connection with the growth of flax. The farmers have the idea that its growth exhausts the soil, but the experiments carried on by the Department of Agriculture during the years 1906-1908, the results of which appear in Bulletin No. 59, show that this view is unwarranted. The Bulletin asks the question, does flax exhaust the soil? This question is usually answered in the affirmative, but this opinion does not appear to be warranted by the chemical analyses which have been made of this crop, showing the principal elements of fertility taken from the soil during the period of its growth. The results which have been obtained by chemical examination have furnished the following figures, which represent approximately the plant food removed from the soil by flax, wheat and oats.

The figures mentioned to this (to quote Professor Saunders):

It will be seen that the grain in the case of wheat crop, takes up a little more nitrogen, nearly one-third less of phosphoric acid, and about one-eighth less of potash. The difference, however, in exhaustive effect of these several crops on a rich soil would scarcely be perceptible, and would not justify the opinion that flax is a very exhausting crop.

Another eminent authority, Dr. A. W. Thornton, of Bellingham, state of Washington, who edited a new book, entitled, "The American System of Flax and Other Fibre Culture" only last year which gives considerable information on this subject, says:

SOIL AND SOIL EXHAUSTION.

Right here it may not be out of place to refer to a very generally held, though erroneous notion, that flax is very exhaustive on the soil. In this connection I cannot do better than quote from C. R. Dodge, report No. 10, on Flax Culture, in the United States, published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, in which Mr. Eugene Boss, a leading authority on the subejct, states as follows: "There is a strong prejudice among some people against the culture of flax, they say flax is hard on the land. I am painfully impressed in regard to the wisdom of those who advocate such an untrue thing, because of their ignorance of the composition of the plant, its habits and needs. Yes, the flax is hard on the land, when the farmer plows his land shallow, sows it thinly, and allows the weeds too much room to fill the space, then it is not the flax that ruins the land, but that very rapacious enemy, the weeds. Plow the land shallow, and you do not let the plant follow its natural course. You force its roots to feed on the surface, and there lies one of the reasons why flax, as commonly cultivated, remains short and dries up instead of ripening naturally. The moisture it so much requires is too quickly absorbed. It is true I have seen fields of pretty long flax that have been sown on very shallow land, but that land was very rich or very open, with a propitious season. I deny that flax is harder on land than wheat, rye, oats, or barley, when similarly cultivated, it wants a deep soil, 10 or 12 inches at least, thoroughly pulverized in order to allow its main root to go straight down into the earth and find there most of the elements essential to healthy growth.

[Mr. Glass.]

He goes on in this way, and his comments on the article show that he is entirely opposed to the theories generally prevailing among the farming community as to the exhaustion of the soil. So much for the flax which we have been growing in Ontario and several other provinces. There is another side of the flax question which is of very great interest to the people of western Canada, and I desire to draw the attention of the House to the developments and the investigations that have been going along in that direction. It is generally understood that farmers of the West have not produced a class of fibre which can be spun into yarn and from yarn woven into high grade linen. The invention and perfecting of a flax puller by the Flax Harvesting Company, Limited, of Brantford, Ont., which is the same machine known as the Tombyll already referred to—has provided a simple, effective and proven puller, promises to be an immense stimulant to farmers throughout the country, and if used by the farmers of the West will add many thousands of dollars of value to the straw product. Indoor retting under the Feuillette system has been in operation for some years, and in France six years ago a substantial grant was made by the French Government to the inventor. A machine for deseeding flax straw has been perfected, the work being done without breaking or tangling the straw, and is now on the market. Bulletin No. 669, published by the Department of Agriculture, Washington, also shows the quantity of linen fibre produced.

The company known as the Flax Fibre Development Association, under the management of Mr. F. L. Van Allen, of Regina, Sask., encouraged by the provincial government, have made, they claim, substantial progress in methods of utilization of western flax straw. They claim to have produced on a commercial basis, yarns binder-twine, heavy commercial twines and fine commercial twines, all from fibre of western flax straw. The seed is threshed, but must not pass through the blower. The fibre is extracted from the straw by mechanical process, treated by their own methods, which can be carried out under cover without regard to climatic conditions, the fibre then being drawn, spun, and twisted on standard soft fibre machinery. As the problems affecting western straw are vastly different from those in the East, they have had to be solved by scientific research. The objects of the company have been defined as follows: To separate and extract

fibre from flax straw by purely mechanical means, and without having to resort to what is commonly known as retting, and to manufacture the product into various articles of merchandise. It is estimated that throughout the Canadian West some 2,000,000 tons of flax straw are burnt annually. The flax plant there being grown solely for its seed (linseed).

Mr. MORPHY: I have been told that the western flax for fibre is not a success and that there is no long fibre in it.

Mr. GLASS: That is correct; that is my information, and that is confirmed by those who are in a position to know. In the West flax is grown entirely different from the way it is grown here. It is not grown for the fibre, but for the seed, and the methods of growing flax and feeding the soil are quite different from the methods used in Ontario. They grow a short plant that develops a large amount of seed, but a very short straw, and the process of pulling is not in vogue there. The straw is cut by the ordinary harvesting machine, so as to get the seed. Very little value is attached to the straw for fibre purposes. It has been wasted, but research and investigation have shown that this straw can be devoted to a very useful purpose in industry. In the past, however, from the standpoint of purely fibre production, it has not been a success. Notwithstanding the enormous amount of seed grown with which to make linseed oil, and any one who has had occasion to use that commodity under present conditions will realize that its advance from 50 cents a gallon to about $2.50 a gallon, shows the enormous world increase in the demand for that commodity of linseed oil.

Mr. MORPHY: What is the reason the flax industry has ceased to be successful in Canada?

Mr. GLASS: I think that question is answered by my observation a few minutes ago. Our experience here was the same as that of the United States. The old fossilized methods of pulling and handling flax and of treating it from the time it was pulled in the harvest field to the time it was manufactured into fibre were so crude and expensive that it could not compete with the cheap labour of Ireland, Belgium, France, Germany, Russian or, in fact, any of those European countries, where fibre was grown. Our labour was too expensive to compete with them. Having solved the problem of pulling flax, we have in a large measure put ourselves on a par with those countries, so far as the future development of the industry in this country is concerned. It is costing $15 an acre to pull this flax by hand. By the use of this machine, and under most improved methods of pulling by the machine, I understand that, at the present time, it can now be done for $2.50 an acre, and this may, in course of time be further reduced. In separating the seed from the plant by ordinary means of the thresher, the fibre in the straw of the West is sacrificed, and when recovered shows a length of from one to three inches only. The fibre has nevertheless a commercial value as a raw material for paper, pulp, felting, insulating, quilt, etc. Where the flax straw is threshed without its being broken the fibre when separated shows a length of about ten inches. This is a very valuable fibre and can be used in the manufacture of oakum and for cordage purposes. World wide shortage of fibres, especially line fibre, and all other fibres in sympathy, have necessarily forced substitution. The linen fields of the world have been the Baltic provinces of Russia, Northern France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Great Britain, Ireland, Holland, Sweden, Austria, Denmark, Portugal and North and South America.

Of these countries, Belgium and Russia supplied the greater proportion of the world's supplies prior to the war, but these fields are completely under German control. With decreased production there has been increased demand, and at the present time the contingencies of war practically demand the total supplies in view, or in the near future possible of production. The first order of the American government for airplanes required a supply of over three and three-quarter million yards of line. Besides linen, the coarser fibres are short in supply. It is said that Canada alone can consume annually ten million pounds of twines. Increased shipbuilding will make an increased demand on cordage, and the movement for greater production is bound to have its influence in increasing the demand for binder twine. With this condition ahead, new sources of supply must be found for the standard fibres, or else suitable substitutes must be found in quantities sufficient for the needs. Will the vast fields of the West solve this problem? Can this substitute be found in the waste flax straw of the western prairies? Some think it can, and that the world's needs may be found and can be recovered from this waste

in so far as the coarser commodities are concerned, just in such proportion as organized effort capital and research will solve the problem of converting into needed articles of manufacture these waste piles of flax straw. Efforts in this direction have been made over a period of many years with varying success and with many disappointments. We need not concern ourselves with the discouragements of the past, but hold fast to discoveries which under scientific investigation have lent hope, and so soon as these industrial problems seem to justify development, might not the nation join with capital in bringing to full fruition the possibilities that lie within them? In Saskatchewan the provincial government have shown a determination to join with private enterprise, and have already given aid and encouragement to the solution of the problem of the utilization of western flax straw, with the result that fibre taken from this straw, grown on the farm lands of that province for seed purposes only, after proper treatment, has been spun into yarns and woven or manufactured into more than fifty different articles of every-day need. This company claim that from this waste fibre they have demonstrated that they can and are making:

1. Yarns giving 4,500 feet to the pound sufficiently fine for webbing for coarse towelling.

2. Commercial twines with even waxed surface, equal in quality to that used for heavy saddlery work, valued at 83 cents a pound.

3. Heavy commercial twines of all ranges valued at 50 cents a pound.

4. Binder twine of soft even surface, 3-ply spun, giving 750 to 900 feet to the pound with even breaking strain.

The treating and care of the fibre takes but a few hours and can be carried on under cover at all seasons. The cost of producing manufactured articles is less than with any other known raw material of equal quality.

The amount of waste flax straw is variously estimated for the western part of Canada to be from one to two million tons. Presuming the more conservative estimate be taken, and assuming that about one million tons is a safe calculation, then we have a straw from which it would seem possible to extract on the basis of the lowest estimate of extraction, namely, 25 per cent—notwithstanding that the Fibre Development Association claim that 35 per cent is possible—but even on the more conservative basis we would seem to have sufficient straw to produce 250,000 tons of good fibre, or a total of 500,000,000 pounds of the finest manufacturing product in its class, including all articles which can be made from hard fibres and the articles made from soft fibres, embracing a range from ship cable to coarse towelling. It is understood that there is in process of incorporation now in the West a new organization to be known as the Co-operative Cordage, Limited, who will take up manufacture in that branch of industry. The Flax Fibre Development company, it is claimed, can treat ten tons of fibre per day with the facilities now at their command, but this would have to be very largely increased if full advantage is to be taken of the straw available.

Every pound of binder twine for the 1919 harvest in Canada can be grown and manufactured in Canada cheaper than imported, on condition that capital and effort join hands and organize to that end. It is said Canada alone will require 60,000,000 pounds of binder twine for one crop. These investigations are in no sense new. They have been carried on and spread over a period of years. Final tests during recent years have shown that the matter is no longer in the region of theory, but practical results have been achieved. It is quite possible now to recover a large amount of money from what in the past has been an entirely waste product.

What are the claims that are pressing most strongly upon us at the present time? I have pointed out the need for increased production. I have pointed out the need, as expressed in the earnest solicitations of the Home Government and the American Government, for the production of every pound of flax fibre that can be produced in the Dominion during the present year. It may be that the last five hundred, or the last one hundred, aeroplanes constructed will be the deciding factor in this great war. We do not know. Those who know tell us that there is no other fibre, no other commodity, which can supply cloth suitable for the manufacture of areoplane wings or bodies. The food controller in England, the food controller in the United States and the food control board in Canada, have strongly impressed upon us the need for linen twine for the making of gill nets for fishing. Hon. members who are interested in that industry in the lower provinces must have been brought to a serious realization of what it may mean when we are told that unless we supply the fibre used in the manufacture of twines from which

gill nets must be made, there is no other product that can be provided to take its place. We are told by the allied Governments that it is vitally essential that flax fibre shall be produced for the making of linen threads necessary for the sewing of army boots, harness, etc. That in itself should be a sufficient inspiration for us to speed up in our production to the very limit of our power. I take it Sir, that after all, there is possibly no greater stimulus that the grower can have than the return he receives on the labour employed and the money expended in producing this crop. As conditions are at present there is no crop grown that can compare in its value to the grower with flax. The British Government, in order to encourage the production of flax next year for government purposes, have made this arrangement with growers in Great Britain: they have said: we will give you the seed free if you grow the flax. We will guarantee to take every pound of straw and seed that you produce and we will give you $42.50 per ton for the straw with seed on. We will guarantee that the minimum return to you from the Government shall be not less than £14 per acre. That looks to me to be a splendid arrangement for the farmer in Great Britain because in that country it is quite possible to grow three and a half tons to the acre and if they can grow three and a half tons to the acre at $42.50 per ton it would seem to yield a liberal return. To get the maximum value out of it in this country farmers will have to adopt co-operative methods and establish a series of mills where the straw can be treated and turned into fibre the same as they now deliver their milk to the cheese factory and get their profit from the finished product in the form of cheese.

The British Government have likewise, in order to stimulate production of fibre, guaranteed that the minimum prices shall not be less than the following: No. 1 grade—and I may point out that in Ireland they have six different grades of fibre—forty shillings per stone for fourteen pounds, which is equal to 71½ cents per pound. That means a guarantee in Ireland of a price which is slightly above the maximum price that our growers have obtained in Canada. No. 2 grade, thirty-eight shillings per stone, or 68 cents per pound. No. 3 grade, thirty-six shillings per stone, or 64 cents per pound. No. 4 grade, thirty-four shillings per stone, or 60⅝ cents per pound. No. 5 grade, thirty-two shillings per stone, or 57 cents per pound. No. 6 grade, the lowest grade of all, I believe, 54 cents per pound, which is $1,080 a short ton.

Our flax growers sometimes say: These prices are good to-day but we do not know what they may be in future. One man informed me that he wished to put in two thousand acres of flax. That gentleman represented a company, whose name I need not mention, but he pointed out that in order to do as he would like would take $30,000 for seed at the present time. He said: I have to secure banking accommodation to the amount of $90,000 to carry me through until I could get any result from my investment. Even with the high cost of labour, if I have a good year and if war conditions continue and the present high prices are maintained, even approximately, I shall be safe, but if there should be a collapse and prices were to go down I should be in a very different position. That gentleman takes the position that the Government ought to guarantee a minimum price on the production of fibre. If the Government needs this commodity, and is of opinion that encouragement should be given towards its production, possibly it will grant a reasonable consideration for the purpose as it has done in the case of wheat and other commodities.

I have tried to suggest that the Government might give some encouragement to this industry. I suggest furthermore that the Government should consider the cost of producing the crop and of guaranteeing a minimum price to the producer in order to protect him from loss. In view of the great need of flax fibre the Government should start a propaganda through the press in order to assure the farmers in districts where flax can be grown, that it is just as patriotic a duty for them to produce flax fibre as it is for them to produce wheat and other commodities. I think that this matter is one of very great importance. I believe the farmer to-day has had it so impressed upon him the importance of producing wheat that he does not realize it is an equally national and patriotic duty on his part to produce every ton of flax fibre that he can. I believe that an advertisement in the agricultural press drawing the attention of the farmers of this country to the great need in this connection would be a big stimulus to the production of flax fibre in the districts where it should be grown for fibre purposes. We can grow wheat all through the western provinces, in fact all over the country, but

the areas where fibre has been successfully grown, and where they have the mills to treat it when it is grown are very limited. Therefore, I submit that if the minister would, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, point out to the farmers the essential need of flax fibre, the national need for the production of that fibre, and point out to them that in growing this commodity in districts where it can be successfully produced they are just as effectively and patriotically performing their duty to the state as if they were growing wheat, it would have an immense influence for good. I do not think I am mistaken in saying that in England a very urgent call has gone forth from the British Government for the production by us of flax to the limit of our ability.

I want also to say a word in connection with the production of hemp fibre. We have already shown that we can grow a superior hemp in this country. In the year 1916 Howard Fraleigh, of Forest, imported from Kentucky hemp seed for the purpose of experimenting on a tract of five acres. I was in his field in August of that year and saw the splendid stand of hemp there, some of it rising to a height of fifteen feet and the average height for the whole field being ten feet. This was his first experiment and his first crop. Mr. Fraleigh was so thoroughly satisfied with the results of his experiment that year that the following year he put in forty acres of hemp seed. Furthermore, stimulated by the success which he had obtained, other farmers in this district round him put in several acres, with an equal degree of success, for the year 1917. In February last, Howard Fraleigh said to me: I have had success with my experiments. I have demonstrated that I can grow in this country hemp of superior quality, and I am prepared as a result of the experiments I have made, after two years' practice, to put three hundred acres into seed this year for hemp. But he pointed out that hemp seed, while it came originally from China, was brought from that country to the United States and planted in Kentucky to acclimatize it, from which state it is imported into this country for seeding purposes. I presented the situation to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Customs in the early part of the year. Mr. Fraleigh pointed out, and I rather took sides with him, that inasmuch as he imported that hemp for seeding purposes, he was entitled to bring it in free of duty, as is permitted to be done in the case of other seeds. Now hemp seed costs $22.75 a bushel, and there has also to be paid on it customs duty and a war tax. No man is going to conduct experiments—it is really not an experiment because Mr. Fraleigh has proved it to be a commercial success—when there is such a large outlay involved, and I rather gathered from Mr. Fraleigh's latest statetment to me that to seed down three hundred acres to hemp was a responsibility rather more than he cared to assume under the circumstances. I desire to point out that Mr. Fraleigh is doing pioneer experimental work that might very well be undertaken by the Experimental Farm, and the Government would, in my opinion, not be going too far if it imported the seed itself and gave it to Mr. Fraleigh to enable him to continue his experiments. I would say more: if the Government distributed hemp seed throughout the country in order to demonstrate that hemp fibre, as well as flax fibre, can be successfully grown, it would be adopting a very beneficial policy in the interest of the country as a whole. Because hemp fibre is important from this standpoint: scientists tell us that it takes less from the soil than anything else that can be possibly grown. It grows like a large sugar cane and completely shades the soil, and weeds have no chance of living where it is grown. I went over his field and could not see a weed in any direction; it was absolutely clean. Mr. Fraleigh says that hemp seed is the best crop he can put in to help clean out the weeds.

Mr. MORPHY: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that hemp seed did not come in free of duty.

Mr. GLASS: I did not say that it did not come in; but that I thought it should come in free of duty. I was in hopes that the Department of Customs, or whatever department has charge of this matter, where a man was importing hemp seed for the purpose of seeding, would remit the duty. This man is importing it for experimental purposes, not for ordinary commercial purposes, and is doing the work that the Department of Agriculture might well do on its own farms at its own expense. This seed was imported by him direct from the shipper in Kentucky. Is it not reasonable that under those circumstances a man should have the same right to free entry as one who might be importing seed for growing? Now, hemp seed in the ordinary sense as we have known

it, is a commercial seed used for bird seed, and as such it comes in subject to a duty, but it is an entirely different product from this seed which is brought in for fibre purposes. A man who is willing to take the chance to grow it and experiment with it should, in my opinion, be entitled to consideration. Mr. Fraleigh has been three years at this, and each recurring year has been presenting his case to the department, and I think the Customs Department might be liberal enough to decide that, under the ordinary tariff for seeds, this commodity brought in for that specific purpose should come in free. I may say that Mr. Fraleigh tells me further that the hemp fibre he has produced from this seed has been sent to the Smith and Dove Manufacturing Company of Andover, Mass., and they have said that the fibre is of as high a quality as has been produced anywhere on this continent. His fibre is a fibre of the very highest quality, and is being used at the present time in combination with linen, and a union linen is being made in these mills by the use of this hemp fibre and the flax fibre in conjunction.

Mr. Fraleigh also pointed this out to me a few weeks ago when I was there, that a hand scutcher is an experienced mechanic who cannot be trained in a day or two or in two or three years, and several of his men have already gone overseas. He says that he cannot get men for that purpose, and that each of these scutchers who has left could each week scutch enough fibre to make a complete aeroplane. I point this out to show that in view of the increase in our acreage of flax this year it is highly undesirable that any further depletion of our scutchers should be permitted.

I understand that a department of scientific research for flax or flax fibre has been established. I do not know just who comprise the special committee, who are devoting their attention to flax. I understand that Professor W. C. Murray, of the University of Saskatchewan, is chairman, and that Dr. Ruttan of McGill University, Dr. F. T. Shutt of the Experimental Farm, Dr. Ferd. Van Bruyssell and Professor Grisdale comprise the committee who have under advisement these matters regarding flax. I believe that the Government would make no mistake if they added to this committee a man like Howard Fraleigh. The Minister of Agriculture told us two years ago when he went over to Washington and skimmed the whole territory of the United States to get information concerning this subject, that when he got to the man who was supposed to be the chief authority there, he gave him the name of two men, one Mr. Summers of Port Huron, Mich., and then he added: "You have in Canada one of the best posted men on this subject on this continent in Howard Fraleigh." That was his tribute to this man. Mr. Fraleigh is a man who lives and dreams this subject all the time; his whole soul, heart and interest are in making the best success of the cultivation of flax. I would suggest to the minister that, in forming advisory committees, or in taking the advice of men who are capable to give advice in connection with flax development, I believe Howard Fraleigh would make a valuable addition to any council that may be appointed.

There is much, Mr. Speaker, to be said on this subject, so much, in fact, that I regret it got started at such a late hour. I do sincerely urge on the minister this one thing: so far as the industrial end is concerned some encouragement is necessary to establish the spinning of flax fibre in Canada, and so to connect up the producing industry to the weaving industry in this country. So long as we remain in our present position, we will be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the other fellow. We do all the hard labour in connection with production and with the delivery of the fibre, and when we get that done we send the fibre out of our country to be spun into yarns, then our weavers have to bring the yarn back into this country to be made into linen. The mill in Guelph, which represents an investment of three-quarters of a million, ships its linens to the United States, showing that it has the best market in the world at its disposal. This proves that their product is worthy of Canadian industry, and is a tribute to the equipment they have for manufacturing linen. I do submit that it is a matter of vital importance to have this industry developed here, that we may retain within the bounds of Canada the full economic value of the fibre produced. It is necessary, by whatever means can best accomplish the purpose, that the spinning industry should be connected up, and, in my opinion we can do that by giving encouragement to the spinning industry to connect up the manufacture of the raw fibre with the weaving of the cloth.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): I will trespass on the patience of the House for just a short time to make

a few observations on the subject which the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) has introduced to the House this evening, and which he has covered so fully in his discussion. The matter doubtless is one of very great importance, and of particular importance to Canada at the present time. In normal times, I understand, the flax fibre which enters into the manufacture of all cords and linens which have largely been the product of Ireland and other European countries, has come largely from that portion of Russia which is now under the control of Germany, also from Belgium, and largely from Ireland. Naturally, the dislocations in this industry caused by the war have been very great, with the result that the fibre which has, in the past, been essential to the industry, is largely lacking, and consequently Ireland and Great Britain, in which the factories and industries have, in the past, been thriving, must look to new fields for their raw material. The question of the development of this industry in Canada has been very fully sketched by my hon. friend. The difficulty that has existed in the development of this industry in Canada has been referred to by him—the lack of cheap labour. Russia, which nominally produces from seventy-five to eighty per cent of the fibre supply of the world, had, of course, an abundance of cheap labour, and as this material for the purpose of being utilized for fibre, up to very recently, has had to be pulled by hand, it was very evident that in this product the country with a supply of cheap labour had the advantage over countries in which labour was more expensive.

I am of the opinion that the successful development of the industry in Canada will depend, in a very considerable degree, on the discovery, shall I say, of suitable machines for handling the flax; in other words, on substituting the work of the machine for the old method of hand labour. It is rather encouraging to find that, within the last few years, machines have been and are being employed that promise excellent success, particularly in that portion of the work that deals with the pulling of the plant from the ground and the preparing of it for the other processes that follow. If we can reach success in that respect in Canada there is an excellent prospect that the industry can develop to considerable proportions.

There is no doubt whatever that our soil and climate are admirably adapted to the growing of flax for fibre purposes. That has been proved by years of successful growing in certain localities in which in the earlier days of the country's development the settlers found it necessary to grow flax in order to supply themselves with a good deal of the clothing they required. Impressed with the importance of the industry in Canada, the Department of Agriculture several years ago undertook certain experimental work in respect to it. That experimental work covered practically the whole development of the industry from the growing of the flax to the manufacture of it into twines. In carrying on this work the department have grown experimental plots of flax in practically all of the experimental farms and stations in eastern Canada. They have found, as the hon. member has mentioned, that it can be grown very successfully, and I believe that the records show that the Gaspé peninsula produces perhaps the best quality of fibre grown in Canada. Flax has also been grown in western Canada. It cannot, however, be grown so successfully there for fibre purposes; the climate appears somewhat against it. The experimental farms have carried the work further. They have, on a small scale, quite an up-to-date set of machinery for carrying on the various operations that the hon. member for East Middlesex has outlined. In that way we are endeavouring to ascertain, first, the districts from which the best fibre can be secured, and second, the relative cost of turning it into the finished article in each district. That work will be of great advantage to the farmers of Canada who will be growing this flax later on. That the minds of our farmers have been turned to the growth of this plant for fibre purposes is evidenced by the fact that the acreage planted for fibre purposes is steadily increasing. In western Canada we have grown flax in quite a large way for seed. The flax crop of western Canada has run in yield from fifteen to eighteen and twenty million bushels per annum, and the results have been very satisfactory.

The hon. member referred to another matter that, in my judgment, is of the greatest importance, particularly to the farmers of western Canada. Experiments have for several years been carried on with the ripened straw that results after threshing out the seed. This straw is ripened, and it has never been considered of any practical value for fibre purposes. Experiments, however, have proven beyond any question of doubt that it can be converted into twines. I have in my office in this building

several samples of twine that have been manufactured in the city of Regina from fibre taken from flax straw. The product varies from fine hard twine, quite suitable for harness-making and similar work, to coarser twine suitable for replacing ordinary binder-twine. Last year the crop of flax straw in western Canada amounted to about 1,500,000 tons. Experiments have shown that each ton of flax straw will produce about 270 pounds of twine in its various forms. If all that flax straw were converted into twine, it would produce something over 300,000,000 pounds of twine. Canada annually uses something like 60,000,000 pounds of binder-twine. Our source of supply is from two countries, the Philippine Islands and the province of Yucatan, in Mexico, and if those sources of supply for the raw material, the manila and the sisal, were cut off, it would leave the farmers of Canada, particularly those of western Canada where they are engaged in grain growing on such a large scale, in a bad position. Consequently it is a matter of the very greatest importance—and in this the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) who discussed it here this evening has brought up a very important subject—to consider how this at present wasted material can be utilized to ensure an adequate supply of twine to bind our crops. And, of course—and this particularly applies to Canada at the present time—if we can convert waste material into useful product, we are simply getting that much further ahead in an economic way. That phase of the question, in my judgment, is one of very great importance. I think if we survey the whole field again we shall find that probably the successful growing of flax for fibre purposes in Canada depends upon the cheapness of the labour we can secure. If we can replace manual labour by mechanical power, by the discovery and development of machines that will pull the flax, we certainly have all the natural facilities for a splendid development of this industry. I see no reason why that should not be achieved. The memory of living man easily goes back to the time when practically all our grain, for instance, was bound by hand. It would be impossible to follow that method now in harvesting our immense grain crops. In that case the ingenuity of man was equal to the production of a machine to meet the increased need, and I feel, particularly in this age of invention, that a way will be found to develop machines of the various types that are necessary to replace hand labour in the carrying on of this industry.

I may add that the officers at the Experimental Farm who are carrying on these investigations are paying particular attention to that phase of the question, and I can assure the hon. member for East Middlesex that the whole question is receiving the close attention of the Government. It is only within the last few years that the department has seriously taken up the question with a view to studying it carefully in all its phases, and already good results are coming. The question is one of vast importance, and I again assure my hon. friend that it is receiving and will continue to receive the careful consideration of the Government. I shall be very glad indeed to take into careful consideration all the suggestions he has made here to-night, and I trust in view of that he will see his way clear to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Main motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Sifton the House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

Tuesday, April 30, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of Order in Council "Defence of Canada Order, 1917," entry in Canada of vessels carrying explosives in self-defence. —Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Copy of Order in Council instituting rank of Surgeon Probationer, R.N.C.V.R.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Report of the Commissioners appointed to investigate the businesses of the William Davies Co., Ltd., and Matthews-Blackwell, Limited.—Hon. Mr. Crothers.

Statement of the expenditure of the Dominion Publicity Committee in account with the Dominion Government and in connection with the Victory Loan, and report of Mr. A. E. Ames, chairman of the Dominion Executive Committee of the Canada Victory Loan, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

SENATE BILL.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways), Bill No. 70 (Letter A of the

Senate), to Consolidate and Amend the Railway Act, was read the first time.

THE WAR.

PROCEDURE UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT. — ANNOUNCEMENT BY MAJOR-GENERAL MEWBURN, MINISTER OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to make a statement in the House regarding the procedure that has been adopted by the Department of Militia and Defence regarding the obtaining of men for military service, in pursuance of Order in Council (P.C. 919), of the 20th April, 1918, and also, of Order in Council (P.C. 962), of the 20th April, 1918.

By paragraph five of the Order in Council first mentioned,—

> The Governor in Council may direct orders to report for duty to issue to men in any class under the Act of any named age or ages or who were born in named years or any named year or part of a year and any exemption theretofore granted to any man of any such named age or year of birth shall cease from and after noon of the day upon which he is ordered so to report, and no claim for exemption by or in respect of any man shall be entertained or considered after the issue to him of such order provided, however, that the minister may grant leave of absence without pay to any man by reason of the death, disablement or service of other members of the same family while on active service in any theatre of actual war.

After the most careful consideration, and having regard to the national interest, which must be the dominating factor today, it was considered that in pursuance of Order in Council (P.C. 919), those between the ages of 20 and 22 years both inclusive, should first be called out and an Order in Council was passed accordingly.

The age of every man by or on whose behalf exemption was claimed had to be given in the claim, hence the age given on the original registration is to be taken as conclusive evidence against the man of his age and year of birth.

Under the last-mentioned Order in Council the Military Service Registrars were instructed to notify all those registered within these ages to report for service, but to notify first the men coming from urban centres, so that men of these ages (20 to 22), who are on farms should not be called sooner than is absolutely necessary, and might thus have an opportunity of completing their seeding operations. Although no exemptions are given in this class it seemed reasonable that this opportunity should be given while the men from urban centres were being brought in.

The responsibility for securing men between the ages of 20 to 22 thus called out has been placed upon the Militia Department which has to assume the duty of apprehending any such men failing to report.

In regard to the men in class one, other than those between the ages of 20 and 22, the operation and administration of the Military Service Act is still controlled by the Military Service Council and all appeals still pending are being prosecuted to a completion.

The return shows the total number reporting under the Military Service Act, up to the 29th April, 1918, as 39,208 to be deducted from this are 2,063, who have gone to Imperial Units, such as Royal Air Force, leaving 37,145 recruits for the Canadian Expeditionary Force. This, of course, includes men of class one who have voluntarily reported.

Desertions.

According to the reports there were, on the 29th of April, 1918, some 7,096 men of Class 1 who had, so far, failed to report and who had not yet been apprehended. Every effort is being made to apprehend these men. The attention of the House should be called to the fact that these men are deserters and, therefore, lawbreakers, and as my Department is charged with their apprehension, I wish to inform the House that it is the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to carry out that duty, and for that purpose to use whatever measures may be found necessary.

Under the Order in Council (P.C. 919) the House will notice that there is only one ground for exemption, viz., "The Minister may grant leave of absence without pay to any man by reason of the death, disablement or service of other members of the same family while on active service in any theatre of actual war," and by the same Order in Council, the words "in any theatre of actual war," are defined as "not including the high seas or Great Britain, or Ireland."

It, therefore, became necessary for me to give definite instructions to district officers commanding for the purpose of defining the persons who should be granted leave of absence under this proviso. These instructions were promulgated in Routine Order No. 466 of the 20th April, 1918, wherein it is stated that the exemption extends to the only remaining son of military age. In any

such case the man so affected will, on reporting for duty, claim leave of absence on this ground to the officer commanding the unit to which he reported, whereupon the latter will give provisional leave of absence and the case will be forwarded to Militia Headquarters, by the officer commanding the district to be confirmed. It must be clearly understood that every man within the class so called out must report, and his claim for leave of absence will then be considered.

At this point I might explain, to clear up confusion which possibly exists, that all men in a class called out are, by the Military Service Act, deemed to be soldiers for the period of the war and demobilization thereafter, and that, if they do not come within the specially excepted classes under the Act, and have not been granted exemption by the tribunals the only method by which they can be relieved of military duty is to give them leave of absence without pay.

Every application for leave of absence on the ground of death, disablement or service of other members of the same family will be dealt with on its merits, the principle to be applied is as follows: If there are several sons, some of whom are serving in France—or in England, with the early prospect of being sent to France—and only one son of military age remains at home, such last-mentioned son is to be granted leave of absence. Cases may arise where there are two sons left at home, one of whom is of military age, and the other of whom will become of military age, say within six months. In such a case there will, at the expiration of six months, be two sons of military age remaining home, and in that event one of them will then be called upon to serve.

In calling out the classes above mentioned, it is realized that we chiefly require men of category "A." We are, therefore, only notifying men who, having already had a medical examination, are found to be in this category or who have not yet been medically examined. Every man, however, upon reporting for duty will immediately be medically examined, whether he has been examined previously or not, and those who fall within the categories lower than "A," will be given leave of absence until further orders."

It should be explained that men of category "B" in Class 1 under the Military Service Act are being generally warned to report for duty, but, as the number of such men presently required is not large, it is intended, for the present, to retain and utilize only those who did not claim exemption or whose exemptions were refused, and not to make use of men in category "B" between the ages of 20 and 22, unless and until their services become necessary.

Temporary Leave of Absence to Farmers and Farm Labourers, in Categories lower than "A."

Realizing the serious need of food production, we have endeavoured to meet this situation as far as possible, and it has been provided that any member of the C.E.F. in Canada, in category lower than "A" who can be spared from his military duties, may be granted leave of absence without pay. This can be done by the authority of the officer commanding the district on presentation of a certificate from the agricultural representative of the district that the man in question is an efficient farm labourer.

The so-called "Regulations" that were printed and distributed to the members of the House, are really extracts from our routine orders that are issued daily from headquarters, for the guidance of district officers commanding. It was considered that extracts from these orders would be useful to the members of the House.

No doubt members would like to know how many men will probably be obtained under these Orders in Council. As there is no complete registration in Canada, actual figures cannot be given, but as far as can be gathered from the lists of men who reported for service or claimed exemption under the Military Service Act, it would appear that there are in Canada between the ages of 20 and 22 inclusive, a total of about 70,000 men. From this number, however, two important deductions must be made,—

(1) A very considerable number who have not yet been medically examined, and
(2) A further considerable number who will, on re-examination, prove to be in categories lower than "A."

Previous experience shows that this latter class will represent a substantial proportion of the whole. Therefore, a conservative estimate, under all the circumstances, would appear to be about 35,000.

As the Order in Council of the 20th April, 1918, (P.C. 919), brings into Class 1 boys of nineteen and those who became twenty since the 13th October, 1917, a proclamation will issue calling on them to register. No date for calling up these men has yet been decided upon. It will, of course, depend on the exigencies of the military situation.

As already stated, the order in which exemptions affecting men of any named age or ages are to be cancelled, rests with the Governor in Council and, of course, before any additional years are selected the matter will be exhaustively considered from all points of view.

The broad principle upon which the Government has acted is that having in mind the urgency of the national peril, very few men, (a) unmarried or widowers without children, (b) between the ages of 20 and 22 and (c) in medical category "A" can really be regarded as indispensable to any business.

Some representations have been made with regard to the only son of a widow who is her sole support. This subject must be approached from two points of view:—(1) the national interest; (2) personal hardship. In the first place, it is conceded that the calling up of the only son of a widow necessarily brings sorrow to the mother, but it must be recognized that this sorrow comes to every mother who parts with her son. There are cases where the only son on the farm is between the ages of 20 and 22, and the widowed mother will suffer hardship if he is taken. The same considerations would apply to the only son of a widow who is living in the city and who, for example, is engaged in business and is supporting a mother, possibly sisters as well. There is also, the case of an only son supporting an invalid father, where equal hardship exists. From the standpoint of financial difficulties, it must not be overlooked that the widowed mother in such cases will be in receipt of,—

(a) Separation Allowance,
(b) Assigned Pay,
(c) Patriotic Fund Allowance.

Take for example, the case of a widow on a small farm. It may be that the farm cannot be operated to its fullest capacity without the son's assistance, but it can be operated to a sufficient extent to provide the living of those people residing on it, and against the loss of income from increased production, etc., must be set off the allowances above referred to.

Further, from the standpoint of the national interest, the diminution of production upon such small properties must be considered, under present circumstances as negligible.

The Government fully realize and most deeply regret that hardship and sorrow are entailed by every new application of the Military Service Act, but they hope the people will realize that those upon whom this stern duty falls have no alternative. Our forces at the front are likely to be attacked by overwhelming numbers at any time until the tremendous struggle which began on 21st March last shall have reached a conclusion. Our failure to support them with adequate reinforcements might lead to their decimation or destruction. It would be of little avail to increase production if that increase should be accompanied by such disaster at the front, that our products could not reach Great Britain or the Allied Nations beyond the seas. In that case we should have sown so that Germany might reap.

Moreover, the Government hopes that during the coming summer a more effective mobilization of the human energy of Canada may be effected, with the result that the crops sown during the spring may receive necessary attention during the summer and may be successfully harvested in the autumn.

Quebec Situation.

I have constantly stated, in the past, that I believed Quebec would do its duty, and I am happy to be able to report to the House many evidences of a marked change of feeling in that province. It is gratifying to note by the papers that Saint Mary's College and Laval University have granted leave of absence to all their students who come under the military law of this country, and have encouraged them to do their duty and it is hoped that this good example will considerably help matters.

Further, I have a report that the quotas from both the McGill and Laval Universities, for the new Tank Battalion, have been completed and more men are offering than can be accepted, for this unit.

There is very good evidence to show that many young men in the province of Quebec who have been exempted are now ready to come forward and serve, and it is realized where these men have had no former military experience, there is a certain amount of dread in the minds of their families as to their associations. Therefore, special efforts will be made to keep friends and associates together.

In view of the splendid spirit displayed by the universities and colleges, arrangements are being made to organize new units in connection with these institutions.

Of course, it must be realized that we are not sending any complete infantry battalions overseas, but representations have been made to the overseas authorities with a view to ensuring that the young men

who come from certain localities shall go to the same reserve unit in England to complete their training and finally to the same linked battalion at the Front; the object being, so far as possible, to ensure that these young men will serve under as congenial conditions as possible.

As far as I am personally concerned, every effort will be made to avoid all misunderstandings with a sincere desire to promote a better feeling between provinces in the Dominion of Canada. It seems to me that where the national interests are at stake, all provincial feelings should be eliminated, so that Canada may present a common front to the common enemy.

In conclusion, permit me to read the following extract from a speech made by Mr. Rudyard Kipling, at Folkestone, and published in the London Morning Post. The paragraph is headed—

If the Hun Wins.

If for any reason whatever we fall short of victory—and there is no half-way house between victory and defeat—what happens to us? This. Every relation, every understanding, every decency upon which civilization has been so anxiously built up will go—will be washed out, because it will have been proved unable to endure. The whole idea of democracy—which at bottom is what the Hun fights against—will be dismissed from men's minds, because it will have been shown incapable of maintaining itself against the Hun. It will die; and it will die discredited, together with every belief and practice that is based on it. The Hun ideal, the Hun's root-notions of life will take its place throughout the world. Under that dispensation man will become once more the natural prey, body and goods, of his better-armed neighbour. Women will be the mere instrument for continuing the breed; the vassal of man's lust and man's cruelty; and labour will become a thing to be knocked on the head if it dares to give trouble, and worked to death if it does not. And from this order of life there will be no appeal, no possibility of any escape. This is what the Hun means when he says he intends to impose German kultur—which is the German religion—upon the world. This is precisely what the world has banded itself together to resist. (Cheers.) It will take every ounce in us; it will try us out to the naked soul. Our trial will not be made less by the earnest advice and suggestions that we should accept some sort of compromise, which means defeat, put forward by Hun agents and confederates among us. (Hear, hear.) They are busy in that direction already. But be sure of this: Nothing—nothing we may have to endure now will weigh one featherweight compared with what we shall most certainly have to suffer if for any cause we fail of victory.

Mr. W. F. McLEAN (South York): Will members of the House be able to get this afternoon copies of the official statement which the minister has just read, so that they can forward those copies to their constituents as answers to questions they have received? Many hon. members would very much appreciate it if that could be done.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall endeavour to have the statement printed at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, by your leave, may I make another suggestion to the minister? In the regulations it is provided that any member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Canada in categories lower than A, who can be temporarily spared from his military duty, may be granted leave of absence without pay on the authority of the commanding officer of the district, on production of a certificate from the agricultural representative. If the minister would supplement the statement which he has made to-day with a list of both the commanding officers and the agricultural representatives in every district, the matter of giving information in reply to questions could be greatly facilitated. I am satisfied that all the members of the House are in receipt of letters asking for information as to how men should apply for leave of absence. If an hon. member can say: Apply to Mr. So and So in your district, and if he can give the name of both the commanding officer and the agricultural representative, he would be able to get the information much more quickly.

Major-General MEWBURN: In reference to the Order in Council, I have practically completed arrangements in every military district throughout Canada as to those men (20 to 22 inclusive) who are to report. I realize that it will mean more or less of a hardship for a man to come from the country into the city to report, but we must have some evidence that a man is within a category lower than "A." All the man has to do is to appear at the Depot Battalion to which he has been ordered to report, when he will be medically examined, and if his medical examination places him in a category lower than "A," he will at once be given leave of absence. We thought the simplest way to do, so as not to put men to undue trouble was to have a representative of the Department of Agriculture in each district to verify applications of men who claim to be farmers or efficient farm labourers. These agricultural representatives will certify that such and such a man is an efficient farm labourer and on his certificate the man will, at once, be given leave of absence. It might facilitate matters if fuller information were given to the public.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I wish to thank the Minister of Militia and Defence for the kind words he has spoken in regard to the young men of Quebec, especially the Laval College men and St. Mary's College men. As I informed the minister yesterday, I met several of the young men who joined the Tank Unit in Ottawa and I think I can safely say that if the minister would follow up the idea of having units in which young men could keep their associations as much as possible, he could easily raise at once in the city of Quebec alone a complete Tank Unit. I have this from several of the young men who have joined that unit.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is exceeding his privilege.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): While I was at my home over the week end, I met two farmers whose sons had been exempted, but their exemptions are now cancelled as a result of the new regulations. At the same time they are receiving notices to appear before the Central Appeal Judge; the judgments granting them exemption having been appealed from. As late as Friday last, some of these men have received notices to appear before the Central Appeal Judge on the first of May. Is that a mistake, and have these young men anything to gain or lose by appearing or failing to appear before the Central Appeal Judge?

Major-General MEWBURN: Were those men other than the ages of twenty to twenty-two?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Major-General MEWBURN: The exemptions have been cancelled only of the men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two both inclusive. All men of the ages other than those mentioned can still continue to prosecute their appeals under the regulations of the Military Service Act.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: But these are men of twenty-one and twenty-two years of age.

Major-General MEWBURN: I cannot understand why any such notices should have been sent out, because the registrars had from the Military Service Council a distinct notification to inform all men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two, both inclusive, that their exemptions were cancelled, and I requested that the men in the urban centres should be called first. Some mistake must have been made. I shall have the matter looked into at once.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains): In the statement which has just been made by the minister, I do not find any mention of farmers who were proprietors of farms before the proclamation was issued in October last, and who are now twenty-one or twenty-two years of age. Supposing a young man of twenty-two years of age is a proprietor of a farm and a farmer himself; supposing he has 150 acres and a large stock and he is alone on the farm, is he bound, as coming under the regulations now in force? He is a bona fide farmer. What action should he take?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is going to an inordinate length to ask a question.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): We all know that there are some 60,000 exemptions claimed in the province of Quebec. We know that the exemptions of men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two are all wiped out. That settles that question. Did the minister state how many of those exemptions have now come before the tribunals and how they were disposed of? How many cases have come before the Central Appeal Judge and how many exemptions are there now?

Major-General MEWBURN: The figures I gave which I obtained from the Military Service Council were an estimate of the number of men of the ages of twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two to whom exemptions had been granted on account of the result of the medical examinations or their position, and it was estimated in that way there were about 70,000 men available. Many of those men have not been medically examined and the figures are only an estimate. I have not the other figures.

Mr. CURRIE: The matter is very important. Cannot the minister bring the information down to-morrow?

Major-General MEWBURN: In reply to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier). Many cases of hardship have already been brought to my notice. In the meantime, the only thing to be done is for the young man to report to the Officer Commanding the Depot Battalion, and state his case there. There should be no difficulty in his getting a sufficient leave of absence to enable him to wind up his business.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY: Would the Minister say how soon Class "A" men in the rural districts will be called?

Major-General MEWBURN: I cannot give a definite reply as that matter is left largely to the registrars. We have simply requested that the men in rural districts should not be called until the corresponding classes in the cities have been exhausted.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle): In the case of a boy of twenty or twenty-two with a widowed mother to support, is there any possible chance of his being exempted?

Mr. SPEAKER: That case has already been dealt with in the statement of the Minister of Militia and Defence. I must remind the House we are not in committee and hon. gentlemen are going far beyond the latitude allowed on the Orders of the Day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will look at the minister's statement to-morrow he will see a full reply to the question he has just asked.

Mr. FORTIER: I had not finished my question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we can with profit adjourn the discussion to another day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do you rule, Sir, that the hon. gentleman cannot put his question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman will see that if every hon. member were to exercise the right of asking a question upon the Orders of the Day we should be here until six o'clock without advancing the business of the House. That would be carrying the privilege beyond reasonable bounds.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Has not every hon. member of this House exactly the same rights as the Minister of Militia has?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has long been the custom for a minister when desiring to do so to make a pronouncement upon an important public matter on the Orders of the Day being called, just as has been done by the Minister of Militia and Defence to-day. It is quite proper for hon. members to address questions to the Government on matters of policy but it is not proper that they should enter into what is in effect a discussion when there is no subject before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think the hon. member is entitled to put his question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member not to be unduly long in putting his question.

Mr. FORTIER: Is there any possibility of having exemption granted in the case of a young man of twenty or twenty-two who is the sole support of a widowed mother with a family of young children? If there is no provision for his exemption have the Government considered taking over the farm in such a case rather than allowing it to lie idle?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is no power vested in me to do that.

Mr. T. H. THOMPSON (East Hastings): The minister has said that the men in the rural districts will not be called out until after the men in the cities have been ordered to report but I understand that many young men in rural districts have been ordered to report on the 1st of May.

Major-General MEWBURN: I did not say that we were not going to call out the men in the rural districts I said a request had been made to the registrars under the Military Service Act that the notices ordering men between twenty and twenty-two years of age inclusive to report be first sent to men in the urban districts. I might say that many men living on farms gave their city address to the registrar when registering. A man living ninety miles from Montreal came in to see me to-day and said his boy had received notice to report, but that it was his own mistake because in registering he had given his residence as Montreal; the mistake is being rectified by the registrar. We are not granting exemption to the men in the rural districts but we are simply doing what I think is fair and reasonable, namely, calling out the men in the urban centres first. It will take some time to deal with those classes, before the men in the rural districts are called.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): May I ask to what the Minister of Militia attributes the better feeling in the province of Quebec?

Mr. BUREAU: Always true to the Orange Sentinel!

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not such a question as can properly be put on the Orders of the Day.

THE BUDGET.

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT BY THE ACTING MINISTER OF FINANCE.—WAR TAXATION; CHANGES IN TARIFF.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in presenting to-day the annual statement of the financial affairs of the country I deem it but fitting and proper that at the outset I should give expression to what I believe is the profound and sincere regret of Parliament, that Sir Thomas White, the Minister of Finance, was unable to deliver the annual budget by reason of an enforced and lengthy absence from official duties. Regardless of party distinctions, and the inevitable differences of opinion that must prevail regarding the administration of the financial affairs of the country, I am sure that honourable gentlemen will heartily concur in the observation, that the highly important duties attaching to the Department of Finance, so abnormal in their magnitude and exacting in their detail during the war period, have been discharged by Sir Thomas White with distinction and with conspicuous ability. To his task he has applied great energy and industry, and in his labours he has been solely animated by the high motive of rendering faithful and unselfish service to the State. I am confident the House will join with me in expressing gratification upon the fact that he has so far recovered his health that he proposes an early return to Canada to resume his official duties, after disposing of some public business now engaging his attention in the United States.

REVENUE.

The revenue for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918, will, when the accounts are finally closed, reach $258,000,000, exceeding the revenue of the preceding year by $26,000,000, and that of the first year of the war by $125,000,000. Of the total amount of $258,000,000, Customs will yield $146,000,000 and Excise $27,000,000. From the various taxations apart from Customs and Excise, we shall have received nearly $25,000,000. The several sources from which this revenue was derived, and the amounts, might be of interest to the House. For the past fiscal year they are as follows: Business profits war tax, $21,271,283; banks, $836,724.28; insurance companies, $385,127.68; trust and loan companies, $267,917.68; Inland Revenue from railways, steamships, telegraph and cable companies, stamps, etc., $2,229,922.81; a total of $24,990,975.45.

EXPENDITURE.

Coming to our ordinary expenditure and taking cognizance only of expenditures for civil government, and disregarding all outlays on account of war, the expenditure for the fiscal year 1917-18 is estimated at

$173,000,000. The total expenditure of $173,000,000 includes payment of interest, estimated at $45,000,000, and pensions of some $7,000,000, or $52,000,000 altogether; whereas prior to the war the outlay on interest was but $12,000,000, and of course the expenditure for pensions on account of the war had not yet begun. It is also inclusive of the sums of $25,000,000 and $7,500,000 voted and advanced on account of the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway respectively. For the capital outlays beyond the ordinary current expenditure of $173,000,000 an expenditure of $30,000,000 is estimated. These two items of expenditure amount to $203,000,000, and represent the outlay of Canada for all purposes apart from war during the past year.

With a total revenue of $258,000,000, and an ordinary and capital expenditure of $203,000,000, it will be seen that during the fiscal year 1917-18 the Government was able to meet all ordinary and capital outlays, including an increased amount for interest account and pensions over the previous year of nearly $15,000,000, and have a favourable balance of about $55,000,000 to be applied to war expenditures.

FISCAL YEAR 1918-19.

The main estimates for 1918-19 have been submitted to the House, and supplementary Estimates will be presented later. Apart from the increased interest caused by our war borrowing, and the amount required for pensions, also arising out of the war, substantial reductions have been made in the estimates of practically all the services, and I anticipate that actual expenditure will be well below the amounts voted. These reductions, however, are more than offset by the additional sums needed for interest and pensions for the current year over the past year, and which excess I estimate at $25,000,000, so that ordinary expenditure for 1918-19 will increase materially over that of the previous year. Outside of interest and pension account, ordinary expenditures should not exceed those of last year. Substantial disbursements this year will be necessary in connection with the soldiers' land settlement programme, and a substantial liability has been assumed for the year in connection with the Halifax disaster. The capital expenditure vote has been materially cut. It is estimated that for the fiscal year 1918-19 we shall be able to pay our ordinary and capital expenditure out of our revenue and have, as in the past two years, an appreciable sum over, which we can apply to war

purposes. The unexpended balance of the Victory Loan will finance our war expenditures and advances to the Imperial Government until July next, when Treasury bills will be temporarily negotiated, until the proceeds of the next public loan are available.

WAR EXPENDITURES.

Canada is now in the fourth year of the war. Our expenditure on war account for the year 1917-18 will approximate $345,000,000, of which amount $167,000,000 was expended in Canada, the balance, $178,000,000, represents our war expenditure overseas. Up to March 31, 1917, we had expended for war purposes $533,437,036.11, so that on March 31, 1918, our total outlay for war will be approximately $878,000,000. This amount includes all expenditures in Canada, Great Britain and France, and is also inclusive of the upkeep of our troops overseas. The amount does not, however, include any pay due but not yet paid to the troops overseas. During the past two fiscal years we have applied to war expenditure surpluses of revenue over ordinary and capital outlays the sum of $113,000,000, and our interest and pension payments attributable to war and covering the entire war period would approximate about $75,000,000.

NET DEBT.

The net debt of Canada, which before the war stood at about $336,000,000 has now passed the billion-dollar mark, and it is estimated that when the accounts for the year 1917-18 are closed it will reach, approximately, $1,200,000,000. The increase is almost entirely attributable to war expenditures. To provide funds for our war necessities, apart from the amounts we were able to spare from the ordinary revenues of the country, we have had recourse to public loans, and from time to time to temporary loans from our banks, which were subsequently liquidated from the proceeds of loans.

TRADE.

The statistics of our trade indicate that our exports, year by year as the war progresses, are showing a greater and greater increase over our imports. The year before the war the imports exceeded the exports by nearly $300,000,000. In 1917-18 this condition had been so completely reversed that the exports exceeded the imports by almost $625,000,000, and our total trade, which passed the billion mark in 1913, exceeded the two and a half billion mark in 1918.

It must be borne in mind, however, that this increase in our total trade is very largely attributable to war conditions, and as well the very favourable trade balance. It might be informing to the House to briefly state that in 1917-18 our exports to Great Britain were about $860,000,000, while our imports amounted to $81,000,000. Our exports to the United States reached the sum of $440,000,000, while our imports were $790,000,000.

IMMIGRATION.

The general impression I fear prevails that we have had practically no immigration into Canada since the beginning of the war. While of course it is proportionately much less than in years just prior to the war, still it is not a negligible quantity. In 1915-16 our immigration was 48,537; in 1916-17 it was 75,374, and in 1917-18, 79,074; a total of 202,985 in the past three fiscal years. Of this total number 169,640 came from the United States and 20,124 from the British Isles. An important fact in connection with this immigration is that it comprised a large proportion of agriculturalists. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization informs me that everything clearly indicates a very large immigration into Canada, commencing shortly after the conclusion of the war and so soon as transportation facilities are available. A factor to be kept prominently in mind is that the employment of women and girls in occupations heretofore filled by men will continue in all the belligerent countries for many years at least, thus limiting the avenues of employment ordinarily open to men, and leaving a surplus for emigration, notwithstanding the heavy toll upon life exacted by the war.

EXCHANGE.

Owing to the inability of Great Britain to settle in the usual way her trade balances, and to which I propose referring later, we are experiencing an acute exchange problem in Canada. During the past few months a very high rate has prevailed on remittances of funds to the United States, which has imposed a severe tax upon importers and the public, and, if it continues, must diminish imports or add to their cost. This high rate is due to the fact that we have to remit more to, than we receive from, the United States, and consequently the demand for United States funds is greater than the supply. Were we

able to sell securities in the United States the rates of exchange might easily have been adjusted or normalized, but Canadians were not permitted to do so. The Government did not require during the present year to borrow in the United States, even if we had been permitted, and consequently by such an operation it was not convenient or practical to correct the exchange.

To redress the adverse rate of exchange with the United States, we must lessen our imports from that country, or the United States must buy more from us, or we must sell securities in the United States to the extent of a very substantial proportion of our adverse trade balance. Other considerations, however, are involved in this matter, to which I shall refer later, but I might be permitted to say that the Government has been diligent in its endeavours to bring about such financial arrangements with the Governments of Great Britain and the United States as would materially relieve our people of the burden of the present high rates of exchange. I hope that very shortly we shall be in a position to announce the successful conclusion of negotiations which have in view this end. In connection with the exchange problem it might be of interest to state that for the first three months of this calendar year our imports from the United States have decreased below that of the corresponding period of last year by over $36,000,000, while our exports have increased in the same comparative period by about $20,000,000.

THE VICTORY LOAN.

The unqualified success attending the Victory Loan of last year, as well of previous domestic loans, is of such notable importance and significance that it calls for more than a passing reference. The large investment made by our citizens in the securities issued by the Government from time to time since the beginning of the war is a matter of natural pride to all Canadians. Since December 1, 1915, domestic war loan issues aggregating $746,000,000 have been made, and of which over $700,000,000 was subscribed for by Canadians, a very tangible evidence of the productive powers of our people, their determination to sustain our army and our commerce by loans to the State, and their faith in the ability of Canada to honour in the future the financial obligations now so honourably incurred. That Canada possessed such a purchasing power it is needless for me to say was hardly entertained by any person, even the most optimistic.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Last November the fourth war loan was placed upon the market in Canada. In the case of the three previous loans, for their successful flotation, the Government of the time relied upon newspaper advertising methods alone to secure the required subscriptions, and no extensively organized campaign was deemed necessary. In the case of the last loan, however, it was felt that more vigorous methods should be adopted in order that a wider response to the appeal should be received from all classes of our population, so that the absorption of the loan would be rapid and that by spreading the holdings over as many people as possible, the subscribers would be more strongly protected so far as the market price was concerned.

The Minister of Finance, with the co-operation of some of the most active of the business men of the Dominion, organized a central committee called the Dominion Executive of the Victory Loan Campaign, which in turn organized associated committees in every province. These again created committees in various counties, cities and towns. By addresses, advertisement and canvass, by the united efforts of all these countrywide organizations, the results far exceeded the expectations even of those best qualified to anticipate the result of an appeal of this character. The bonds were of five, ten and twenty year maturities. The prospectus called for an amount of $150,000,000, but the loan was an open one and the right was reserved to exceed subscriptions above this amount. In response to the appeal, subscriptions to the amount of $408,000,000 from approximately 600,000 subscribers, a subscription from about one in every nine of our population, a subscription of over $58 per capita, was received. This was slightly better than the results of the Liberty Loan of 1917 in the United States, where some 9,400,000 subscriptions were received, or about one in more than eleven. The subscriptions in the four western provinces were particularly gratifying, and indicate in these new provinces remarkable accumulation of wealth, which fact is pleasing to the older sections of the Dominion. The Victory Loan Committee state the subscriptions of Alberta amounted to $16,515,150; British Columbia, $18,814,700; Saskatchewan, $21,777,050; and Manitoba, $32,326,600. Opportunity was given to the overseas forces to subscribe, and we received over $1,500,000 from soldiers who cashed in their faith in their fight and country.

The total subscription was cut down to an allotment of $398,000,000 of new money, not counting holdings of previous war loans which were convertible and were converted into Victory Loan Bonds to the amount of over $150,000,000. When all the charges are computed and paid, the cost of the loan will approximate 1¼ per cent, which is comparatively small in such a large operation and extending over so wide an area. The banks received ½ of 1 per cent as remuneration for their services and to compensate them for the labour entailed in all their branches in taking the subscriptions; issuing temporary receipts; delivery of the scrip; receiving the five instalments from January to May; transmitting the cash to the Department of Finance; in delivering the bonds to subscribers in exchange for scrip; in paying at par all over Canada the coupons and interest cheques during the whole period covered by the loan.

The probable subscribers of the larger amounts were solicited by the agency of a special committee and upon these subscriptions no commission was paid. The local canvassers received ½ of one per cent on all subscriptions received by them to compensate them for their time and labour; and finally, the bond dealers and brokers who co-operated most heartily and energetically in the work and who placed the services of themselves and their several staffs at the disposal of the committee were to be allowed such remuneration as was deemed reasonable by the Minister of Finance. It is estimated that the total charges will amount approximately to $5,000,000, or about 1¼ per cent. When the issuing charges for all our other previous loans are considered, it will be found that this may be regarded as exceedingly reasonable.

I wish to acknowledge on behalf of the Minister of Finance and the Government his and their thanks and appreciation of the splendid and patriotic services of all the committees and workers whose efforts in a noble cause proved so successful; to the press, also, and to the public spirited citizens who, in an honorary capacity, gave valuable assistance in this great campaign, I desire to publicly and gratefully acknowledge their valuable services. Preparations for the next Victory Loan have already commenced, and the Government have also under advisement the matter of the sale of War Savings Stamps, a borrowing scheme very successfully employed in the United States.

FINANCING WAR AND TRADE.

There is a very direct connection not only between our domestic loans and the financing of our war operations, but also with our productions and our overseas export trade, and I think the matter well worthy of some consideration. Fundamentally trade is the exchange of products, and payment of the purchases of goods abroad must be made by the sale of goods or securities abroad. With us, gold is not a factor in international trade. All are acquainted with the fact that the war has disturbed the natural currents of trade rendering impossible the settlement of international trading accounts in the usual manner. Prior to the war, Canada had a favourable trade balance with Great Britain through the sale of her products and securities in that country, while we have always had an unfavourable trade balance in the United States. We settled the latter in London out of our available credits there, which was of course convenient to the United States because that country always had payments to meet there.

The later stages of the war, however, have materially altered Great Britain's position, and circumstances have compelled her to purchase heavily of war supplies and foodstuffs on this side of the Atlantic, while her exports have been diminishing. She has thus become chiefly a purchasing nation, and is no longer a loaning but a borrowing country. In 1917-18 we had as a matter of fact a favourable merchandise trade balance with Great Britain of about $790,000,000 while with the United States it was unfavourable to the extent of $350,000,000. Normally, we would settle our unfavourable American trade balance with the moneys receivable from Great Britain for her liberal purchases of our high priced commodities. However, owing to the enormous purchases Great Britain was obliged to make for herself and some of her allies, and so great had been the drain upon her liquid resources in the first three years of the war, that in July, 1917, she was obliged to secure loans or dollar credits for her Canadian purchases, otherwise, she would be obliged to practically cease purchasing here. In that event, commercial disaster would have overtaken us and we would have had difficulty in financing our war expenditures. It was therefore important that immediate action be taken to meet this new condition of affairs. In order that our industries and our artisans might be employed, that our agriculturists be afforded an export market and encouraged to pro-

duce, and that all our people might be paid for their exportable productions, which was of course of vital importance to all classes of our people, arrangements were consummated in midsummer last year whereby the Government of Canada agreed to make advances to Great Britain at the rate of $25,000,000 per month in order that she might purchase in Canada such of our products as she needed and which we had to sell. In fact, advances for cheese and meat products in excess of the agreement were made last year. In addition, and for the same purpose, the Canadian banks agreed to make advances to the British Government, and altogether up to this date have advanced $200,000,000 on the security of Imperial Treasury Bills. Further, the Government of the United States last year agreed to establish credits for British purchases in Canada. These arrangements are still effective and are likely to continue throughout the year. In a word, the Government of Canada and the Canadian banks have been granting credits for Great Britain's purchases in Canada in substantial amounts since midsummer of 1917, otherwise, our overseas trade would have been seriously handicapped. I must point out, however, that while the Government has thus been making advances to assist in the payment of British purchases in Canada, Great Britain has been paying for Canada the upkeep of her troops in Great Britain and France, and sundry Government accounts. These payments by the Imperial Government for Canada have been to date $100,000,000 less than the payments made for Great Britain by the Canadian Government, and there is that amount to our credit in this open account to-day.

That is strictly the Government's financial position in respect to war and trade for this year. It might be interesting to consider the economic position of the people outside of the Government. The exact position of the people of the country, apart from the Government, is surrounded with additional difficulties. They must meet an adverse balance of merchandise trade with the United States and also the principal and interest of maturities there. They must as well pay for imports from Great Britain, which last year amounted to $81,000,000, notwithstanding we are the creditor country, and they must pay the interest owed by our people to people in Great Britain, and which amounts to about $135,000,000 annually. The combined commitments of the Government and the people are, therefore, abnormal and substantial by reason of the conditions I have outlined.

Relatively, our position during the whole of the last fiscal year was less onerous than it is at present. In the early part of 1917 Great Britain was able to pay for some of her purchases, and, in addition, Canada was permitted to borrow money from the United States to the extent of $185,000,000, which assisted in reducing our adverse balance with that country. In 1918, as far as one knows at present, we are prohibited from selling securities of any kind in the United States, and to that extent we are at a disadvantage this year in the settlement of our American purchases, and, of course, Great Britain is unable to pay directly for any portion of her Canadian purchases.

The experience of all nations during the war teaches us that all problems change as we approach them. We may yet, during the present year, be permitted to sell in a restricted way securities in the United States. The United States may buy more from us during this year on account of war and other purposes than she did last year. I believe she will. We may, during the year, and should, as a people, buy less of the United States of non-essential articles. Great Britain may arrange with us to pay in pounds sterling for what merchandise our people buy from her, and what Canadians owe her people for interest, the Government collecting here under suitable arrangements the interest and merchandise accounts due the people of Great Britain by our people, and with it buying additional Canadian products and shipping them overseas. At any rate, there, in rough outline, is the problem of the Canadian people to-day in carrying on our part of the war, and in part our trade and commerce, and making possible the productions and activities of the manufacturer, farmer, fisherman and lumberman, and such in part is the method employed in bringing about that end.

With these facts before the House, it might be interesting to consider what directly and indirectly are the commitments of the Government for this year. Approximately we must provide:

For Civil Budget	$230,000,000	
For War Expenditure	425,000,000	
For advances to the Imperial Government for financing in part our export trade with Great Britain	325,000,000	
In all	$980,000,000	$980,000,000

To discharge this there will be:

Revenue..	$270,000,000	
Advances by Great Britain to pay for maintenance of Canadian troops overseas, about.. ..	300,000,000	
Unexpended balance of Victory Loan, as of March 31, 1918.	130,000,000	
	$700,000,000	$700,000,000
leaving a probable balance for 1918-19 of..		$280,000,000

to be provided from loans in Canada or elsewhere if possible. This is not inclusive of our commitments for expenditure on account of the purchase of railway equipment and Canadian Northern Railway maturities. The latter we hope to extend upon small payments of principal under powers which we are asking of Parliament this year, and the railway equipment, it is expected, will be financed largely by the issue and sale of equipment securities. The figures which I have given are probably not exhaustive of either income or outgo; I merely wished to show by a few figures, approximately only, the dimensions of the Budget of this country.

I have detained the House perhaps at too great a length in a statement as to ho our war and in part our trade is financed. I wanted to make clear that if we are to continue our part in the war, and maintain our overseas trade at its present dimensions, the people of Canada must loan to the Government the money to accomplish that end. That is, they must, year after year, purchase Victory Bonds. There is no other way of accomplishing it. It cannot be obtained elsewhere. We must rely on our own capital and labour, so far as one can see, to carry on our present war and trade programme. I cannot too strongly state the imperative necessity of the Government borrowing from our own people, and the imperative duty of our people to loan to the Government. No person can too strongly impress this view upon our country. This obligation rests upon all classes and upon every citizen. To enable our people to do this, it is necessary that they continue to produce wealth. The production of wealth means an excess of production above our own wants. We must continue to produce, and if possible in greater quantities, by a more effective mobilization and utilization of our man and woman power, notwithstanding the fresh requirements of our army for man-power, and the many other difficulties confronting us. And we must economize in every way. Primarily, saving is not a question of money. It is rather a question of saving the things that money will buy. The less we consume of that which we produce the greater the surplus we shall have to sell abroad. The more we save of our productions and of our services the better able shall we be to meet our increasing taxation, and the greater the power of our people to purchase Government bonds. Of our imports from the United States, there is a great volume of non-essential commodities, and luxuries. If we all ceased to buy of these, our adverse trade balance with the United States would be partially redressed, the cost of remittances for our essential imports from the United States would be less, the cost of these essentials would be that much less to our importers and consumers, and a greater surplus would be available for payment of taxation and loans to the Government. We must learn to dispense with luxuries, and possibly with some of the things which we have hitherto regarded as necessities. In order to reduce this class of imports, it may become necessary to control the same by the licensing system. I am merely pointing out that which should be the aim and the purpose of the state and its citizens and which becomes more clear as the war is prolonged. I do not think it can be justly said that the Canadian people have altogether failed in this respect, notwithstanding the many temptations which a war prosperity has brought to us. An investment of over $700,000,000 in Canadian Government securities by Canadians is indisputable evidence of production and thrift, but better still, a token of stability, law and order in the days to come. The increase in our bank deposits is likewise an evidence of economy on the part of our people. I feel I am not subjecting myself to sound criticism when I say we can do better, and in very fact we must. In other respects are our people to be commended. In our expanding trade and commerce one might well have looked for a period of speculation that would have later spelled disaster, but there has been no speculation in lands or stocks, municipalities have curtailed expenditures as they all should do, building operations have been restricted to our wants, our financial institutions occupy a strong position, our currency is upon a sound basis, and the expansion of our industries can hardly be said to be unsound.

TAXATION.

I now approach a consideration of the matter of taxation. It is the function of Government to secure from the people, from time to time, such revenue as will meet ordinary expenditure and as much more as necessity and wisdom dictate. It will always, I presume, be a debatable question what portion of war expenditures should be paid from current taxation, but any principle is subject to variation according to the period over which the war is prolonged, the volume of expenditure, and the population and resources of a country. Again, inevitably there must be wide differences of opinion as to the form and degree of taxation that shall prevail. One might safely say that no system of taxation should be in force which has a repressive effect on production and trade, or as some one has said, no tax should paralyse industry of any kind, hamper enterprise, or breed discontent among our people, but that none should be avoided which are essential to provide the revenue required and that will distribute the incidence of taxation as equitably as conditions and experience dictate. Again, it is claimed and with considerable force that excessive taxation will deplete the source for investment in Government War Bonds which we must possess. It is comparatively easy to enunciate such principles as applicable to taxation, but in the trying circumstances and conditions which confront us it is a difficult task to provide any general scheme of taxation which shall completely fall within the rules I have just outlined. We are confronted by conditions, not theories. Many accepted economic principles of trade and taxation are by force of conditions impossible of application to-day. It is further to be observed about taxation that whether you increase or decrease any taxation it is becoming exceedingly difficult to determine whether the purposes of revenue shall be accomplished or not. With the limitations and restrictions in export and import trade, and even upon production, throughout the entire world; with embargoes, licenses and fixation of prices; with the transportation agencies of most countries largely under governmental control, and subject to traffic priorities; with increasing production costs, increasing wages, and contracting labour markets; with the tremendous demand for raw materials for war purposes, and with problems of exchange, one would be bold indeed to prophesy the course of the currents of our trade and commerce from day to day, or the net results and effects of any taxation proposals.

For the reasons which I have just stated, and others, I should not be surprised to find at the end of the fiscal year a considerable reduction in revenue from Customs and Excise as compared with the last year and upon the present rates. The prohibition of the importation of spirits and beer during the war will alone entail an annual loss to revenue of over $15,000,000. With increasing interest and pension charges, due to war, we must, of necessity, from time to time impose fresh taxation to supplement our revenues.

Since Parliament last met and during the recess two taxation measures were enacted by Order in Council. These relate to the Canadian Pacific railway and to the meat-packing and cold-storage industry. Copies of these Orders in Council have been laid upon the table of the House, but I might be permitted, in fact it is perhaps my duty, to state to the House the effect of these taxation measures.

By an Order in Council, which is effective during the war from January 1, 1918, we shall receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway one-half of the net earnings of that company from its railway operations after payment of fixed charges and dividends, and as well the income tax on the company's special income received from sources outside of railway earnings. It is further provided that the total amount to be paid each year shall not be less than the amount which the net earnings exceed the earnings for the year ending December 31, 1917, due to the increase in freight and passenger rates granted by the Order in Council of December 26, 1917, and further, it shall not be less than the company's net earnings in any year from railway operations, in excess of ten per cent on its common stock up to $7,000,000. We estimate a revenue of $7,000,000 and possibly more from this source this year. In respect of the Order in Council relating to the packing industry, it is provided that the packers shall retain in addition to 7 per cent per annum upon the invested capital one-half of any excess up to fifteen per cent, the balance being payable to the Receiver General. The revenue to be derived from this source, is of course dependable on the volume of business carried on during the year by the industry and the profit, which is hardly capable of estimate at the moment.

Mr. MURPHY: That Order in Council was not retroactive?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think that Order in Council was retroactive.

The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, is not applicable to this calendar year unless clause three of the Act is revived, which we propose doing. From this tax we received of revenue $12,506,516 the first year, and $21,271,283 the second year. For the third accounting period of 1917, the returns are only receivable on or before the first of July, 1918. A safe estimate of revenue for that period is $25,000,000, which if realized will make a total of $58,771,799 received from the Business Profits War Tax for the three accounting periods. It is proposed to amend clause five of the Act, which limits the business to be taxed to those employing capital to the amount of $50,000 and over. The amendment will provide that businesses employing capital of $25,000 and up to $50,000 shall be subject to taxation, but at a lower rate. The rate of taxation shall be twenty-five per cent of the amount by which the profits exceed ten per cent, the rate being applicable alike to incorporated companies and any other business employing the stated amounts of capital.

Important amendments to the Income Tax Act are proposed. The exemption in the case of unmarried persons is to be reduced from $1,500 to $1,000 and for married persons from $3,000 to $2,000, the rate to be two per cent from $1,000 and up to $1,500 in the case of unmarried persons and widows, or widowers without dependent children, and two per cent from $2,000 and up to $3,000 in the case of all other persons.

The present super tax is to be continued as at present up to incomes of $50,000, at which point a new classification and rate is proposed, and which is as follows: From $50,000 and up to $75,000, fifteen per cent; from $75,000 and up to $100,000, twenty per cent; from $100,000 and up to $200,000, twenty-five per cent; from $200,000 and up to $400,000, thirty per cent; from $400,000 and up to $600,000, thirty-five per cent; from $600,000 and up to $800,000, forty per cent; from $800,000 and up to $1,000,000, forty-five per cent; and all over $1,000,000, fifty per cent.

In addition to the normal tax and supertax, it is proposed during the war to enact a war surtax assessable up to and inclusive of the calendar year in which the war ends, upon the tax payable, as follows: On incomes from $6,000 to $10,000, five per cent; on incomes in excess of $10,000 and not exceeding $100,000, ten per cent; on incomes in excess of $100,000 and not exceeding $200,000, fifteen per cent, and upon all incomes in excess of $200,000, thirty-five per cent.

At the last session of Parliament the Minister of Finance was strongly urged to provide an exemption for each child in the family of a married person liable under the Income Tax Act. During the recess and before he left Ottawa in January last, he had given careful consideration to these representations, and he concluded that some exemption in such cases should be made. Accordingly, an amendment to the Act is to be submitted providing for an exemption of $200 for each child under the age of sixteen years. This amendment is not retroactive, and is not applicable to the Income tax payable for the year 1917.

The Corporation Income Tax, now four per cent, is to be increased to six per cent. Other minor amendments are proposed, but I need not detain the House with them at this time.

The computation of the Income tax is difficult, and in order that the House may clearly understand the effect of the proposed amendments, I shall illustrate the same by a statement showing the present and proposed tax payable in the case of a married person. The first figure I shall read shall be the income, next the present taxation, and lastly the proposed taxation.

Income.	Married Persons. Present Tax.	Married Persons. Proposed Tax.
3,000	Nil	20
6,000	120	140
10,000	360	392
20,000	1,260	1,382
30,000	2,460	2,702
50,000	5,260	5,782
75,000	10,010	11,007
100,000	14,760	17,607
200,000	43,760	50,957
400,000	101,760	142,757
500,000	130,760	195,407
600,000	159,760	248,057
800,000	217,760	366,857
1,000,000	275,760	499,157
2,000,000	565,760	1,228,157

We propose to increase the excise duties payable on manufactured tobacco from 10 cents to 20 cents per pound; on cigars from $3 to $6 per thousand; on cigarettes from $3 to $6 per thousand; on foreign raw leaf tobacco from 28 cents to 40 cents per pound; on foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, from 42 cents to 60 cents per pound. We also propose to establish an excise duty of 5 cents per pound on raw leaf tobacco grown in Canada, allowing the Canadian grower a sufficient quantity for his own use without payment of duty thereon.

We also deem it expedient to place a Customs tax of ten cents per pound upon tea. The importations of tea for consumption in Canada amount to about thirty million pounds per year, a per capita consumption of a little more than four pounds per annum. An excise duty of 10 cents per pound shall also be imposed on all tea held by importers and dealers, on the 30th day of April, instant, and on that day unsold, in excess of one thousand pounds. The importations of tea during the past three months have been equal to half the importations for the year 1917.

The imposition of a specific duty of 10 cents per pound on tea, necessitates changes in the Customs duties upon coffee and chicory, in order to place the taxation upon these articles on a parity with the taxation upon tea. The principal change in the taxation upon coffee relates to green coffee. The Customs tariff upon green coffee is, British Preferential Tariff, 2½ cents per pound, and General Tariff, 3 cents per pound. It is proposed that the British Preferential Tariff be 5 cents and the General Tariff 7 cents, per pound. The coffee tariff items are covered by the West Indies Agreement and the Preferential rate for coffee from the West India Islands, which were parties to the agreement, must be at least 20 per cent below the General Tariff rate. This has been provided for in the several tariff changes in respect of coffee. Changes in the Customs rate of duty payable on tobacco, cigars and cigarettes compensating for the increases in the excise tax upon these articles will be submitted.

It is also proposed to increase the duties payable on beverages which require malt, rice or corn in their manufacture and when containing not more than 2½ per cent of proof spirit. The present rate of duty upon this commodity is 17½ per cent, plus the War Tariff Rate of 7½ per cent, or about 25 per cent ad valorem, and it is proposed to raise the rate of duty to 40 per cent ad valorem.

The resolutions which I shall submit at the close of my remarks will provide for the repeal of the special war tax rates on sleeping car berths, and shall substitute the rate of 10 per cent of the price paid for each berth, with a minimum rate of 25 cents; and for the increase from 5 cents to 10 cents of the tax on parlour car seats; they shall provide for an excise tax of 1 cent per hundred on matches, or fractional parts thereof; an excise tax of 8 cents on each pack of playing cards; and a specific rate of Customs duty of 5 cents per lineal foot upon moving picture films.

The resolutions shall also provide for a special war excise tax of 10 per cent upon the selling value of automobiles, jewellery, gramaphones, graphaphones, phonographs, talking machines, mechanical piano and organ players and records, when imported into or manufactured in Canada. The tax upon automobiles is applicable to all imported into or manufactured in Canada and unsold this day. Such are the taxation proposals, and other than I have stated no tariff changes are proposed.

In conclusion, let me say that we may safely look to the future with courage and fortitude. Happy are our conditions in comparison with those of the belligerent countries of Europe. Armies do not contend for mastery upon our soil. Our undeveloped resources are tremendous. Immigration has been temporarily arrested, but shortly after the war we shall resume our growth of pre-war days and our financial burdens shall not then appear so onerous. We have assumed enormous responsibilities and we shall discharge them in the manner befitting our country, our cause and our race. The future of our country as well as the fate of civilization and democratic institutions will depend upon the result of this war, and no price is too high to pay for victory. We have already played a distinguished and noble part in the titanic struggle of the warring nations, and it shall not diminish for the lack of resources to be furnished by our people. We shall face coming events not without anxiety, not without a clear realization of our task, but with a strong resolve to use our strength to the utmost, confident that our Canadian people will patriotically and cheerfully provide for our expenditures, and the ways and means to support and sustain our gallant army in its stand for the political institutions which we cherish and which we pray shall not perish from the earth.

RESOLUTIONS.

I beg to give notice that upon the House resolving itself into committee I shall move the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend Schedule A to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by Chapter 5 of the Acts of 1914, second session, and by Chapter 3 of the Acts of 1915, and to strike thereout tariff items:—

24, 25, 25a, 26, 27, 28, 28a, 29, 29a, 143, 144, 145, the several enumerations of goods respectively and the several rates of duties of Customs, if any, set opposite each of the said items, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duties be inserted in said Schedule A:—

Tariff items.		British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
24	Chicory, raw or green, per pound.....	5 cents.	7 cents.	7 cents.
25	Chicory, kiln-dried, roasted or ground, per pound	8 "	10 "	10 "
25a	Coffee, extract of, n.o.p., and substitutes thereof of all kinds, per pound.....	9 "	12 "	12 "
26	Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations thereof and substitutes therefor, including acorn nuts, n.o.p., per pound..	8 "	10 "	10 "
27	Coffee, roasted or ground, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, per pound.....	8 " and 7½ p.c.	10 " 10 p.c.	10 " 10 p.c.
28	Coffee, green, imported direct from the country of growth and production, and green coffee purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, per pound.....	5 cents.	7 cents.	7 cents.
28a	Tea imported direct from the country of growth and production, and tea purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, per pound ..... When in wrappings, cartons or other packages weighing five pounds or less the weight of the wrappings, cartons or other packages to be included in the weight for duty.	10 "	10 "	10 "
29	Coffee, green, n.o.p., per pound.....	5 " and 7½ p.c.	7 " 10 p.c.	7 " 10 p.c.
29a	Tea, n.o.p., per pound..... When in wrappings, cartons or other packages weighing five pounds or less the weight of the wrappings, cartons or other packages to be included in the weight for duty.	10 cents. and 10 p.c.	10 cents. 10 p.c.	10 cents. 10 p.c.
143	Cigars and cigarettes, the weight of cigars to include bands and ribbons, and the weight of cigarettes to include the paper covering, per pound...	$4.10 and 25 p.c.	$4.10 25 p.c.	$4.10 25 p.c.
144	Cut tobacco, per pound.....	95 cents.	95 cents.	95 cents.
145	Manufactured tobacco, n.o.p., and snuff, per pound	90 "	90 "	90 "
147a	Beverages in the manufacture of which malt, rice or corn is used when containing not more than two and one-half per centum of proof spirit.	25 p.c.	40 p.c.	40 p.c.
657a	Cinematograph or moving picture films, positives, one and one-eighth of an inch in width and over, per linear foot.	3½ cents.	5 cents.	5 cents.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the provisions of the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of May, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, and to apply and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have also applied to such goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to impose, levy and collect on tobacco and cigars manufactured in Canada the following duties of excise;

(a) On all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine-cut, cavendish, plug or twist, cut or granulated, of every description,—on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed or in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument and without being pressed or sweetened,—and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, cuttings and sweepings of tobacco made from raw leaf tobacco or the product in any form, other than in this Act otherwise provided, of raw leaf tobacco, twenty cents per pound, actual weight;

(b) On common Canada twist, when made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, and on the farm or premises where grown, by the cultivator duly licensed therefor, or in a licensed tobacco manufactory, twenty cents per pound, actual weight;

(c) On all snuff made from raw leaf tobacco, or the product in any form of raw leaf tobacco or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, scented or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, twenty cents per pound, actual weight;

(d) Snuff flour, when sold or removed for use or consumption, shall pay the same duty as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and stamped in the same manner as herein prescribed for snuff completely manufactured, except that snuff flour not prepared for use, but which needs to be subjected to further processes, by sifting, pickling, scenting or otherwise, before it is in a condition fit for use or consumption,

may be sold by one tobacco manufacturer directly to another tobacco manufacturer, and without payment of the duty, under such regulations as are provided in that behalf by the Department;

(e) On cigars of all descriptions, made from raw leaf tobacco, or any substitute therefor, six dollars per thousand;

(f) On all cigars, when put up in packages containing less than ten cigars each, seven dollars per thousand;

(g) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, six dollars per thousand;

(h) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, eleven dollars per thousand;

(i) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, forty cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established;

(j) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, sixty cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established;

2. In all tobacco manufactories where less than fifty per cent. of Canadian raw leaf tobacco is used, and where ten per cent., or more, of other materials is used, such materials shall be subject to a duty of twenty-three cents per pound actual weight

2 Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that no person shall grow tobacco in Canada in excess of the amount or for purposes other than those mentioned in section three hundred and twenty-five of the Inland Revenue Act without a license, that a fee of two dollars be paid for such license and that a tax of five cents a pound be collected on all tobacco grown with the exception aforesaid.

3. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the preceding resolutions shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May nineteen hundred and eighteen.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and to provide that the tax to be paid by purchasers of a berth in a sleeping car be increased to ten per cent of the price for each berth, but in no case shall the tax be less than twenty-five cents for each berth and that the tax for a seat in a pullman or parlour car be increased to ten cents for each seat; that the definition of the word "Consumer" be amended so as to include a person who buys the articles mentioned for any purpose; that medicinal preparations and compositions excepted at the end of section fourteen be limited to those sold under the name used for them in the publications mentioned in the said section or any preparation manufactured and sold exclusively for the medical profession and on the labels of which no claim is made that the preparation has medicinal or curative powers or any description as to the amount that constitutes a proper dose; that manufacturers and importers of matches and playing cards be required after the thirtieth day of April, 1918, to affix to each package of matches and playing cards an adhesive stamp of the value of one cent for each one hundred matches or fractional part thereof in a package and of the value of eight cents on each package containing not more than fifty-four playing cards, and that such stamps be placed upon all packages of matches and playing cards held by dealers for sale on the first day of July, 1918, and that such stamps need not be affixed to packages of matches or playing cards manufactured for export; that there be levied a war excise tax equal to ten per cent upon automobiles, gramophones, graphophones, phonographs, talking machines, cylinders and records therefor, mechanical piano and organ players and records therefor, articles commonly or commercially known as jewellery, whether real or imitation, for adornment of the person, when manufactured or imported after the thirtieth day of April, 1918, on the duty paid value when imported and on the price when manufactured and sold, provided that such war excise tax shall not be payable when the articles are manufactured for export or in the case of jewellery where the total amount of jewellery manufactured by any one person does not exceed the value of one thousand dollars in any calendar year; that a war excise tax be collected upon all automobiles and jewellery imported into Canada for sale or manufactured in Canada on or before the thirtieth day of April 1918, and which on that day have not been sold to bona fide users, of ten per centum of the amount of the duty paid value when imported and of ten per centum of the price when they have been manufactured and sold in Canada, but that no war excise tax be collected upon the same when manufactured for export in accordance with regulations; and that no war excise tax be collected on jewellery imported or manufactured and unsold on the thirtieth day of April, 1918, where the total duty paid value or price of the entire stock of the same held by any one person does not exceed one thousand dollars; and that there be levied a war excise tax of ten cents per pound on all tea entered at Customs on or before the thirtieth day of April, 1918, and held by importers or dealers and which on that day had not been sold, where the stock of such importers or dealers exceeds one thousand pounds.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and to provide that paragraph (c) of Section three be repealed; that any business having a capital of not less than twenty-five thousand dollars and under fifty thousand dollars shall pay a tax of twenty-five per centum of the amount of the profits exceeding ten per cent per annum upon the capital; that the amount paid or payable under the provisions of Part 1 of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and The Income War Tax Act, 1917, shall be deducted from the amount payable under the provisions of the above Act, and that in computing the profits of such no taxpayer shall include any tax paid under the said Acts in the expenses of his business; that the amount of capital in the excepted business mentioned in Paragraph (a) of section five of The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, be reduced from fifty thousand dollars to twenty-five thousand dollars; that dividends paid during the accounting period shall be considered as a reduction of the unimpaired reserve, rest or accumulated profits; that the provisions of section three of the last mentioned Act be continued in force to the thirty-first day of December, 1918.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and provide that "dependent child" shall mean a child under

twenty-one years of age and dependent on its parent for support or over twenty-one and dependent on its parent for support on account of physical or mental incapacity; that paragraph (b) of section three be repealed and that an exemption of two hundred dollars be allowed for each dependent child under sixteen years of age; that paragraph (d) of section three be amended by striking out the words "or from the net earnings"; that subsections one and two of section four be repealed and that it be provided that there shall be assessed, levied and paid upon the income during the preceding year of every person residing or ordinarily resident in Canada or carrying on any business in Canada and upon the income received by any person from any source within Canada the following taxes:—

(a) two per centum upon all income exceeding one thousand dollars but not exceeding fifteen hundred dollars in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children, and exceeding two thousand dollars but not exceeding three thousand dollars in the case of all other persons; four per centum upon all income exceeding fifteen hundred dollars in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children, and exceeding three thousand dollars in the case of all other persons;

and in addition thereto,

(b) two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds six thousand dollars and does not exceed ten thousand dollars; and

(c) five per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds ten thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty thousand dollars; and

(d) eight per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds twenty thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty thousand dollars; and

(e) ten per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds thirty thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty thousand dollars; and

(f) fifteen per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds fifty thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy-five thousand dollars; and

(g) twenty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds seventy-five thousand dollars and does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars; and

(h) twenty-five per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds one hundred thousand dollars; and does not exceed two hundred thousand dollars; and

(i) thirty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds two hundred thousend dollars and does not exceed four hundred thousand dollars; and

(j) thirty-five per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds four hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed six hundred thousand dollars; and

(k) forty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds six hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed eight hundred thousand dollars; and

(l) forty-five per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds eight hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed one million dollars; and

(m) fifty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds one million dollars;

and in addition thereto the following surtax,

(n) five per centum of the tax payable upon income in excess of six thousand dollars but not exceeding ten thousand dollars;

(o) ten per centum of the tax payable upon income in excess of ten thousand dollars but not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars;

(p) fifteen per centum of the tax payable upon income exceeding one hundred thousand dollars but not exceeding two hundred thousand dollars;

(q) thirty-five per centum of the tax payable upon income exceeding two hundred thousand dollars;

that corporations and joint stock companies, no matter how created or organized, shall pay six per centum upon income exceeding three thousand dollars, but shall not be liable to pay the supertax; that the minister may permit any corporation or joint stock company the fiscal year of which is not the calendar year, to make a return and to have the tax payable by it computed upon its income for the twelve months ending with its last fiscal year preceding the date of assessment; that section five be amended by exempting the incomes or such portion of the incomes of judges and retired judges as come within the provisions of subsection three of section twenty-seven of the Judges Act and the incomes of incorporated companies whose business and assets are carried on and situate entirely outside Canada.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, my first word must be one of thanks to the Acting Minister of Finance, who so kindly handed me, a few days ago, some of the figures on which he based his statement, and which enables me to deal less inadequately with the financial situation which confronts this country than would otherwise have been the case.

I apprehend that at all times, and more especially at a time like the present, the duty of an Opposition is to submit everything proposed by the Government to the closest and most careful scrutiny, and then to make the observations and the criticisms which occur to them with an eye only to the best interests of the country. In that spirit I shall deal with the statement of the Acting Minister of Finance.

First of all, we were very glad to hear that the health of the Minister of Finance has improved—not the health of the Acting Minister, for he needs no remarks to be made upon his good health; as we say in the province of Quebec, ça saute aux yeux, it leaps to the eye. We hear through the public press that the Minister of Finance has got as far as Washington, and we hope that while he is there no rude newspaper man will poke in front of him any reports of the speeches he made at the time of the Reciprocity proposals six years ago, because it might give him a relapse.

The Acting Minister of Finance has dealt with the question of the unfavourable

balance in exchange of trade between us and the United States, and while he was speaking the thought occurred to me that if the Government of this country had not thought it best to limit the profits which the paper makers could have made in Canada at this time we might have had a greater development of paper-making here and more news print might have been sold to the United States. After all, the attitude of this Government towards the paper makers of Canada was not altogether fair. This Administration wished to treat the newspapers right, they wished to be kind to the newspapers, and they thought it would be a nice thing to exhibit their kindly feelings at the expense of the newsprint manufacturers. So they offered to the newspapers a continual treat, but instead of paying for the treat themselves they had it paid for by the newspaper manufacturers, who had to supply the newspaper proprietors with newsprint at a certain fixed price, a price which the manufacturers say is below what it costs them to produce the paper.

As to the loss of revenue because of prohibition I do not believe that the Acting Minister of Finance need be very much disturbed because, speaking for myself, I think that any loss which occurs through prohibiting the importation of wines and spirits into this country, or their manufacture herein, will be more than made up by the increased health and strength and wealth of the Canadian people.

The super-taxes announced were not very alarming, nor the taxes on income, and I say this, speaking for our friends on this side: that if the Acting Minister of Finance is attacked by any person for having too heavily taxed those who can best bear taxation, he can look to us for support and encouragement. The money must be found somewhere, and it should be taken from the pockets of those who have the most of it. We should not tax the poor unless we are compelled to, we should see that the rich pay and pay in large measure. And to the honour of the rich men of this country let me say, that I do not believe there will be any serious objection to income taxes as long as they are applied honestly and fearlessly, and as long as no one who should rightly be taxed is allowed to escape.

As regards the excise duties on tobacco, I suppose it is a proper way of raising revenue, but I trust it will not work out that the tobacco for the poor man's pipe will cost him too much. As far as cigarettes are concerned I suppose the President of the Council will agree with me that the use of cigarettes is a pernicious habit, and therefore that it is quite proper to tax them.

As regards the 10 cents a pound duty on tea, I am sorry to see that a Government which has made such an appeal to the ladies has, in return for their support and admiration, taxed their favourite beverage. Perhaps there is an explanation for it, but I would point out that on tea imported direct from the country of growth and production, and on tea purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, the following tax is imposed: British preferential tariff, 10 cents per pound, intermediate tariff 10 cents; general tariff, 10 cents. Some explanation is needed for the departure from that sound principle—which the Acting Minister of Finance should have learned years ago at the feet of that other great Nova Scotian, the member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding)—that there is such a thing as the British preference in this country. It seems too bad that tea coming from China, for instance, shall pay no more to get into Canada, or no more after coming in, than tea from Ceylon raised by a fellow British subject under the far eastern skies.

Then, with reference to the duty of 10 per cent on autos: let me express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that this 10 per cent does not apply to farm tractors.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: Of course, a farm tractor is an automobile just the same, I presume, as a truck is an automobile. I believe it might have been well to have differentiated between pleasure cars and business cars or utility cars. Surely, when the provinces are, and have been, spending vast sums of money to improve the roads of this country, it is a mistake to tax a truck which is, perhaps bringing in from the country thousands of gallons of milk to our town populations. I think there should have been a differentiation effected there. I have this also to say: as far as I can see this 10 per cent, which applies as well to automobiles coming into the country as to automobiles manufactured in the country, will practically give the whole market over entirely to the manufacturer of Canadian automobiles, because I believe I am right when I say that the present customs tariff on automobiles coming in from the United States amounts to 42½ per cent, and if another 10 per cent is added it will make the duty 52½ per cent, which I should say, is an absolutely prohibitive duty. I consider that the 10 per

cent which the manufacturer in Canada will be taxed will be very little for him to pay in view of the market being practically given over to him. On these grounds, Mr. Speaker, I question the advisability of the tax as it is presently submitted. There is room, I presume, for the taxation of luxuries; but the taxation of luxuries should be so effected that no increase of protection should be given to the native manufacturer, at any rate not at a time like this.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the hon. member will permit me, I would like to correct a statement he made a moment ago, so that the country will not be misled. The duty on automobiles does not apply, and is not intended to apply, to motor trucks of any kind.

Mr. McMASTER: Will it apply to delivery trucks?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. McMASTER: If that be so then I have to say that this legislation is very loosely drafted, because the idea I took from it was that "automobile" is a term of wide application, covering pleasure cars, express delivery vans, and such automobiles as the large trucks used by the Militia Department on the streets of this city.

Now, my hon. friend made some remarks which he thought were more or less hopeful about our having a favourable balance of trade. He told us that we were selling more to Great Britain than we were buying from her, and that we were buying more from the United States than we were selling to the United States. In the case of Great Britain the balance was favourable to us; in the case of the United States the balance was not favourable to us. I think that before going further, I should remind the House of the very essential fallacy wrapped up in the phrase "favourable balance of trade." Suppose a vessel laden with commodities grown in Canada leaves the port of Montreal for Great Britain, the goods on board being worth $100,000, and that it returns with a cargo of commodities useful to the Canadian people worth $120,000. On the unfavourable balance of trade theory our exports would be represented as $100,000; our imports as $120,000; and our unfavourable balance of trade, $20,000. But, suppose my hypothetical ship is lost on the voyage from Liverpool to Montreal, then the exports from Canada are set down at $100,000, imports into Canada, nil; favourable balance of trade for Canada $100,000. It is not a wise thing to base any public policy on absurdities of that sort.

What is the situation in regard to our trade? The situation is that we are maintaining an army across the seas, and helping to maintain other armies across the seas, and in consequence our imports have been enormously swollen and our exports still more enormously swollen. To illustrate my argument, I have merely to refer to a table dealing with war trade, prepared by the Department of Statistics, containing the exports of certain Canadian commodities having a direct bearing on the war for the last normal year, which ended on the 31st March, 1914, compared with the exports of the same commodities for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1917. These are the latest figures I have been able to obtain along these lines. The war has swollen both our exports and imports, first, by greatly enhanced prices, and, secondly, by greatly increased quantities of certain commodities imported and exported for the equipment and provisioning of our army and for the use of our allies. I do not ask the House to follow me in a long list of figures, but there are some rather striking examples of my contention which I think may be of interest to hon. members. In the fiscal year ended March 31, 1914, we exported from Canada $446,000 worth of clothing. I leave the odd hundreds out. For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917, this item had increased to six and one-third millions of dollars. Eggs jumped from just over $37,000 to just over $1,800,000. Explosives leaped from over $241,000 to over $281,000,000. Gutta percha, which we exported in the year 1914 to the value of $686,000, jumped to over $2,500,000 in 1917. In the year 1914 we exported 15 gasoline launches, worth a little over $9,000; in 1917, we exported 463 launches, worth over $15,000,000. The export of bacon has caused a good deal of interest in this country, and I note that from $3,750,000 in 1914 our exports have jumped to $43,000,000 in 1917, which latter figure, of course, includes the price of the brine which was pumped into the bacon according to a well known process which occasioned a certain amount of interest throughout the country some months ago.

Exports of beef jumped from over $1,000,000 in 1914 to $5,750,000 in 1917, and canned meats from $95,000 to $1,750,000. Pork, showing the family characteristic, almost kept pace with bacon by increasing in export from over $200,000 to over $2,500,000. Among the metals a vast increase of exports was shown. Exports of aluminium

jumped from under $2,000,000 in 1914 to under $6,000,000 in 1917 and brass from one-third of a million dollars to less than $7,000,000. Copper jumped from about $10,000,000 to almost $25,000,000. Exports of iron and steel increased fourfold, and of printing paper more than twice, in spite of the threat given by the Government to the newspapers at the expense of manufacturers of print. Textiles, manufactured and unmanufactured, increased in export almost fourfold, tobacco sixfold, vegetables from $1,500,000 to $12,000,000, vehicles from $4,000,000 to $14,000,000, wood pulp from $6,000,000 to $20,000,000. The same condition prevailed from March 31, 1917, to March 31, 1918. I am sure that the Acting Minister of Finance, who has not yet had time to dissipate the sound economic views which he held on this side of the Chamber, will agree that no national policy could possibly be founded on the absolutely artificial financial condition which confronts the country at this time.

Now let me deal with the national debt. When ten days or two weeks ago the Acting Minister of Finance instructed his deputy to hand me the figures in this respect, the net debt of the country was said to be $1,100,000,000. To-day it amounts to $1,200,000,000—though I do not say that $100,000,000 has meanwhile been added. What does this mean? A poor, but, I trust, honest professional man finds it very hard to imagine what a billion dollars is like. But if we assume that our population is 8,000,000, the per capita debt of the country amounts to $140; that is to say, every man, woman and child in the country has to-day an obligation in respect to the Federal Government of $140, as against $40 in 1913. Receipts on account of consolidated revenue, or what in business parlance we would call receipts on account of current account, amounted last year to $258,000,000. The expenditure last year on consolidated fund account amounted to $173,000,000 and on capital account $30,000,000, making an expenditure—quite apart from the war, except as regards a certain proportion of the interest paid and pensions—of over $200,000,000. Of this expenditure of $173,000,000, $7,120,000 was spent on pensions—and I am sure that not a member of this House grudges one cent of that expenditure. Our only desire is that the money shall be spent in such a manner as to give a value of one hundred cents for every dollar expended.

Payments of interest on account of our debt amounted to $45,750,000. We paid last year on account of interest on the debt more than three times as much as was paid for all purposes by the Dominion in 1868.

It is interesting to note just what proportion of our total current expenditure of $173,000,000 is due to the war. Payments on account of pensions are, of course, nearly all due to the war; there was a civil pension list, but the amount involved would be less than $500,000. We can put the war pensions down at $6,650,000. The interest paid on the debt was not all due to the war. Making proper allowances for interest paid on our pre-war debt and deducting this amount from the $45,750,000, we find that about $33,000,000 is the amount representing interest on the war debt. So that out of the $173,000,000 of current expenditure last year, not more than $40,000,000 was spent as a result of the war, leaving a balance of $133,000,000 spent on consolidated or current account.

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a very serious financial situation confronts this country. The amount spent for pensions last year, over $7,000,000, will amount to not much less than $15,000,000 next year, even if the war be not protracted beyond this year. Of course, we can make no prophecy, even the most vague or indefinite, as to when the war will end. A year from now the interest on our debt will, we may safely estimate, amount to $60,000,000. If we are to conduct the affairs of the country properly and in businesslike fashion, we must establish a sinking fund, and I suggest, though possibly there are men in the House who can strike the figure better than I can, that it would not be too much to set aside $15,000,000 a year for the purpose of extinguishing the immense debt which this war is necessarily imposing upon the country. We of this generation do wish that the country shall not be burdened for all eternity by heavy war charges; we should as far as possible, remove the burden of the debt from the country for the sake of our children and their children who will come after them.

Then, there is a matter which, with admirable Scottish caution, the Acting Minister of Finance avoided this afternoon. What about the Canadian Northern railway? What additional obligations will the acquisition of that road impose upon the Canadian people. Our public accounts for 1917 disclose that the Government railways were not great revenue producers for the Canadian people. The Intercolonial railway, under the able management of the

Minister of Railways and Canals, last year came out $4,000 on the right side of the ledger, with not a single cent allowed for the many millions of capital invested in that enterprise, while the cost of operating the National Transcontinental was $1,870,000 more than the revenue obtained from it.

The Quebec and Lake St. John railway, at the end of the year, was just $27,540.82 in the hole. If I say that we should, year after year, estimate a deficit on our railways of $10,000,000, would I be estimating the deficit at too much? I do not think so, in view of the fact that we do not know how much interest we shall have to pay on the $400,000,000 of debts which, according to the Drayton report, the Canadian Northern railway system owes. We have assumed this liability, and very strange to say, those gentlemen who are responsible for the assumption by the Canadian people of this Canadian Northern liability, are unable to tell us the exact amount of that liability. We may find that we shall have to make great capital expenditures in regard to that road, but before I come to capital expenditures, I had better conclude my remarks in regard to current expenditures.

For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918, it cost the people of this country $133,000,000 to run the country outside of war expenditure. We should in this country be able to get along with an expenditure on current account of $100,000,000. Impossible, I hear hon. members say; it cannot be done. Why can it not be done? In the year 1911, when my honoured leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) directed the affairs of this country, when the commercial sky was blue and smiling, when Canada was full of hope, when our population was almost as great, if not as great as it is now, we were able, under the direction of our Finance Minister, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) to conduct the affairs of this country on a current expenditure of $98,000,000. What has been done before, will and must be done again. I think it was Lord Bacon who said that the practice of economy was in itself a great revenue. We, in Canada, have, to a certain extent forgotten what economy means in matters connected with the administration of the affairs of the country. Just to give a little example, the other night the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) and myself were endeavouring to cut down in the Estimates a small item of $5,000. What do you, Sir, imagine this $5,000 was for? It was to encourage the eating of fish in Toronto and the rest of the province of Ontario by bonusing a system of fish dinners at the Toronto exhibition. The minister pointed out, with all the grace in the world, that it was a good thing for the people of Ontario, for certain physiological reasons, to eat more fish. We were almost alone that night. The minister was over on that side of the House; a few of us, mostly from the province of Quebec, were on this side, and in the end the House approved the estimate and allowed the item to pass. It is $5,000 here and $5,000 there, but in the end, economy is lost, and the great revenue which comes from the practice of economy is also lost.

While the war is being waged, and after the war is over, we ought to be able to get along with an expenditure on current account of $200,000,000. That would be made up somewhat in this fashion:

Expenditure on revenue account, less pensions and interest on public debt	$100,000,000
Pensions	15,000,000
Interest on public debt	60,000,000
Sinking fund on debt	15,000,000
Deficit on Government railways.	10,000,000
Total	$200,000,000

That will mean, on an estimated population of 8,000,000, an annual charge of $25 per head for every man, woman and child in the country. People from other provinces than Quebec, whose olive branches number one or two, may look with equanimity on an annual capital charge of $50, or even of $100, but in the province of Quebec, from which I come, and in which the quiver is a great deal fuller than in some other parts of the country, a capital charge of $25 per head is a very severe menace to face.

I have not attempted to estimate our future expenditure on capital account. It is almost impossible to do so. The Canadian Northern railway represents a problem sufficient to daunt the bravest heart. According to the report of Sir Henry Drayton and his associates, it will cost about $70,000,000 in the next five years for betterments of that system to bring it up to proper operating condition. The road, according to the same report, owes at least $400,000,000, and the strange thing is that no one seems to know exactly what it does owe. Hardly a week passes when that commission, sitting in the city of Toronto, is not in receipt of further claims against the Canadian Northern railway. What is that commission sitting for? It is sitting in

Toronto to see what sum less than $10,000,000 the people of Canada shall pay to the owners or the pledgees of the stock of the Canadian Northern railway for taking that stock away from them. There was room for a commission, but the commission should have sat for this purpose—to see what sum the owners and the pledgees and other people interested in the Canadian Northern railway should give to the Canadian people for taking their obligations off their hands. I greatly fear that for many years to come we shall find ourselves face to face with grave capital commitments.

I am glad that the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has brought forward to-day proposals for the application of allowances, in regard to a man's payments on income tax, in respect to the children which he has. That is only fair and right. It is following sound British precedent. I noticed in Mr. Bonar Law's Budget speech that the British Government had carried to a higher figure than formerly the exemptions for children.

The next criticism which I have to offer to my hon. friend's speech is that it discloses no proper nor adequate measures of economy.

It has been my lot recently to read a certain number of budget speeches which have from year to year been delivered in the House, and a certain number of financial criticisms, and with all respect in the world for those members of this House who have made speeches and those criticisms, there is a certain sameness about them. When the Liberals were in power their expenditure was denounced in words eloquent and bitter by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). To-day no longer does he denounce, at any rate in bitter tones, the Government's extravagance; the eloquence has remained, but the bitterness has gone. Here are his words, uttered when he was financial critic of the Opposition in 1908:

> The rapid pace which has been set and the recklessness of the expenditures that have been undertaken have obliterated all the old rules, the old lines in reference to expenditure. Whither are we rushing?

The expenditure which was animadverted to in such eloquent tones amounted in that year to $76,000,000. In 1911 the present Prime Minister, then the leader of the Opposition, issued a manifesto to the Canadian people, who were then called upon to decide which of the two great parties in this country should direct the country's des-

tinies for the next parliamentary term, and he wrote these most severe words:

> The increase in what is known as ordinary controllable expenditures of from $36,000,000 in 1896 to $79,000,000 in 1910 is proof of extravagance beyond any possible defence and establishes a prima facie case of corruption.

It is a sad commentary upon the value of election promises and upon the frailty of mankind to know that the Administration of my right hon. friend the present Prime Minister increased the consolidated fund expenditure or what we may call the expenditure on current account from $98,000,000 for the year ended March 31, 1912, to $112,000,000 the succeeding year; the next year it had increased to $127,000,000, the next year to $135,000,000, back again to $130,000,000 the next year, leaping up again to $148,000,000 the next year, and the expenditure stands at $173,000,000 for the year just closed, exclusive of all war expenditure except pensions and interest on the war debt.

To compare the first four years of the Conservative Administration with the last four years of the Liberal Administration—of course, in regard to this part of my remarks the Acting Minister of Finance is no more responsible than a babe unborn—we find that the expenditure of the Conservative Administration exceeded by about 45 per cent that of their predecessors, though the country was certainly prosperous in the last four years of Liberal Administration, and although part of the first four years of the Conservative Administration was passed in war time, when extravagance ceases to be a fault and becomes a crime. To those who find it difficult to believe anything disadvantageous concerning the Conservative party—and although the name Conservative has disappeared from political history we cannot think that all Conservatives have lost their identity in the sea of Unionism—and to those who may object that my remarks deal only with consolidated revenue account, I need only say that the capital expenditure accounts of certain spending departments of the Government show the same high, and in my view unjustifiable, increases. In all governments there are forces working for economy and forces working for extravagance, and the history of this country shows in the most plain and unmistakable manner that the forces of economy have been relatively stronger under the administration of Liberal leaders than under the administration of my right hon. friend the present Prime Minister, or those who have preceded him in guiding the affairs of the Conservative party.

But now, face to face with the sternest situation that has ever confronted the Canadian people, let us admit frankly that whatever virtues of thrift and economy our people possess as individuals, these qualities have not been adequately reflected in the management of the nation's business. Having signalized the fault, let us see what conditions have led to it.

In a democracy the people get the Government they deserve, and I ask the question: Why have the Canadian people had extravagant governments? The first cause has been a lack in the Canadian people of a feeling of responsibility for the good government of their country. Many there have been who have frankly stated that they took no interest in politics; that they were too busy to do so; and what is still more astonishing, some such seemed to take a considerable degree of pride in this shameless sort of selfishness. Perhaps, a feeling of colonialism felt by certain classes in our country, especially in years gone by, has been responsible in part for this condition. The second cause has been the fact that we were collecting our federal taxes almost altogether through a customs tariff and excise, and no one knew what he was paying to the State.

These two causes, in some measure, will be removed by the war. The people of this country are now feeling as they have not felt for years how nearly and closely politics—the science and art of Government—touches every individual member of the State, and many persons are now learning, as direct taxpayers to the federal authorities, that they have a direct interest in the economical administration of the country's affairs.

But there is a third cause, and I believe a most potent one, consisting in a widespread misapprehension about the surpluses which the governments of this country have declared on current account, or consolidated fund account, for a number of years past.

For the fiscal year 1899-1900, we had a surplus on account of consolidated fund of just a little over $8,000,000; the next year, the surplus was a little over $5,500,000; the next year, a little over $7,250,000; the next year that of 1902-3, the surplus had increased to over $14,250,000; the next year it went to $15,000,000; the next year it was almost $8,000,000; the next almost $13,000,000; for nine months of the next year it was almost $16,500,000; the next year it amounted to almost $19,500,000; but in the year 1908-9, which followed the commercial crisis of the fall of 1907, the surplus was reduced to a little more than $1,000,000; the next year, however, 1909-10, it increased to over $22,000,000; the next to almost exactly $30,000,000; the next year, 1911-12, to almost $38,000,000; the next year to $56,500,000; the next year, 1913-14, it was almost $36,000,000; the next fiscal year saw the outbreak of the war, and for that year, 1914-15, instead of the usual surplus a deficit of almost $2,500,000 occurred. This was changed, however, the succeeding year, to a surplus of almost $42,000,000, and in the year 1916-17, the surplus amounted to $84,000,000, while for the year just closed it amounted to $85,000,000.

On the face of things, these surpluses demonstrate a truly marvellous condition of national prosperity, but I ask the question: Can we regard these surpluses as an indication of the excess of money furnished for taxation by the people of Canada out of their earnings over and above the necessities of the Government? In other words, during these years is it a fact that after having earned large sums of money the Canadian people have contributed, indirectly it is true, either through Customs duties or excise, such large sums by way of taxes to the Government that the Government has had these surpluses? My answer is: Far from it, because the revenue in these years in which these wonderful surpluses have occurred—in the history of the country the surplus never reached 10 millions until the year 1902,—largely represents taxation on our own borrowings. Perhaps I could better explain what I mean by an illustration. Let us suppose a man in business has for many years been conducting his affairs at a profit, and in order to provide for his declining years he has been placing in a fund a part of his profits, which he calls his surplus fund. And let us suppose further that experience has taught him that the easiest way of doing so is to put aside each month, in a special account, 5 per cent of his gross receipts. Let us further suppose that it becomes necessary for him to enlarge his establishment. For that purpose he borrows $10,000. Will he, if he be a prudent business man, regard this sum as a gross receipt and put $500 of it in his special account? Assuredly not, because he knows that no part of it can be treated as revenue. It is capital which he has borrowed, and to put it, or any part of it, in his surplus fund would

be to invite disappointment, as it all has to be repaid.

Let me now apply the illustration for the period from the year 1902 to the year 1914. Our Dominion statistician has estimated that the Canadian people, acting through their Federal Government, or their provincial governments or municipalities, or corporations, or as individuals, borrowed from Great Britain and other countries, but almost exclusively from Great Britain, $2,713,300,000. A computation which it is interesting to note is largely borne out by the figures of Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, manager of the Bank of Montreal, who estimated that in 1914 Canadians owed Great Britain £545,546,849, which in our currency approximates very closely the figures arrived at by Mr. Coats, the Dominion statistician, who, in arriving at his conclusion, it is interesting to note, proceeded along entirely different lines.

Now, these sums so borrowed came into Canada not in the form of gold or bank notes, or any other sort of money; they entered in the form of goods, largely from the United States, and on these goods were levied taxes at the rate, let us say, of at least 17 per cent. Seventeen per cent on the total of our borrowings comes to $461,251,000, a sum very largely in excess of our total surpluses from the year 1902-3 to the year 1913-4, both inclusive, and a sum within $20,000,000 of the total surpluses on account of consolidated fund since the year 1902-3 to date.

We may continue, if we like, to call these moneys surpluses, but as far as they represent taxation on goods which came into this country as a result of our borrowings abroad they are surpluses which will have to be returned to our creditors in time to come. What is my conclusion on this point? I presume that in the form of bookkeeping obtaining the entries had to be made as they were, but I think that if the true nature of these surpluses had been pointed out to the Canadian people, if it had been shown to them that these surpluses in large part represented taxation on our own borrowings, there would have been less pressure on the Finance Minister to swell his estimates and more power in the Finance Minister to resist requests of that kind.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (resuming): It would be an occasion for deep regret to those who closely follow and understand the needs of our own soldiers, those of our Allies and of the civil populations overseas, to know that there has been one very serious omission in the able speech delivered this afternoon by the Acting Minister of Finance, and the omission is this: He has announced no policy of taking off the duty on agricultural implements and machinery to increase food production. I take it that it should not be necessary for me to speak at any length on the need of food at this time, but if proof is required it is at hand. In the Canadian Food Bulletin, published by the Canada Food Board, on 28th March of this year, I find a call for greater production from the Prime Minister himself. He wrote:

> The campaign for increased production of foodstuffs now launched by the Canada Food Board is of the most vital importance to the victory of the Allied cause. Because of our geographical position the United Kingdom, the Allied nations are depending on Canada for food as never before. Specific suggestions will be issued from time to time by the Canada Food Board for the guidance of the people; and it is the earnest hope of the Government that every citizen will realize his or her personal individual duty to adopt and carry out these suggestions. Mere perfunctory observance will not be enough; the crisis is grave and urgent beyond possibility of exaggeration; and it will only be through an earnest sense of individual responsibility that Canadians will be able in this matter to honour their obligations to their heroic soldiers overseas, who are defending our liberties at a cost besides which any personal inconvenience or discomfort on our part is insignificant.

Was the relative importance of food production altered by the great German offensive which began on the 22nd day of last month? Not, at any rate, in the opinion of Lord Rhondda, the British food controller, who from London, on the 10th of April, cabled the Canada Food Board as follows:

> In these stern days it is inspiring to learn that Canada is tackling the food problem with redoubled energy. The terrific pressure on our military front makes it all the more imperative that those behind the lines should strain every nerve to defeat the enemy's avowed object of destroying the British Empire. Germany hoped first to starve the Old Country by the submarine campaign and then to smash her land forces. She has failed to starve us and she will fail to smash us but we cannot achieve victory without food. There never was a time when it was more needed. The Canadian farmer and the Canadian farm hand now have the opportunity to make an effective reply to the enemy's present onslaughts by bending their undivided energies to the increased production of those food supplies for which we depend to such vital extent on your great Dominion.

Our own Dr. Robertson has assured us that the world faces a food situation which

is nothing short of appalling. The increased dependence of our Allies, France, Italy and Belgium, upon us for food production is shown by the following facts: In France the average yearly production of wheat for the five years preceding the war was 317,000,000 bushels. In 1916, the production had fallen to no less than 214,000,000 bushels, and in 1917 the crop was estimated at 161,000,000 bushels. Likewise, in Italy, the average pre-war production for five years amounted to 183,000,000 bushels. In 1916 this had dropped to 176,000,000 bushels, and in 1917 the estimate was 147,000,000 bushels. In Belgium the average pre-war production was almost 15,000,000 bushels. It fell in 1916 to almost 12,000,000 bushels. The estimate for 1917 only amounted to 9,000,000 bushels. The total reduction in those three countries amounted to over 198,000,000 bushels, representing a reduction from pre-war production of nearly thirty-eight per cent. In view of these facts Canada finds itself one of the most important factors, if not the most important factor, in the food situation. Supplies from Eastern Europe no longer exist. Supplies from Australia and Africa are too far away to be moved. As Lord Rhondda has said: What we ask from the United States and Canada we cannot procure elsewhere. As between ourselves and the United States we have a far larger exportable surplus of wheat than she has. In the past year our exportable wheat surplus amounted to 154,000,000 bushels, while the United States had only one-third of that amount. Canada is called upon to be a factor in saving a world which is face to face with starvation. She has illimitable quantities of the choicest wheat lands awaiting the plough; she can add enormously to her exports of foodstuffs, especially of grain, in a single year if—and, Mr. Speaker, there is so often an "if"—she can command sufficient man power to do the necessary farm work. Face to face with this situation the Government has conscripted for the army men from the farm. The decision has been made, and I have no desire to re-open the question—the responsibility is upon the Government. But I have merely to say this—and I will not use my own words lest it be thought that party spirit, or something of that sort, had affected my judgment, but I quote the words of Lord Rhondda—"Unless the Allies in Europe are able to import the necessary supplies for the feeding of their armies and their civil population, victory may slip from our united grasp." God forbid! But if disaster should overtake our armies in the field, and if that disaster should be due to a failure of food, I am glad that the responsibility is not upon my shoulders. The Food Board has been created in Canada at vast expense. It has issued some rules and regulations, and has distributed some useful information. Whether the board has justified, is justifying, or will justify the immense amount of money spent upon it, is a matter to which it is now too early to dogmatise; we will leave that question for decision to the future. But there is one means of encouraging food production in this country which the Government has refused to adopt, although it is simple and easy. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the old story of Naaman, the Syrian, and how he came to the Hebrew prophet seeking to be healed of the disease of leprosy, and the prophet said to him: "Go and bathe in the River Jordan and your skin will be again like the skin of a little child." He disdained at first to follow the direction, and why? Because it was too easy, too simple. I ask the Government of the day not to refuse my suggestion on the same ground, that it is too easy and too simple. What is my suggestion? It is this: That all agricultural tools, implements and machinery of all sorts and kinds, from the rake and hoe to the great tractor and thresher, be placed upon the free list, and that either by drawback or otherwise, the manufacturer of such be placed in as good position in respect to his raw material.

I cannot imagine what adequate reason the Government can offer for withholding its consent to this proposal. It cannot be that the Government fears the lack of revenue, because with two such Ministers of Finance, one acting in Canada and the other in the United States, we can face the future with a certain degree of confidence, and the Government cannot be anxious about the loss of revenue which might be incurred by placing these useful articles on the free list. A Government which is borrowing by the hundred million, and which has presented to us a budget for war purposes alone of $500,000,000, cannot baulk at a mere two million dollar loss of revenue, for that is all the duty realized at the Canadian Customs houses from the entry of agricultural implements during the past year. If there is any reason for refusing my request, it must be based on some other consideration than the loss of revenue. Can the manufacturers of such implements complain of the proposal? If they complain,

should their complaint be heard? Men and food are necessary to win the war; food must be produced in Canada in greater abundance; free tools to work with will help the farm to produce in greater abundance. These are statements of fact which no one out of bedlam can contradict. If the manufacturers of agricultural implements object to this cheapening of a means of production, do they not place themselves in a very ignoble posture before the Canadian people, who are in a war where food may be the deciding factor? Were I disposed to follow the methods of certain of my political opponents—not of all, I am glad to say,—who, for the past year have made it a constant practice to accuse of lack of patriotism, of disloyalty, even of traitorous conduct, those who did not see eye to eye with them in the way they thought it best to conduct the military operations of this country,—what hot shot I could pour into the flanks of those persons who object to free agricultural implements! I could ask them, did they not realize that while Canadian boys were fighting for liberty in France, they were fighting for their tariff privileges in Canada. I could ask them whether the blood of their boys spilled on the battlefield was dearer to them than the dividends on their stock. I might venture upon the field of emotional oratory, of which the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) is such a master, and with uplifted arm and flushed face, ask whether they would be responsible for holding back food from our soldiers at the front and our starving allies across the seas. Aye, I might boom across the floor of the House at hon. gentlemen opposite that question which in itself at this time is the very quintescence of insult: Do you not know that there is a war on? But I do not propose to follow any such line of political or economic debate. I believe that the interests of this country are best served by an open, frank, courteous discussion upon those points of public policy on which we differ as well as on those on which we agree. In this spirit, let us consider the situation in regard to free agricultural implements.

First, this Government has admitted the principle of the advisability of free agricultural implements by taking off the duty on farm tractors costing not more than $1,400 f.o.b. factory. I have a very close friend who is a large farmer in Saskatchewan, and as he is not only a man of some means but also a citizen of patriotic inclinations. He laid his plans this summer for putting in an extra large crop.

He found that the tractor that he wished and that was best for his purposes, was of a large size which would cost a good deal more than $1,400. What he finds is this somewhat interesting, because remarkable, situation: The Canadian Government will encourage his neighbour, who needs a small tractor, to buy it by allowing it to come in free, but as my friend requires a large tractor he will have to pay $600 duty upon it. He is a man of judicial mind and high education; he has thought for some time about this problem, and he has given it up in despair; he is absolutely unable to understand why the Government should differentiate between a large tractor and a small tractor, and allow his friend, whose purpose can be served by a small tractor, to have his tractor come in free while he whose purpose is just as worthy of commendation as that of his neighbour will have to pay $600 duty for a large tractor. And the action of the Government in picking out one sort of farm implement to enter free of duty is very unfair to many an eastern farmer who cannot use even a small tractor on his hilly farm and smallish fields, but who would be considerably benefited by getting his mower, binder and potato digger in free. The farmer in the Eastern Townships—for I speak of that part of the agricultural Dominion with which I am most familiar—has had a hard condition to face for many years past. By reason of emigration to the West, by reason of the building of railways, and by reason of the great growth of our eastern cities, even before the war, he found himself in a very difficult position so far as farm labour was concerned, and when the war came there were many voluntary enlistments of young farmers and young farm hands. To-day he finds that perhaps the last boy on the farm has been taken by the latest Act of the Government. Most of these farms are dairy farms, with constant work seven days a week, year after year. What I fear is that there may be—I trust there will not be—a disposition to lose heart on the part of our farmers, to sell off their stock, and to raise only sufficient for their own need.

It has not been altogether easy for the agriculturists in this Dominion to follow the changes of policy of this Administration and of the Administration which preceded it in regard to the taking of men for the army from the soil. In the Military Service Act the necessity for sustaining the productivity of the Dominion was at least inferentially set forth, the terms of the Act being:

And whereas by reason of the large number of men who have already left agricultural and industrial pursuits in Canada to join such Expeditionary Force volunteers, and of the necessity of sustaining under such conditions the productivity of the Dominion, it is expedient to secure the men still required, not by ballot as provided in the Militia Act, but by selective draft.

Certainly the speakers who addressed audiences in Canada prior to the election did not allow this feature of selection in the Military Service Act to pass unnoticed. As the campaign waxed warmer in certain sections, where the judges had either been too severe or the military representative too energetic, representatives from the Department of Agriculture were injected into the matter. So, we had this somewhat curious spectacle. We had tribunals appointed by the Government—not directly by the Government; the Government formed a committee, and then the committee picked certain men who served on the tribunals, and certain others were picked by the judges.

Before this tribunal, created in roundabout fashion by the Government, appeared a representative of the Department of Militia endeavouring to cause the tribunal to look at the matter in a certain way, and a representative of another department of the Government, endeavouring to have the tribunal take another view of the situation. It was a case of "pull tailor, pull devil," the poor conscript being pulled between the two. Strange to say, these representatives were both accredited agents of the Government— and as the Prime Minister himself said the other day, during the course of a short lecture on constitutional law directed to the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and myself, the different ministers are jointly and severally responsible for each other's acts. I do not wonder that the farming community were somewhat bewildered, because, unlike the member for George Etienne Cartier and myself, they had not had the privilege of sitting as students, not at the feet of Gamaliel, but at the feet of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) as our law professor. But if the Administration knew how to bewilder, they knew also how to reassure. On December 3, 1917, they passed reassuring ordinance in the shape of an Order in Council—which is an abomination in the sight of every true lover of the constitution, but which to this Administration is a very present help in time of trouble. By the terms of this Order in Council it was decreed that bona fide farmers who had been conscripted might obtain leave of absence without pay on the fiat of the Minister of Militia and Defence. The election over, and a large majority in favour of the Administration having been secured, loud and eloquent appeals went forth to the farmers to increase production. The farmer heeded these appeals; all over the country men made their preparations for putting in a larger crop. Then comes the latest action of the Government, conscripting men from the farms as well as from all other walks of life. The Government must have considered that the occasion demanded this step, or they would not have taken it. I do not wish to discuss whether their policy was wise or not, but I say that they must do something to show the farmers that they were in earnest, that they were really serious, when they were talking about increased production. The criticism is now made by those who put the Military Service Act upon the statute-book that the Act provided for too much selection; so the Government rush to the other extreme by eliminating selection altogether in respect of men aged twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two. A widow, the proprietor of a farm, whose only son is the only hired man she can get, will see her boy join the army—not unwillingly, because quite probably he is twenty and wanted to go two years ago with his high school chums in the neighbouring town, but she restrained him in order that he might work on the farm. She will see him go, while her sister, another widow who has a boy of twenty-five running, say, a gents' furnishings emporium in the neighbouring town, sees her son stay.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the pool rooms?

Mr. McMASTER: I do not believe there are such vast reserves of pool room loafers as the Government seems to be thinking about. Under these circumstances, the Government must endeavour to keep their name good with the agriculturists; if they do not, they run the risk of losing whatever reputation they may have for being serious. You will remember how, some thirty odd years ago, Gilbert and Sullivan poured good-natured ridicule on the British Admiralty in their immortal opera "H.M.S. Pinafore." If a modern Swift or a modern Butler no longer exists to satirize this Government, I warn them that if at some no distant future date they go into a house of public entertainment they may have their ears greeted with this tuneful jingle:

The clock we have pushed forward
For gardening after tea;
But as for farming implements—
We can't admit THEM free.

What opposes this needed reform? What are the forces impeding the freest possible access to tools which are necessary aids to greater production? They are two: first, the attitude of the agricultural implement men; second, the attitude of certain of the big interests of this country.

Let us deal with the first; the objection of the agricultural implement manufacturers. The question of free agricultural implements is not a new one. It was discussed very fully in the debates of the session of 1912-13. On that occasion the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke as follows:

Speaking for myself and for my own interests I would be prepared to say that if we got all our raw materials at any equally reduced duty, either no duty or a duty commensurate with the amounts knocked off implements, we could afford—there is no question about that—to reduce the duty on agricultural implements, but it would be at the cost of displacing probably 100,000 men in the Dominion of Canada in all these implement works and their tributary industries that supply them with raw materials.

These avowals made by the hon. member for Brantford go far along the line advocated by me, though they do not go the whole way; and he has very prudently and properly attempted to speak for no other than himself and his own interests. In this connection I have two points to submit to the House: first, that the agricultural implement business has reached the stage when, given raw materials, duty free, it can stand and should be made to stand upon its own feet; second, that the fear of displacing 100,000 men in tributary industries is grossly exaggerated, if not altogether unfounded.

As to the first point. The number of employees who were engaged on salary or on wages in the agricultural implement business in 1915, according to the postal census of that year, was 7,609. The value of the raw materials used in that year was almost $6,000,000; the value of the products was over $13,372,506, and the exports amounted to over $3,500,000. The war must have greatly affected the export business of this trade, because during 1914 almost $8,000,000 worth of agricultural implements had been exported. Even in 1915, a year of war, the exported product was about one-fifth of the whole, which indicates that the industry is native to the soil, is soundly organized, properly managed, and needs nothing more than a fair field and no favour for success.

As to the second point raised by the member for Brantford, the probable displacing of 100,000 men, can it be said that 100,000 men are employed in those industries which make the raw material which enters into the machinery made by the manufacturers of agricultural implements? I do not think so.

I do not think so because, according to the Government census of 1915, there were only 59,361 persons engaged in that year in the steel and iron industry, and they certainly could not all be displaced by reason of the loss of some custom of the agricultural implement manufacturers. Secondly, although the implement manufacturers are good customers of the iron and steel manufacturers, they are not their only customers—far from that. As stated before, the raw materials which in 1915 went into agricultural implements amounted to almost $6,000,000. Would I be wrong in assuming that 80 per cent of this, or say, about $5,000,000, consisted of iron and steel products in some form or another? I am not an expert on this matter, but as a representative of an agricultural community I am able to look a plough in the face and tell it from a harrow, and it would appear to me that most of these agricultural implements were made of metal, and that the wooden parts represented a very small proportion of the value of the whole. Perhaps I may take 80 per cent as a fair working basis as to the proportion of iron and steel products which go into the making of agricultural implements. From the investigations I have made, I do not believe that more than one-fifth of the iron and steel manufactured in this country goes into making agricultural implements. In other words, I do not believe the agricultural implement manufacturers are customers for more than one-fifth of the iron and steel produced in this country.

Before we leave this question, there is this third consideration: The duties on the raw materials entering into agricultural implements are very low. Most of this raw material will be found in one or another of the following schedules. I might just say, en passant, that it would be interesting to know what principles, if any, underlaid the tariff. It seems to be the strangest sort of hodgepodge of all kinds and conditions of things that one can imagine.

Item 379 reads:

Rolled iron or steel angle beams, channels, angles and other rolled shapes or sections of iron or steel, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, weighing not less

than 35 pounds per lineal yard, not being flat, oval, or round shapes, and not being railway bars or rails, per ton, British preferential, $2; intermediate, $2.75; general, $3.

That is a specific duty. There is to be added to that, under duties which were added a year or so ago for alleged war purposes, British preferential, 5 per cent, intermediate and general, 7½ per cent.

Item 386 reads:

Rolled iron or steel in bars, bands, hoops, scrolls, strips, sheet or plate, of any size, thickness or width, galvanised or coated with any material or not, and steel blanks for the manufacture of milling cutters, when of greater value than 3½ cents per pound, British preferential, free, intermediate, 5 per cent.; general, 5 per cent.

To that would have to be added British preferential, 5 per cent; intermediate and general, 7½ per cent.

Item 396 reads:

Seamless steel tubing valued at not less than 3½ cents per pound, adapted for use in the manufacture of agricultural implements, British preferential, free; intermediate, 5 per cent.; general, 5 per cent.

The duty is now British preferential, 5 per cent; intermediate and general, 12½ per cent.

Item 412 reads:

Iron or steel nuts, washers, rivets and bolts, with or without threads, nut, bolt and hinge blanks, and tee and strip hinges of all sorts, n.o.p., per hundred pounds, British preferential, 75 cents; intermediate, 75 cents; general, 75 cents.

There is to be added to that British preferential, 10 per cent; intermediate, 20 per cent, and general 25 per cent. Now, of course, you will have to add an additional 5 per cent duty on these articles if they come from the British Isles and an additional 7½ per cent if they come from elsewhere.

Item 444 reads:

Mould boards or shares or plough plates, land sides and other plates for agricultural implements when cut to shape from rolled plates of steel and not moulded, punched, polished, or otherwise manufactured, British preferential free, intermediate, free, general, free.

The duty will now be British preferential, 5 per cent; intermediate, 7½, and general, 7½. It would seem to me reasonable to argue that the removal of these duties cannot have that injurious effect dreaded by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) when he was dealing with this matter a year or two ago. It would appear to me that the economic case for free agricultural implements with which to help win the war, is absolute, complete and sound.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Will the hon. member kindly state the date of the Hansard from which he is quoting?

Mr. McMASTER: For some weeks past I have been carrying a copy of the hon. gentleman's remarks around with me in my pocket. The hon. member for Brantford addressed the words which I have quoted to the House and which are reported in volume 6 of Hansard of 1912 at page 10,512. I have also carried around with me some other words of the hon. member which are to be found at page 10,517, and I think that the House will be interested in hearing them. The hon. member said:

The quality of the manufactured goods turned out by Canadian manufacturers is of the best, and the fact that they have competed in the markets of the world against all competitors shows that they are able to compete with the world in quality and in price.

If that is the fact, I would think it well that the farmers of this country should have the benefit of free agricultural implements in order that they may grow more food and, in that way, help to win the war.

I now propose to deal with the attitude which I believe has been assumed by the big interests of this country to the proposal for the introduction of free agricultural implements. I do not think I am breaking any confidences or saying anything that is not known to the world pretty generally when I say that the presence of stalwart radicals in the Borden Administration of to-day is viewed by the large interests of this country with a certain degree of perturbation, if not of fear; and of course, the attitude of the large interests is not at all due to the character of the representatives in the Borden Administration. That, of course, would cause them only joy and confidence. It is the economic views—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I correct the hon. member? I understood this was the Borden-Rowell administration.

Mr. McMASTER: I shall not be deflected from an economic discussion by any pleasing, agreeable and humorous pleasantry of the honourable and gallant member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes).

The attitude of the big interests in this country in regard to free agricultural implements is not unlike the attitude they assumed over reciprocity. Though the interests of the protected manufacturers of this country were safeguarded in the most ample manner through the care of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr.

Fielding) and others of the Administration of that day, the financial and industrial interests of this country thought they saw in reciprocity the entering of the thin edge of the wedge into what they regarded as their tariff privileges, and therefore they opposed reciprocity and opposed it in a most interesting manner. It can best be illustrated by a reference to a story in Holy Writ. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when Paul and his companion Silas were travelling around the country preaching the gospel, they came to a place called Ephesus, where there was a great temple of Diana of the Ephesians, and they were so successful in their preaching that the business of the people there who made little images of Diana fell off, and a man Demetrius called together the association of craftsmen of that city and said: This man Paul and this man Silas are hurting our business. Let us put a stop to it. Did they go out into the market place and lay complaints against these two men for hurting their business? Not for a moment. They raised the loyalty cry. They went out into the market place and for the space of two hours they cried, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," and they raised a riot so that Paul and Silas got into trouble. That was one way to stop competition. In the same way the large interests of this country, in the summer of 1911, did not go out into the market places of Canada and say: These Liberals are going to hurt our business. They could not say that, because it was not true to begin with. So they raised the loyalty cry so as to hurt the Liberals who were pressing for reciprocity, a measure which, I believe, would have been of great benefit to the Canadian people, and I know that some hon. gentlemen opposite share in that view. The whirl-a-gig of time brings round its revenges. Those who supported the Conservative opposition of that day, and whose life blood was opposition to the very name of reciprocity, saw that same party when it came into office take the duty off wheat, wheat flour and semolina—the very keystone of the anti-reciprocity arch. The attitude of the big interests which opposed free agricultural implements is not unlike the attitude assumed by some manufacturers in this country in the days of 1896 when certain reforms in a downward direction were effected by those in charge of the tariff affairs of that day. You will remember how that stalwart old war-horse of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper, said that the sorrowful wail of the manufacturers was heard abroad in the land, and we know that after a reduction had been made in certain duties and after the party which made those reductions was able to go on with its work, there was a great era not only of general prosperity but of manufacturing prosperity in Canada; our manufacturers never made greater strides than they did between 1896 and 1911.

Mr RICHARDSON: Will the hon. gentleman tell us what the total reductions in the tariff by the Liberal party, after 1896, averaged?

Mr. McMASTER: I am always willing to oblige, and I happen to have carried those figures around in my pocket also. I am not prepared, perhaps, to give my hon. friend his answer just as he would like it, but I am sure he will be glad to let me give the answer as I like it. In order to help the farmers of this country, cream separators, which had been protected before 1896, were placed on the free list, and what makes me believe in sound economics for this country is that cream separator factories grew up in Canada even though cream separators were put on the free list. Then there was Indian corn. Before 1896 that was dutiable at the rate of 7½ cents per bushel except when used for distillation purposes. The staunch temperance element in the present Administration was not present in the Conservative Administration prior to 1896, and consequently you could get Indian corn in free if you wanted to make whisky out of it, but if you wanted it for feeding hogs or cattle you had to pay a duty of 7½ cents a bushel. That duty was taken off, and Indian corn allowed to come in free. Pig iron, which was one of the basic raw materials for a great number of manufactured articles, had been taxed under the old tariff at four dollars per ton. Under the new general tariff it was taxed at $2.50 per ton; under the preferential tariff, which was in force up to the 30th of June, 1898, it was taxed at $2.18¾ per ton, and after the 1st of July of that year at $1.87½ per ton. There was also a reduction in other matters, not as much as I would like—I am very much of the kidney of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), and should have liked to see my friends go a little further. But I say this: If I wish to go to Toronto do I join a number of men who are going in the direction of Montreal or do I attach myself to a number of men who are going in the direction of Toronto,

even though they are not going as fast as I would like to have them go?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I should like to say that a study of the politics of this country for the past twenty-five or thirty years convinces me that more reductions were actually secured from the high-priest Tories than from the low-tariff Liberals.

Mr. McMASTER: I would imagine that the applause to that sentiment was somewhat local. I would doubt very much if it came from those representing manufacturing interests in the splendid old province of Ontario. But there were a great many reductions made; duties running up as high as fifty and sixty and seventy per cent were reduced to ad valorem duties not running over thirty-five per cent. It must not be forgotten that there was also the British preference, and without being unduly antagonistic to the hon. member for Springfield, whose views on many questions do not differ very largely from my own, I would remind him that this British preference was fought in the most strenuous way by those high priests of Toryism from whom he states he received so many tariff favours, and they fought it because they said: You are interfering with the market which should be reserved for the Canadian manufacturer.

I would also like to ask my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and other staunch free traders on the other side of the House, whether the reciprocity agreement was not a great step in the right direction, and whether the Liberal Administration of 1911, who adopted that policy and went down fighting for it, were not entitled to the sympathy of those who, we will say, hold sound economic views on tariff questions? The fears of the manufacturers of 1896 proved groundless. I would think, and hope, that the fears of the large interests in this country would prove groundless in regard to the introduction of free agricultural implements.

But let me note the very pleasant situation in which we find ourselves to-day in discussing economic matters, especially when these economic matters deal with the United States. You will remember that a few years ago if you discussed economic matters in connection with the United States with some sections of our people you frequently placed your loyalty as a British subject in jeopardy. But, now, how different it is! We find the Prime Minister himself coming before the House and in gracious fashion thanking the United States for having sold so many steel plates to us at a price no higher than they were charging their own people.

Mr. MURPHY: And they are going to New York to consult the Finance Minister.

Mr. McMASTER: They have always gone to New York when it suited their purposes. It is only the other day that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) told us that the United States and ourselves must fight this war as one economic unit. Six years ago, the friends of these hon. gentlemen were saying that if we adopted a certain trade proposition we would become an economic unit with the United States and then away with the Constitution, the Throne would tumble, and the Stars and Stripes would be substituted for the British flag. Really it is now very pleasant to be able to discuss economic questions without placing one's reputation for loyalty in jeopardy.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it not very pleasant to see Old Glory flying side by side with the British flag and the French flag? They were not flying together then.

Mr. McMASTER: It is splendid, and I do say for the political party with which I have always been associated, and with which I am associated yet, that we have never attempted to make political capital in the past by endeavouring to raise anti-American sentiment on the North American continent.

I respectfully suggest that it may very well happen that the fears of those who believe that their own best interests, and, indeed, who perhaps sincerely believe that the best interests of the country are served by the maintenance of artificial security through the operation of a protective tariff, are groundless. I know what the reply of these gentlemen will be, and it will be this: "We know our own business much better than any professional man who happens to be a member of Parliament, and we and not he must be the judge of what is best for us." In reply to this, may I make this observation? The federal reserve banks, created by President Wilson, have been a great success and have enormously benefited the United States banking system, but the bankers, before the law creating these federal reserve banks was actually placed upon the statute-book, almost unanimously condemned the proposal. They thought they knew banking much better than President Wilson, but President Wilson and his advisers knew what was best

for the country, and therefore best for the banking interests, even better than the bankers themselves. But whatever has been the wisdom or unwisdom of a policy of restriction on Canadian trade in the past, the present condition makes the continuation of such a system impossible for the future.

I have in the earlier part of my remarks pointed out that by the year 1914 the Canadian people, whether acting through their federal, provincial or municipal governments, or associated as corporations or as individuals, had borrowed about two and a half billions of dollars, mostly from Great Britain. Since then, largely due to the war, our borrowings outside this country have increased by no less than another five hundred millions, and should the war last much longer I believe that the debt due by the Canadian people to the outside world will not be far from three and a half billions of dollars. The debt of the Federal Government will not reach this figure, but the total obligations of all Canadians to creditors outside Canada may do so.

What does this mean? It means that the interest on this amount will have to be paid yearly by Canada. It will not be paid in money; it will be paid in goods. And in what goods will it be paid? Taking the year 1914 as our last normal year, we find that the total exports of Canada amounted to $455,437,224, and of this amount only $67,602,238 worth was of manufactured goods. Can we look, under our present fiscal system, to any great increase in the export of manufactured goods? I answer "no," because the Canadian manufacturer operating under our present system is at once the victim as well as the beneficiary of that system. The Government, in attempting to reserve the home market for the native manufacturer necessarily by so doing increases the costs of production of the native manufacturer. One man's unfinished product is another man's raw material, and as the Government tries to encourage all manufacturers, it must inevitably, and does, increase the price to many manufacturers of the materials which enter into their finished products.

The only way we can meet our immense interest payments will be to increase the export of the great natural and extractive industries of this country. These are far and away greater, even under present conditions, than the export of manufactured goods. Thus, in 1914, we exported almost $207,000,000 of agricultural produce; just about $54,500,000 of animal and other produce; about $20,750,000 of fish; just over $43,300,000 of forest produce; considerably over $59,000,000 of mineral produce; just a little over $3,000,000 of miscellaneous produce—as against a little over $67,500,000 of manufactured goods.

How can we increase the produce of the farm, the mine, the sea, and the forest? By taking off the economic disabilities under which these producers at present suffer; by giving them their machinery of production at lower rates of duty, and by reducing all round their cost of operation.

In order that this country may face its debts in manful fashion and pay them we must enormously increase the rural population of Canada. What is the situation? In 1871 only fourteen out of every one hundred of the Canadian people lived in urban areas; in 1881, the proportion had not increased; by 1891, however, it had more than doubled, and thirty-one out of every hundred lived in urban areas. In 1901 the condition had become more intensive, and thirty-seven out of every hundred lived in a city or town, while in 1911 45½ persons out of every one hundred lived in an urban area, and to-day the best authorities tell me that fully one-half of the Canadian people live in urban areas. We have developed our towns and cities altogether beyond the power of the rural population to support them. We are in the position of an hotel proprietor who has built an hotel and equipped it for a thousand guests, and finds that only four hundred frequent his hostelry. His overhead charges are those involved in preparation for a thousand guests, but the receipts are those that come from only four hundred. The hotel may go bankrupt unless the number of guests can be substantially increased. We have got to increase the population of rural Canada. We cannot expect to attract or to hold the number of settlers which we otherwise would do unless we make living conditions, as far as we can, as easy, if not easier, than in the United States. We cannot ask the grain grower or stock raiser of the western prairie to compete with men in the same lines of business from the United States, from Australia, from the Argentine, unless we can get all the articles in his business and all the articles for his personal needs and those of his family at prices as low as those at which his competitor can satisfy his needs.

The economic effect of what I have just laid down will not be felt in its intensity so long as there is cheap land, but once the supply of cheap land comes to an end, then the full economic effect to which I have alluded will come into operation.

The burdens which the Canadian people will have to carry when this war is over will make it imperative that every ounce of the national energy, and every dollar of the national capital, be directed into those channels which will give the greatest economic return.

Again, we shall most of us agree that the fiscal policy of Canada must be in the future, as it has been in the past, greatly influenced by the fiscal policy of the United States. Now, what is their fiscal policy for the future likely to be? The war has made of the United States of America a great creditor nation instead of a great debtor nation. When this war is over, instead of the United States owing Europe for money borrowed in years gone by, Europe will owe the United States for money borrowed during the course of the war. Prior to the Civil War between the North and South of the United States, that country carried fifty per cent of its own exports and its own imports in its own ships; immediately prior to this war, it only carried ten per cent. The depredations of the Alabama, but in a greater degree the influence of a policy tending to reduce imports, was largely responsible for the diminution. But after this war, matters will have assumed a different aspect, and the United States will have become again a great shipbuilding power. Both of these facts will tend to accentuate the direction of the economic and fiscal thought of the American in the direction of a lower tariff. If the United States, now the greatest absolute free trading area in the world, shakes off the shackles of restriction and adopts the principle of liberty in regard to its commerce, it will be inevitable that Canada will be forced to follow suit.

And there is another reason why I would urge upon the House and upon the country the need for sound economic thought in regard to the tariff, and it is this: No one who has read anything of the diplomatic history of Europe for the last ten or fifteen years can have failed to be impressed with the fact that the scrambling among the European nations, either for new territory or spheres of influence in the uncivilized or less highly developed parts of the world, has been responsible for the generation of a great deal of international friction. What induced European nations to this policy? Some of them, to a certain extent, because they wished to enlarge the territorial limits within which their manufacturers would have a favoured market. Those among us who believe in the goodness of God and the sanity of mankind, look forward after this war to a world in which right and reason will reign, and we wish to eliminate from the world's economy those causes which intensify international jealousies and international rivalries; and many of us believe that in a world where trade was free in all parts, the occasions for international jealousies, international misunderstandings and international conflicts would largely diminish, if not entirely disappear. And it is our sincere wish that this country should not be the last in the movement towards a sound and reasonable internationalism.

In laying these proposals for a sound economic policy for Canada before this House, I maintain that no manufacturing industry, whose existence is justifiable in this country, will be in any way hurt. My desire is that all my Canadian fellow-citizens, in whatever employment they be engaged, should be both happy and prosperous. But I say this, that manufacturing cannot prosper unless Canada, as a whole, prospers; and that Canada cannot prosper under a policy of restriction. As to changes in our fiscal system, what I have to propose is "Reform not Revolution." I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a speech I once delivered in Calgary, in the hearing of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) and I remember expressing some tariff views at that time which did not receive altogether the approbation of that hon. gentleman. He thought that I was far too moderate in the reforms which I suggested. I hope that to-night when I have finished speaking, the same moderate reforms which I propose now, and which were unacceptable to him then, will be supported by him and that he will at least go as far as I am going to-night. We need a lower tariff in Canada, not only to remove the economic burdens which now rest on the national producers, but also that we can obtain more revenue for the state, because there are certain lines which are so highly protected to-day that importations in those lines are practically negligible and we get little or no revenue from them.

But I am willing to adopt the dictum of Woodrow Wilson who said: "The direction in which a party or individual is moving is a matter of principle; the speed with which the movement takes place is a matter of expediency." I am willing that we should go slow; I am willing to give every possible chance, to have every interest in this country adjust itself to what is before us. But I believe that in urging the

reconstruction of the tariff policy I am doing what is absolutely right.

I have endeavoured in my remarks to place before this House the serious financial situation with which this country is confronted. I have pleaded for economy, and I have advocated with all the force I possess the removal of the duties on agricultural implements, not only as a measure of justice to the agricultural interests in this country, but as a war measure. I have endeavoured to show that without a return to sound economic principles a most menacing future is before us. I have not painted the future in too dark colours. I have unbounded confidence in the ability, strength, industry and intelligence of the Canadian people. The future is not bright; the hill of difficulty is before us, but I believe that we can win through if we are a united people.

We on this side of the House have felt a great deal of pleasure this session. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because we have found some things which we had anticipated would occur have not happened. We had heard of a celebrated white horse. We had heard that this white horse was given to kicking, to rearing and biting. The horse was brought out, though not with the consent of the whole House. It required the united efforts of twenty-one men to bring that horse out of the stable. When the horse came out, we were pleased to find that it was a much maligned animal, that its behaviour was a great deal better than we had been led to suppose. Instead of rearing and kicking at us, the only kicks it gave were side kicks directed at the Minister of Justice; and it breathed kindly words about the gallant 22nd battalion. We found that this horse was not nearly such a vicious animal as we had thought he was.

There is something else that has delighted us in this House. That is the spirit of union which has been shown by members on the other side. We reciprocate those feelings. We believe that this nation will fall if divided; but we do not believe it will fall, because we believe that it will not be divided. We have a difficult future in front of us; we have a long hill to climb, but we believe that that hill can be climbed; we believe that, with unity, with the spirit of courage and perseverance, the difficulties which confront the Canadian people can be overcome.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Sir HERBERT AMES (St. Antoine): Mr. Speaker, we have, for the past hour, been listening to an address which reminds the older members of the House of ante-bellum days, when the good old discussions on the relative merits of tariff and free trade were frequent every session, and when a large part of the time of members of the House was taken up in considering which system was the more beneficial for the people of Canada.

I think we were all pleased this afternoon when the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) announced that there would be no tariff changes, not that the Acting Minister of Finance has not been asked to make tariff changes, because requests have come to him to make alterations in the tariff, but the Acting Minister of Finance, as the mouthiece of the Government, believes that this is not the time when non-essential questions that are likely to divide us should be thrown into the arena of this House.

I have been waiting for an amendment to be moved by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster)inasmuch as I have presumed that, after spending an hour in elaborating an idea, he would test the will of the House in respect to his proposals. He has not, however, seen fit to do so, although possibly an amendment along the lines he suggests may yet come from the other side. I trust it may not. I feel that it would be very much like what Hindenburg at present is trying to do, namely, to drive in a wedge between the point of contact of the allied armies.

An hon. MEMBER: It cannot be done.

Sir HERBERT AMES: The line has bent, but has not broken, overseas, and I think I can assure the member for Brome that if he endeavours to make an attack upon the point of contact where he thinks the two forces can be forced asunder, he will make a mistake so far as this side is concerned.

Now, I am going to ask hon. members to come back to the subject matter that was presented so earnestly and so ably this afternoon by the Acting Minister of Finance. I think we need, upon many of the matters that he has laid before us, the very best counsel, the very deepest thought, the very closest consideration; and I trust that we may not be diverted from the great issues which he has laid before us to-day. I was in this House when the Budget speech in the early part of 1914 was delivered, and I could not refrain from contrasting that occasion when I heard the

Budget speech being delivered to-day. The Finance Minister in the early part of 1914 in delivering his Budget speech, spoke of the prosperity of Canada. He had delivered a budget which had brought him congratulation, and which contained in it no cause for alarm. He had shown the House, I remember, that the total expenses of the year, on revenue and capital account combined, had been $163,000,000, and that entire sum had been met by the collections of that year, and that we had not added one dollar to our debt, may more, we had decreased our debt between 1911 and 1914. Canada was in a thoroughly sound and healthy condition, financially speaking. It was well that it was so, for we were destined shortly to be submitted to a trial greater than this nation had ever before been called upon to endure. It was well that we were financially sound in the early part of 1914, because the great war came upon us that summer, and found us in that respect as in many others, ready. When Parliament met in August, 1914, we had a short session, but a very momentous one. We were under the cloud of a great menace, possibly a disaster. Parliament wasted no time in debate, I can assure you, in that session. We passed the necessary appropriation, $50,000,000, the amount we thought sufficient at that time to enable us to raise our first fighting force. We passed other legislation to enable the Government to be carried on and to cope successfully with the situation, and we adjourned within two weeks. Parliament at that time gave its pledge, and gave it unanimously, that in so far as Canada was concerned, we were in the war for all we were worth, and that we would put into it all the men, money, munitions and food that was necessary to the extent of our ability, and we have kept that pledge. Our forces have grown from 50,000 to 100,000, from 100,000 to 250,000, from 250,000 to 500,000, each increase with the consent of Parliament, one step after another. To raise, equip, train, transport and maintain an army such as we have had and still have in the field; to care for the dependents of the soldiers and to look after those in need of pensions; to carry on all the other activities of the war, and at the same time to keep the regular functions of Government in operation, is an immense task. In our war record stupendous figures may be found. In the first year of the war we spent $60,000,000 for war purposes; in the second year, $166,000,000; in the third year, $306,000,000; in the fourth year $348,000,000—a constantly mounting expenditure; a total to the end of March, 1918, of no less than $880,000,000. If any one had predicted in the war session of 1914 that within three and a half years this war would cost us $880,000,000, that man would have been told by every financier in the country that Canada would be bankrupt long before any such sum could be raised. Yet as war needs came we have sanctioned one appropriation Bill after the other, each year meeting larger requirements — $50,000,000, $100,000,000, $250,000,000, $500,000,000; four successive war Bills aggregating $900,000,000, and we have had before the House this session another war Bill for $500,000,000, making a total of $1,400,000,000 voted by Parliament for war purposes since the outbreak of hostilities in 1914.

At the risk of laying before the House figures which are easily accessible to all and of repeating facts that all have heard, I purpose briefly to run over the financial history of the war to date so far as Canada is concerned. I do this because I feel that, as a preliminary step to the consideration of the measures which the Finance Minister will base on his Budget of to-day, it is desirable that we should be reminded of the various milestones which we have passed during the last four years; that we should realize what obstacles we have met and surmounted; that we should be able intelligently to pass in review those things which we have accomplished. To do that will make it possible for us more wisely to deal with legislation and more courageously to look into the future.

When Parliament assembled six months after the outbreak of the war the outlook was far from encouraging. There had been throughout the country a dislocation of business, a great uncertainty as to what might happen. All our borrowing was suddenly cut off, and Canada, which had been a debtor country ever since Confederation, found herself no longer the happy possessor of moneys pouring in at the rate of a million dollars a day. Our customs revenues greatly declined. We found ourselves face to face with a diminishing income and an increasing expenditure. A demand was made that public works should cease; I remember that I myself supported that demand. We now recognize that the Government did wisely in not suddenly putting to an end the public enterprises being prosecuted on capital account. These were continued in order that men might be able to find employment, that contractors might be kept solvent, that

the business credit of the country should be maintained. So it was that notwithstanding the war we completed the National Transcontinental railway, finished the Quebec bridge, and spent considerable moneys in continuing the Hudson Bay railway project and the Welland canal.

When the Finance Minister faced this House in February, 1915, it was to announce that he expected the war expenditure of the coming year to amount to $100,000,000; that his income was largely curtailed; that at the best he could not be expected to do any more than meet current account and capital expenditure; and that the entire war expenditure of that year would have to be made with borrowed money.

Other great wars have occurred in the world's history. Some of the older nations are more or less familiar with war, and a science of war finance seems to have grown up, which is useful to us in showing us what not to do—what we should avoid. In February, 1915, the Finance Minister, I have no doubt, read and pondered long. He was familiar with the history of the United States between 1860 and 1865, during the great American Civil War. He remembered the disasters that had come through war financing along wrong lines, and, profiting from that experience, he laid down and announced the policy which has been maintained and followed ever since, and to which we in large measure are indebted for our ability to stand the strain at the present time. I wish to touch on a few of the principles involved in this policy, to show how in the last four years they have been adhered to, enabling us to meet the emergency. I hope that we may be able to continue so to do.

Notwithstanding what the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) said this afternoon, I affirm that current expenditure has been stationary ever since the war began. That is to say, if you compare, year by year, the figures of the regular cost of running the Government, you will find that there has been no increase. If you take the total expenditure and deduct therefrom interest, pensions, and what has been neccessarily expended on the Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern railway systems, you will find that even to-day we are spending no more in the ordinary administration of Government—notwithstanding the fact that wages have increased and the cost of materials has advanced—than we were spending in the year prior to the war. The first sound principle, then, is that the regular current expenditure of the Government should be kept down to the lowest limit that can be adopted without sacrifice of efficiency.

The second principle laid down, doubtless based upon the American experience, was that our borrowings, as far as possible, should be long-dated. You will remember how the American Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Chase, in 1861 borrowed $250,000,000 at 7½ per cent and had to pay the Treasury notes within three years. He expected that the Civil War would last only six months, but long before that war ended he had to meet that $250,000,000 and he found it difficult indeed to pay. You will remember how he started, first in comparatively small amounts, to issue legal tender notes without gold support, and once having begun, he had to keep on going the wrong way. You remember how the banks, within a year after the opening of the war, discontinued specie payments, and how it took the United States fifteen years to bring up to par the $433,000,000 of paper money that had been issued during that time, the value of which during the dark days of the war went down as low as forty cents on the dollar. When you compare the experience of the United States during that period with our own financing, you will agree that we have every reason for congratulation. So our Government laid down the second principle that the money that had to be borrowed should be obtained on long terms. Out of the $900,000,000 that has been authorized for borrowing since the war began, only $100,000,000 is payable in the near future. That is the loan to be paid, I understand, in New York this summer, for which ample provision has already been made. The Victory Loan, which to-day represents sixty per cent of our whole war borrowings, is payable as follows: forty-three per cent in five years, that is in 1922; fourteen per cent in ten years, that is in 1927; and forty-three per cent in twenty years, that is in 1937. The other loans are payable in 1925, 1931 and 1937. Therefore, when the war is over—and we hope it will end at no distant date—as the moneys that have been borrowed to enable us to carry it on are distributed in their payments over a term of nearly twenty years, it will be possible for subsequent Ministers of Finance to pick up those loans, one by one as they mature, and consolidate our war indebtedness and, in that way, escape the disaster which our American friends in the Civil War found it so difficult to avoid.

The third principle that has been carried out in our war financing so far has been this, that at least a considerable portion of

the war cost has been paid each year out of revenue. It is sound to affirm that it is the part of posterity to carry a portion of the load, inasmuch as we are to-day fighting to preserve the inheritance of those who may come after us; but it is equally true that those of us who are alive to-day, especially those of us who are here in Canada, should, as the war goes on, carry as much of the burden as we are able, so that we at home may be making a sacrifice to some extent commensurate with the sacrifices that our brave lads are making overseas. That we are doing this is shown by a very simple calculation. When the war started, our net debt was $336,000,000. On the 31st of March, 1918, it stood at $1,106,000,000. Obviously, then, our funded debt had been increased since the outbreak of the war by $770,000,000. We have already seen that our war cost to date has been $880,000,000. Consequently if we have only increased the debt by $770,000,000 and have spent up to date on the war $880,000,000, we must have paid at least $110,000,000 out of revenue. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was this afternoon arguing in favour of a sinking fund. It is true that our loans, with the exception of the £5,000,000 loan, borrowed in London early in the war, have no sinking fund. But what better sinking fund can you possibly have than our action during the last few years? We can hardly be expected to extinguish the already incurred debt as we go along, but if we can each year prevent its increase by $35,000,000 surely that is a sinking fund of the very best character. If we can go on paying $35,000,000 of our war cost each year during the war (and if we can do it during the war, we surely can do it when the war is over) we could, in twenty-eight years, pay off an indebtedness of $1,500,000,000 with interest computed at 4 per cent. Consequently, a sinking fund does not seem to us necessary or desirable, for I am certain if we can continue to bear the same share of the load as we have thus far carried, we shall be doing our fair share as we go along.

It is very difficult to ascertain for a country what part of war expenditure should be borrowed and what part should be taken out of revenue. The character of finance differs in every country. It depends upon the conditions that prevail in the country. It is impossible to say that because other countries do thus and so, we should follow along identical lines. For example, France and Italy are not able to pay out of revenue one dollar of their war expenditure. Great Britain, in 1916-1917, paid out of revenue 17 per cent of her total war expenditure after covering all other expenditures. The United States, in the first year of the war, when they voted $20,000,000,000, arranged that 14 per cent of that amount should be paid out of taxation. Circumstances differ in different countries, but it seems to me that as long as we in Canada are paying one-ninth, or 11 per cent, of our war debt as we go along, we are bearing all that can be reasonably expected.

Of course, most of the money that is used by Canada in prosecuting this war is borrowed. That would have to be the case, but the history of our borrowing, since the war began, makes a story of which we have no reason to be ashamed, a story which, in fact, it would do us good to repeat frequently, because it reflects credit upon Canadian patriotism, resourcefulness and courage. I am going for a few minutes to go over that record. I know it is familiar to most of the members of the House, but it can do no harm to put it clearly before us at the beginning of this debate, so that subsequently it will not be necessary to repeat figures that will by that time be familiar to all. For half a century prior to the war practically all our borrowings, both for public and private ends, for Governments, federal and provincial, municipalities and corporations, came from Great Britain. We always turned to London when we wanted to borrow money. Naturally, when the war broke out, we looked to the Mother Land. At first she gave us temporary help. Within a few months of the outbreak of war we had borrowed from her $60,000,000. By March, 1915, our unfunded indebtedness had reached the sum of $100,000,000, but the Government and especially the Minister of Finance of the day had no intention that the system of temporary borrowing should be allowed to continue any longer than could be helped. Consequently as soon as conditions became better, and the money markets of the world were beginning to settle again, he went out to secure long term loans. Of course, he turned to Great Britain for the first loan. In March, 1915, he got £5,000,000 at 4½ per cent in London. Then, as hon. members know, intimation came from across the sea that Great Britain had all she could do to finance her own war expenditure, and Canada, if she could do so, was requested to find elsewhere the moneys

she needed. We then turned to the United States, but the United States at that time was not at war, and it would have been an unfriendly act had the United States lent to Canada money to be expended in arms and ammunition to fight a nation with whom the United States was not then at war. While, however, the letter of the law could not be broken, there was a way in which the spirit of the law might be evaded. We were able to borrow from the United States on the understanding that the money thus secured would not be spent for war purposes. We, of course, used that money for purposes of peaceful development, but we were enabled to that extent to set free other moneys for purposes of war. We borrowed $45,000,000 in New York and paid it back within two years, and then, by the Public Service Loan of 1916, we borrowed $75,000,000 more. It was not long before the United States decided that they could lend us no more money. They too went into the war and we, shut off from Great Britain and from America, found it necessary to fall back upon our own resources. Canada appealed in confidence to her own people, and she did not appeal in vain. Then began that wonderful career of Canadian domestic borrowing, a performance we have every reason to be proud of.

Our first Canadian loan was floated in November of 1915. We called for $50,000,000 and were very timorous as to whether that sum would be raised; that was shown by the fact that we got the banks to underwrite it. But when the subscriptions came to be opened we found they totalled $100,000,000, eighty millions of which came from the Canadian people and only twenty millions from the banks.

Eleven months later it was necessary to float another loan, and it was again to the Canadian people we turned in October of 1916. The second Canadian war loan called for $100,000,000 and you all remember that $201,000,000 was subscribed.

Seven months went by and again we appealed to our people to help us finance the war, and in March of 1917 the third Canadian war loan of $150,000,000 was issued and $265,000,000 was subscribed by our people; nothing whatever was taken or asked from the banks. When certain conversions had been made it was found as a result of that loan that 70 per cent of that $265,000,000 was new money which the Canadian people had loaned to us for carrying on the war.

Needless to say, the Finance Minister and the Government were encouraged at the splendid manner in which the Canadian people on three successive occasions, had responded to the appeal that had been made to them to put their savings in the hands of the Government for war purposes. Then the fourth, the great Victory Loan, was launched. We have heard this afternoon from the Acting Minister of Finance of the preparations that were made, of how widespread and extensive and intelligent they were, of how it became possible to bring the necessities of the Government and the advantages of the loan under the notice of practically every man, woman and child in Canada. Nominally the loan was for $150,000,000; that was the sum that was asked of the Canadian people. It was known, however, and generally admitted that the Government would take whatever sum was subscribed; there was no limit to the amount they were prepared to receive. The Victory Loan brought in $398,000,000 of new money besides about $150,000,000 of conversions which, of course, do not count as new money.

Let me recapitulate for a moment the history of those loans because I think when we see them in their magnitude and in their completeness we shall realize that they give us cause for congratulation and ground for hope. We put confidence in our own people, and that confidence we found to be well placed. Of our entire outstanding securities, $75,000,000 of the war debt is in the hands of Canadians, or 85 per cent of the whole. Just think what that will mean after the war. We may have hard times and it may be difficult for the Government to finance in years to come after the war is over, but our war debt is not held by a stranger nation that can take us by the throat and make us pay whether we will or not. Our war loans will be held by our own Canadian people with whom we can treat and from whom we can always be sure of sympathetic consideration.

Now I want to call the attention of the House to a remarkable feature of these loans—a feature which I think gives us the greatest of hope for the future, and that is the ever-widening distribution among the people of Canada of our securities. To the first loan one person out of every three hundred of our population subscribed; that is, about one-fortieth of the families of Canada may be said to have bought a bond. To the second loan one person in two hundred and thirty of our population subscribed, and to the third loan one in one hundred and ninety. To the last loan one

in ten of our population subscribed; in other words, computing five persons to a family, it would mean that in every other home throughout Canada there has lodged a bond of the Victory Loan. The average subscription for the second and third loans was $6,000; that means there must have been a great many large subscribers and that the earlier loans must have been mainly taken up by the capitalists. But the average subscription to the victory loan was $500, showing that there must have been tens of thousands of small subscribers in order to bring the average down to that figure. If we compare this record with that of the American loans I think we have cause for congratulation. The second great American Liberty Loan—we cannot speak of the third because it will not be completed until the end of this week—was for three billion dollars—twenty times our loan of $150,000,000. One to twenty does not adequately represent the difference between the wealth of the United States and that of Canada. It should be far easier for the United States to raise three billions than it is for us to raise one hundred and fifty millions, and yet we find that while their loan was over-subscribed only 54 per cent, our loan was over-subscribed 180 per cent. One in eleven of their population subscribed to their loan, and one in ten to our loan. But lest we might be unduly conceited comparing ourselves with others on this same continent, we have only to cast our eyes across the seas and note what is being done in the Motherland when they appeal to their people to take up their borrowings. The British loan of 1917 had eight million buyers, a little better than one in six of the entire population, which means pretty nearly a bond for every home in England. The next time we float a loan in Canada we shall have the British standard to endeavour to measure up to.

Just here and now may I put in a word with respect to the next loan that Canada must float. She will need every ounce of strength she has to raise the money required. She will need the hearty co-operation of every member of this House in his own constituency to explain to his people the financial condition of Canada, to arrange for the widest possible publication of the needs of the case, and every man here should feel that this summer his duty lies in his own constituency to help in every conceivable way in making the next great loan that will be financed in Canada a great success.

We have been listening this afternoon to some new taxation proposals. Each successive budget since the war commenced has brought in new methods of taxation. In the new budget some of the present taxes have been increased and new ones have been added. The taxation that we have had in the last four years has in the main been just, based upon the principle of not reducing the productivity of Canadian enterprise, but it is not entirely without criticism, as I shall venture to suggest before I take my seat. We are now called upon to consent to greater taxation, and exercising the time honoured privilege ever since Magna Charta of a member of an assembly such as this, we shall one and all criticise these taxation proposals if we see fit. Our criticism of them and our counsel regarding them will, I think, be wiser if we briefly go over together the previous steps that have led up to these proposals, because knowing what has already been done we shall perhaps be more ready and willing to do what is necessary in the future.

War taxation is always heavier than other taxation and that for two reasons. Usually in war time there is greater prosperity, there is more money going from hand to hand, and also in war time there is a greater willingness on the part of the people to give, and give liberally, of their means when required for the defence of the State. Therefore, taxes which in peace time would be resented by our people are accepted willingly at this time, especially if they are satisfied that the burden is being distributed impartially.

When our first war Parliament met very little additional taxation was proposed. The war had only commenced and the Minister of Finance had had very little time to prepare for the raising of additional revenue. All that was done to bring in increased revenue was to make a few changes in the excise.

In the next war Parliament we found that the Minister of Finance had had time to carefully study the situation and he came into the House with thoroughly considered proposals designed to increase the public revenue. The War Appropriation Bill, brought down in February, 1915, called for $100,000,000. The minister's estimate of the total requirements for the year, current and war, was $285,000,000. The revenue in sight was $135,000,000. So that in the second year of the war, the Minister of Finance looked forward to a deficit that had to be overcome of $150,000,000. The measures that were resorted to to increase the rev-

enue were mainly increases in the Customs. There was a general increase in the rate of duties as you will remember, of seven and a half per cent and five per cent. For the benefit of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who has been labouring here this evening to create the impression that agricultural implements were always unfavourably treated, I would like to have him read in the statutes of that year the express provision by which there was made exempt from the additional tariff the following items: wheat, flour, tea, anthracite coal, fish from Newfoundland, salt for curing fish, lines, twines, nets and hooks for the fisheries, reapers, mowers, binders, harvesters, binder twine, traction ditching machines, sugar, tobacco, newsprint paper, and a few other articles. It was recognized by the Government of the day, and at a time when there was no infusion of Liberal members in its ranks, that while additional tariff rates were to be placed upon all other articles, the articles which helped the fishermen to catch more fish and the farmer to grow more crops were not to have their rates advanced. The measure advancing the rate of customs taxation introduced in February, 1915, yielded considerable revenue. I would like to have my friends realize that this was not a measure of protection; at least it was not enacted with that intention in view. It was a measure intended to increase the revenue, and it did increase the revenue as was expected and desired. That special taxation which took the form of an advance in customs rates gave us an increased revenue in 1915-16 of $25,000,000; in 1916-17 of $37,800,000; and in 1917-18 of $45,000,000. The alterations that were made in the tariff at that time have since yielded us about $108,000,000, and are still going strong, yielding $40,000,000 and upwards each year.

10 p.m.

Up to that time the Federal Government had indulged in indirect taxation only. A few measures were now introduced directly taxing certain corporations. The banks were taxed upon their note circulation, which tax has been yielding about $1,000,000 a year. The incomes of trust and loan companies and the premiums of insurance companies were brought under taxation that year, and that tax has been yielding $1,500,000 a year. Railway and other tickets were taxed, and that tax has been bringing us about $1,000,000 a year. Stamp duties on bottles and packages have brought in $1,000,000 a year; and the advance in the postage rate from two to three cents has provided us with from $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 a year. So that when the Minister of Finance found himself faced with requirements amounting to $150,000,000, he brought in new measures and managed to pull up his revenues from $135,000,000 to $172,000,000, and, of course, the balance had to be borrowed. But that year we borrowed only the cost of the war.

The third War Parliament met and found the war still continuing. We found the expenditure going up, the demands increasing. The War Appropriations Bill called for $250,000,000. That, added to the other expenditures, capital and current, made the total expenditure that had to be provided for in 1916-17, $415,000,000. Still further taxation had to be imposed. By the spring of 1916, conditions in Canada had changed for the better. Business was improving. The crops in 1915 had been extremely good and prices were high. The munition factories had accommodated themselves to the new order of things and were able to manufacture at a profit. The trade balance, which had been adverse, gradually swung around to the other side, and became favourable. Canada was in a ripe condition for taxation, and the Government took a strong forward step and brought in the first real measure of direct taxation that we have ever known. That was the business profits war tax. That was presented and defended on the principle that those who during the war were making extra profits, either directly or indirectly because the State was at war, should be called upon to yield in whole or in part those profits for the defence of the State. The principle being sound, Parliament passed that measure. The result is that the Government takes one dollar out of four on earnings above seven per cent by every corporation and above ten per cent by every individual. This measure exempted businesses under $50,000, but to-day we learn from the Acting Finance Minister that the Government has decided to make that exemption $25,000, a provision which, I think we all agree, is much more satisfactory. That business war profits tax has yielded large revenue, as it was expected to do. It produced in the first year $12,500,000, and in the second year, $21,271,000. The revenue for the third year is not yet reported, but it will probably be about $25,000,000, because the rate has been increased. In 1916-17, with a total expenditure of $485,000,000, $233,000,000 was met out of revenue. The minister had pulled the revenue up from $172,000,000 in

the previous year to $233,000,000, and after paying all our running expenses and all charges upon capital account, we were able to contribute $60,000,000 out of the taxation of that year towards the cost of the war.

Those of us who were here have reason to remember the fourth War Parliament, the Long Parliament, that lasted from February until September, a Parliament in which the issues were to some extent obscured because of the contention of parties. The Government in respect to taxation enunciated a policy in the spring, another policy in the summer and still another policy as fall drew near. The outlook was for an enlarged expenditure; all the former taxes were continued and the business tax was increased. Now the business tax had been twenty-five per cent, or one dollar out of four on all profits above seven per cent, but it was suddenly increased at this session. It was made to yield far more than before, and on that I shall later say a few words.

I think I can affirm, without any fear of contradiction, that it was not the original intention of the Government last year to introduce an income tax—in fact, the Finance Minister early in the parliamentary session distinctly stated that he would not —but he was more or less stampeded, I believe, in the matter. However, the income tax was introduced, it came to stay, none of us to-day are asking for it to be abolished; in fact, we expect that it is to the income tax we shall have to look henceforth for the main portion of our war revenue.

The financial statement for 1917-18, the year which ended a few weeks ago, was presented by the Acting Finance Minister this afternoon. It is practically on a par with the preceding statements. It shows that the total expenditure last year was $525,000,000, and that the revenue had again showed a material increase. It had been pulled up from $233,000,000 to $258,000,000; and once again we paid all our current expenses, all our capital expenditure out of revenue, and had $55,000,000 to pay on war account.

If you add these figures together it will give us a four years' survey, and make it possible for us to see just what Canada has done since the war began. It is partly due, I admit, to business prosperity, and largely due to the willingness on the part of our people to accept the taxation measures which were voted by successive Parliaments, but we have during those four years increased the annual revenue by $100,000,000. To-day we are receiving from the people sixty-five per cent more than we were taking from them when the war began. We have met all our current expenditure during the last four years out of revenue; we have paid $130,000,000 of capital expenditure which it is presumed for the most part has gone into productive enterprises; we have cancelled $100,000,000 of our war debt; and we have done that out of the money the people have given us as we have gone along year by year during those four years. I think that is a record of which we have every reason to be proud, a record that even at this time —after four years of war, when everybody is girding up his loins for a renewed effort —gives us confidence in the stability of our Canadian financial institutions, confidence in the willingness of our people, and confidence that even if this terrible war continues we shall be able, for some years at least, to carry on as before; and we shall need all our courage and all our devotion for the task that is ahead.

The Acting Finance Minister to-day gave us the figures for the coming year—staggering figures, tremendous figures. The war estimate for the coming year $425,000,000; consolidated fund estimates $225,000,000; capital expenditure $30,000,000; in all $680,000,000, four times the entire revenue of Canada at the time the war broke out. That is the sum that we have got to meet. The taxes that have been to-day outlined, together with those that are being continued, are expected to bring in $270,000,000, and $410,000,000 remain. We have left on hand of moneys that came from the Victory Loan $130,000,000, so we have to provide for $280,000,000 more. That will only carry us from August to the end of March. The next loan necessary to be floated will probably be a loan for a year's needs, and in all likelihood we shall require to ask the people of Canada for from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 in the next great loan campaign that will come, I presume, early next fall. It is on that account that I was pleading a moment ago that every member of this House should realize the enormity of the task, and also the part which he, individually, is called upon to play in enabling the Government to secure the needed money.

Before sitting down I want to make a few observations with regard to some of the taxation proposals. I listened very attentively this afternoon to the Acting Minister of Finance, I think I heard most of the things that he said, but some of the

declarations that I had been hoping to hear were not uttered. It will be a disappointment to some of our people if the business tax is allowed to remain another year as it is. I think it is excessive as amended last session, and I cannot but feel that the Government were stampeded then when they increased the rates of that tax. I am making no plea for individuals, I am not asking that the money which reaches an individual should be in any way exempted from the full taxation that it to-day bears. The plea that I am making is in the national interest, not in the interest of the individual; tax him as heavily as you like. But the members of this Government and the members of the House must look forward; they must remember that the day is coming when this war will end; they must remember that the day is coming when they will need that every industrial enterprise in this country shall be solvent, be able to pay its debts, be able to continue to employ its workmen, and be able to find places for the thousands of returned soldiers that are coming back to us. There will necessarily be after this war a tremendous readjustment; there will necessarily be a considerable deflation. Where are the industries of Canada to obtain the additional capital that they will require after the war to enable them to readjust themselves to post-war conditions? They cannot get it in Great Britain; there will be no more capital coming from Great Britain for some years to come. They will not get it from the United States because the United States will also probably have absorbed nearly all its liquid capital in the enormous loans that they are now placing with their people. They will not get it from our banks in Canada, because our banks after the war will be making arrangements for deflation, and they are not going to allow any money to be put into bricks and mortar—that we may be sure of. Where are our business firms going to get money that is necessary to make the readjustments that must be made after the war? There is only one place they can get it: they must save it now as they go along; consequently if the business profits tax is so excessive that it does not permit a corporation to retain a reasonable amount of undistributed capital so as to be strong after the war, and to make the necessary adjustments, that corporation will then be at a tremendous disadvantage. My contention is that the sliding scale of the business profits tax is too abrupt; it is far more onerous than the American business profits tax.

[Sir H. Ames.]

If, for example, you had two firms on opposite sides of the Detroit river, one at Windsor and one at Detroit, and each had a capital of $300,000, and those two firms each made 25 per cent profit on a year's business, the firm on the Canadian side would pay $24,750 in taxes, or one-third of its total profits, and the firm on the American side would pay $12,150, or one-sixth of what it had made.

What is going to happen after the war? American and Canadian firms will be called upon to compete in the markets of the world. American firms have already had two years' start. They had two years before they were taxed at all during which they made enormous war profits and laid aside great sums of money. Hereafter they can put aside each year twice as much as we can. Of these two firms, the American company would have $400,000 capital at the end of three years, and the Canadian $360,000. If we are going to compete in the markets of the world with our friends to the south of us we must permit our industries to have the same chance to live that they have. What I point out is this: In Canada the state takes one-quarter of all the profits between 7 and 15 per cent. In the United States, if a corporation can show that they have been making seven, eight, or nine per cent in pre-war times they are allowed exemption to that amount. On profits between 9 and 15 per cent they would only have to pay 20 per cent, against Canada's 25 per cent; between 15 and 20 per cent, the American rate of taxation is 25 per cent, or one-half that in Canada for the same percentage. The rate in Canada for profits of 20 per cent and over is 75 per cent, in the United States 35 per cent for profits of 20 to 25 per cent. Consequently it will be seen that we take away from our Canadian firms under certain conditions twice as much as would be taken in the United States under similar conditions. Only the other day I saw the statement of a business firm in which this significant clause occurred: "We have during the last year declared dividends on our preferred and common stock, but the tax we have paid the Government is a larger sum than those dividends combined."

Now, my contention is this: Earnings should pay taxes at their destination, not at their source. If you take these dividends and tax them before they are distributed while they are still in the hands of the corporation, they can be used to increase its

productivity and the productivity of the country at large. That it is not the place to tax them excessively. When these dividends have been distributed, when they come to you and to me and reach their final destination, tax them then as heavily as you like, because so long as these dividends are undistributed in the coffers of the corporation they are used for the public good in increasing the production of the country. But when they come to me, I can do anything I like with them, I can spend them in any frivolous way I want to. It is proper for the Government to say: we are going to take such a large amount of your dividends, which are your own exclusive personal property, that you will not be able to indulge in these frivolities, but that money will have to go for war purposes. That is fair to my mind. But, in my judgment, it is unwise to tax too heavily undistributed earnings of industrial enterprises of the country.

I have even another proposal to make to the Government, a proposal that I wish other ministers were present to listen to. It is this: If you cannot see your way clear to reduce in any way the severity of that schedule where it takes 50 and 75 per cent, then permit a company to take part of the money which it would pay you in taxation, half of it, let us say, and invest it in Government bonds. You get the money immediately just the same for war purposes. Let these bonds be registered bonds if you like; let them be non-interest bearing bonds for the time. Make it impossible for these bonds to be disposed of unless the minister's permission is given. Now, what do I mean by that? I mean just this: that these business firms, who will have to make industrial readjustments after the war will feel that if they go to the minister and show him that that money will be used in necessary alterations to their plants, the minister will release these bonds and allow them to be sold for the credit of the company. In that way, a company will feel that it has something to fall back upon, and that it will be able, after the war, to find that capital which it cannot find in England or the United States, or secure from the banks of Canada. It would thus be able to get a certain portion of the capital required for its development.

As regards income tax, I have only a few observations to make. Until the war came, the Federal Government always relied upon indirect taxation for its revenue. The business war profits tax and the income tax were the first real measures we have had of direct taxation. We used to leave direct taxation to the provinces. I believe British Columbia is the only province which has really imposed that tax to an extent that the people feel. The war has forced upon us the direct tax, and we are likely hereafter to secure a very large portion of our revenues from such taxation. Last year, when we met here, we passed the income tax. At that time the United States was considering amendments to their Act. Since Parliament adjourned a year ago, the United States have passed an amended income tax, and I was glad to-day to see that the Acting Minister of Finance was proposing to modify our income tax very much along the same lines as the American income tax of October, 1917. I wonder if he realizes what it is going to mean to reduce his exemption from $3,000 to $2,000, in the case of married men, and from $1,500 to $1,000 in the case of single men? I think our exemption has been too high. I have many a time said from the public platform that unless a man was earning $10 a day every working day of the year, the income tax would not touch him. That is quite true. A single man has had to make $5 a day in order to pay income tax. Now, we are going to tax incomes from $2,000 upwards. In addition to that, there is to be an exemption for each child under the ages where they cannot work. What did the United States find when they reduced their exemption from $4,000 to $2,000 in the case of married men, and from $3,000 to $1,000 in the case of single men? They found that it multiplied the number of contributors eight times. Our income tax at the present time will touch only about one per cent of our whole population. I very much doubt whether there will be one hundred thousand people paying such a tax this year under the legislation passed last year. You will have eight times as many under the new proposals, if our experience is the same as the United States. And that is right, because the experience of every one who has touched the great heart of the Canadian people at this time since the war began is that the people as a whole are sympathetic. I have had experience with the Patriotic Fund for four years, and I know that we get thousands of subscriptions from people making less than $10 a day, and I know that the people are ready and willing to bear their fair share of the war taxation, and the widening of the base of taxation suggested this afternoon will meet, I think,

and should meet, with universal approval. I understand that in Great Britain an exemption of only $750 of income is allowed, the normal tax being six shillings to the pound, or 30 per cent. On an income of £2,500, or $12,500, 52 per cent would have to be given to the British Government. Our taxation is a long way from being so heavy as that.

I wish to say just a word about the Patriotic Fund. As honorary secretary of this great national benefaction, it has fallen upon me to see that the revenue is provided for carrying on its work. We have to pay out nearly $1,000,000 every month for the assistance of over 50,000 families. The burden is distributed throughout Canada probably better than any taxation measure the Government has brought in. Practically every one has been contributing directly or indirectly to the Patriotic Fund, and if the Fund continues on its present basis until the end of the fiscal year we shall probably have received upwards of $50,000,000—an accomplishment in patriotic giving of which the people of Canada have every reason to be proud. But it is needless to deny that we look forward with alarm to the effect that all these taxes are going to have upon our income. The imposition of heavy business and income taxes considerably lessens not the willingness, but the actual power of companies and individuals to give. We have found that people, particularly of the industrial classes, who buy bonds and pay for them by instalments cannot at the same time contribute to the Patriotic Fund. The Government, therefore is encroaching largely on our sources of revenue, and moreover is in their various loan campaigns utilizing our workers and causing them to be so fatigued that they are unable to take up Patriotic Fund campaigns as well. Our problem is this: shall we try to continue to get the moneys as we have done, or shall we ask the Federal Government, which has so impaired our revenues, to make good the difference? The difficulty is that the taxes which have been placed upon the country by the Government do not reach alike all sections of the Dominion. They do heavily affect the city centres; they do affect men who are contributing out of salary or wages. But we get fully half of our revenue today by taxation, voluntarily levied by provinces, municipalities, county councils, township councils, on the realty within the area that makes the contribution. What are we going to do about that? Here is a source of revenue which the Federal Government has not yet exploited.

[Sir H. Ames.]

If the Government say to us: "We will not expect you to raise any more money in the way you have done throughout the country," might they not resort to the same method of taxation that has been employed on our behalf in rural districts? I made the suggestion the other night to one of the ministers—I make it again, more tentatively than seriously—that if the Patriotic Fund at the end of the present fiscal year pulls out of the field, so to speak, and tells all the provinces, municipalities, county councils and township councils that they need not tax themselves any more for its support, will the Government take over that source of revenue, levy a tax of, say, one or two mills on the realty of the country from one end to the other, and give us our share of the sum so collected? In any event, while it will not be necessary during the present fiscal year to ask the Finance Minister to put into the Budget any sum for the Patriotic Fund, in all probability when Parliament assembles again in 1919 we shall have to confess that we cannot raise the necessary sums in the old way and we shall have to ask the Government, which has encroached upon all our sources of revenue save one, to come to our aid after April 1, 1919, and take care of it thereafter.

I have a few more suggestions to make, and possibly the Acting Minister of Finance and such other members of the Government as are here will make note of them. I was talking the other day with one of the largest exporters of pulp and paper from this country. He drew my attention to the fact that we were losing a large amount of revenue through clause 3C of the Business Profits War Tax Act. He has to pay a very large portion of his business profits tax to the United States, and we, on the submission of proof that that has been done, do not collect that amount from him. But there is no reciprocal arrangement with the United States in that regard. I suggest to the Acting Finance Minister that an arrangement be made under which, in cases where taxation now paid to the United States Government really belongs to us, we may either in like manner secure taxation belonging to them or be allowed to collect taxes on profits which are really earned in this country and let them do the same.

I point out also to the acting minister—with all due deference, and with no intention of raising a hornet's nest about my ears—that those engaged in the business of farming and stock raising are wholly

exempt from the terms of the Business Profits Tax Act. I happen to know of a farmer in Southern Alberta whose revenue last year was an amount running into six figures. He is in the grain growing business, and is not touched by the Business Profits War Tax Act. I know also of a rancher not far from Calgary who made several hundred thousand dollars last year through raising horses as a business—and he pays no business profits tax, because his business is exempted under the statute. Those who are engaged in raising grain and cattle and horses would not object if they were included among those who are liable to the business profits tax and given the same opportunity which the rest of us have to contribute toward the expenses of the war. It is true that they pay income tax, but that amounts to probably only one-third as much as would be paid under the business profits tax.

It will be necessary for us in every way to stimulate the sale of our bonds. The manager of a trust company with whom I was in conversation the other day pointed out to me how difficult it often was to pay the succession duties in connection with an estate out of its liquid assets. Particularly in war time, a large number of securities are far below their normal value, and, in order that the succession tax should be paid, it is often necessary to sell securities at a figure which causes considerable pain to the trustee. Would it not be possible for the Federal Government to persuade the treasurers of the provinces to accept Government bonds in payment of succession taxes? In that way a man who was making his will and felt that the time was coming when his estate should be liquidated, would buy a certain amount of Government bonds, knowing that they were as good as cash for the payment of succession taxes, and that the shinkage would not be the same as it might otherwise be.

I would also ask the acting minister to consider the matter of the limitation of exemption from taxation of future Government bonds. A very large share of the wealth of the country is passing into Government bonds; we may have several billions of them before we are through. Every time that an investment that is taxable passes into a Government bond, it ceases to be revenue producing so far as we are concerned. While it may be subject to a provincial tax, it cannot be taxed by the Federal Government unless the Federal Government breaks its plighted word. We should consider that what may be perfectly justifiable with $500,000,000 Government bonds outstanding, may be dangerous if we have $1,500,000,000 or $2,000,000,000, because the time may come when a very large portion of the wealth of this country may be in Government bonds and may be held in such large sums that some people whom we feel we ought to tax will be entirely exempt.

I apologize for having taken up so much of the time of the House. I have, I know, laid before the House figures which are accessible to all and facts with which every one of us is probably already acquainted, but I have done that because I thought it was desirable at this time that we should get back to the real question at issue—how are we going to bear the financial burden entailed by this war? We are about to assume new burdens. If an election was in sight, I would say that we feel very much like the gladiators who exclaimed, "We, about to die, salute you." We shall no doubt, receive objections from our electors to this taxation. We must be prepared to defend the action of the Government in this regard, and as I said some time ago, we must, one and all, endeavour to help the Government in the flotation of its loans. The review of what Canada has accomplished during the last four years in financing this war will not only enable us more intelligently to deal with the problems of to-day, but should give us courage and inspiration for the future.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make the remarks which I believe it is my duty to make on the present occasion, I wish to say that at this hour I intend to be as brief as possible. I wish to express a few sentiments which it has been my pleasant duty to express in four Parliaments in succession before this one which it has been my privilege to attend as a member of the House of Commons. In facing the House to-night I find myself in circumstances quite different from those in which I have been during the last eighteen years I have sat in this House. In former years, sitting on the same side as the acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), I was always ready to stand by him and to applaud his remarks which were in favour of free trade or tariff reform for Canada. To-day I find that he has taken another position; that he is in the new Government called the "Union Government." I have no doubt that, impelled by conscientious motives, the Acting Minister of Finance and some others of our friends have left our revered leader and the Liberal party on this side in order

in their judgment better to give their support in carrying on the affairs of the country. My hon. friend will perhaps allow me to say that similar conscientious motives have not permitted me to follow him, and I have remained true to my conscience and persuasions, faithful to the leader of the Liberal party. I came into this House eighteen or nineteen years ago, an ardent admirer of the true principles of British Liberalism, of which our leader was a successful exponent in this country until, in perhaps his greatest effort in that direction which was to make Canada still happier than it had been during the fifteen years of his administration, which was to make Canada the happiest country in the world, he was defeated in 1911 on account, as I have already said in this Parliament, of the false judgment of the people of Canada at that time. Peoples, like individuals, at times make mistakes. At that time the present Acting Minister of Finance considered that the majority of the people of Canada had made a mistake in not accepting the policy proposed by the leader of the Government of that day, and that if they had accepted it, Canada would have been more prosperous than it was when war broke out.

About four years ago when war was declared, I came to this Parliament with the intention of being heart and soul in the war and also with the intention of putting forth every effort in my power in the constituency from which I come. I am still of the same opinion, willing and determined to render every possible assistance to the carrying on of the war. It has never entered my mind, nor the minds of the people whom I have the honour to represent, that Canada should for one day cease to participate in this war with all its resources in men and money. In 1914, I was in favour of Canada's participation in the war under the voluntary system. I appealed to my people to support the noble cause for which our aid was asked. The people of my constituency, people of French extraction, if we take into consideration the conditions under which they are living, responded as nobly, gloriously and generously as the people of any other constituency in the Maritime Provinces or any other provinces. My people still hold the same views. During the last campaign I and others of the Liberal party were represented as being disloyal to the Crown, as not being in sympathy with the aims of the war nor with the maintenance of the British flag. I need not repeat that I, for one, believe that we in Canada are to-day fighting, not only for the relief of Belgium, for the cause of France and of the British Empire, but for the freedom of worship and language which we enjoy under the British Crown and which we could not enjoy under any other flag.

I must congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance on his Budget, and he will always hear from me when congratulations are in order. He has determined to raise the income tax. This tax which was introduced last session has been welcomed by the country. If the acting Minister of Finance will allow me to say so, an income tax has been urged from this side of the House for many years particularly since the war began and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who has urged the Government with all his eloquence to impose this tax ever since the war began has always found in me a very humble and very sincere follower in this matter. It was my pleasure last session to suggest that the income tax should be made as high as it is in the United States, and I am proud to see that the acting minister has taken a step in that direction, and is placing the burden of war on the shoulders of those best able to bear it. I am sure that every true Canadian, millionaire and semi-millionaire, will generously pay the tax in order to maintain Canada's part in the war.

But there is one feature of the Budget that has been a disappointment to me. I am sure the people of Canada will be disappointed to-night. They expected that agricultural implements, at all events, would have been put on the free list. The failure to do so will be a great disappointment not only to the farmers of the West, upon whom the Allied armies and the civilian population of those countries as well as of Canada depend, but it will be a disappointment to the farmers of the East as well. The farmers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have been preparing all winter for a crop which should be double the largest they have ever had in the past if they were given the chance they expected. They were depending on free agricultural implements, more especially now that their farm help has been taken away from them. Hired help will be impossible to get in many districts this year, and agricultural implements and labour-saving machinery are all the more necessary. The Unionist press is continually telling us that tariff questions must be put aside until after the war. I say that it is simply because we are at war and because greater production is so imperative in

Canada to save the Allied countries from starvation that the tariff should be dealt with now and farm implements admitted free. There will be no fear of a famine after the war, but there is now, and Lord Rhondda and other eminent authorities have told us they look to Canada more particularly to save the situation. After giving serious thought to the situation on the other side, it is my firm belief that the 1918 crop of Canada alone will save the war for the Allies. The food stocks of our Allies are being depleted, while the Germans in a very short time will be getting food from those countries which they have conquered. Greater production in Canada is absolutely imperative. It is not merely injudicious to postpone consideration of the tariff until after the war; it is criminal. Farm implements should be admitted free now. Twenty-two million men have been withdrawn from production and have been fighting for the last four years, and it is up to Canada to feed them. I had the pleasure a few days ago of hearing the President of the Privy Council eulogize the women of France, who have been looking after the crops ever since their husbands, sons and fathers went to the front. No one has a deeper appreciation of the virtues of the women of France than I. I knew of their virtues and admired them long before the President of the Privy Council told us of what these brave women were doing. While the men of France were fighting at the front the women of France, with an energy that seems almost incredible in the weaker sex, have been tilling the soil and keeping the life in the population of that country. As it is, France has been able to sustain her population in time of war. But we must not forget that the crop of last year, with all the skill and devotion of the women of France, was not equal to the demand. The result is that to-day France is being rationed, she is living from hand to mouth, and the people have not more than sufficient food from one day to another. This is largely due to the lack of transport chiefly from Canada. We have the food, but we have not the ships to carry it across the Atlantic. We are called upon to-day to build ships, and to build more ships.

In 1911, one of the chief policies of the great leader of the Liberal party was the creation of a naval service. It would have been of the greatest possible advantage to Canada and the British Empire if we had had the cruisers that we proposed to build at the time of the commencement of the war, and if the mercantile marine, which would have been a result of the establishment of a naval shipbuilding industry, had been created. If that policy had been carried out, we would have been in a position not only to help ourselves but to help the Empire. During the last six years those who before the election of 1911 opposed the navy in order to please the Nationalists of Quebec, have never attempted to build a navy in Canada. From year to year the hon. Acting Minister of Finance, had been asking the Government of the day to undertake the building of ships. From year to year the members from the Maritime Provinces had been asking the Government to commence, without further delay, the construction of a mercantile marine. I had also exerted my energies in that direction. For years we had been asking the late Government to build ships. The result to-day of the inaction of the late Government is that while we have grain to send across we have no ships to carry it. We have known for the last few years that North America was the only country which could possibly help the Allies with food products. Australia is so far away that a ship sailing from that country could only make one trip while a ship sailing from the Atlantic ports of Canada to the ports of Great Britain and France could make four trips. That is one of the reasons why Australia and New Zealand has set such a fine example in supplying man-power to the Allies. If Canada had been in the same position as New Zealand and New Zealand, she could have furnished not only the force that she has sent across, but half a million more men. While I admire the patriotism and devotion of the people of Australia as evidenced by the contribution of man-power which they have made to the cause of the Empire and the Allies, and while I admire more particularly their determination to build the navy which has been created since the beginning of the war, I repeat that they are not in the position in which we find ourselves. They are not in a position to produce more than their own food requirements, because they cannot export their surplus products. They are not in a position to manufacture munitions for the Allies on account of their great distance from the scene of the conflict. They have no ships to carry munitions any more than they have ships to carry provisions. If we were to produce in Canada only what we consumed ourselves, if we were to pro-

duce no munitions for the Allies, we could send another half million men to strengthen the man-power of the Allies. These are conditions which we must bear in mind when we seek to throw a wet blanket on the patriotism of the people of Canada, and more particularly on that of one nationality.

Like my revered leader, I am for the prosecution of the war. If in his vision of the future he had been listened to by the majority of the electors, Canada would perhaps be in a better position now than she is to assist the Allies, even with man-power. To-day, with all my desire to see every young man go who possibly can go to the assistance of our Canadian soldiers, to reinforce them, and to reinforce the armies of the Allies, we are in a position now where we cannot possibly do that which our patriotism inspired us to do at the outbreak of the war. In the beginning of the war it was only manhood that was required. There was food in every country at war. France was provided with food for the year to come, and England had provided for her necessities. They were in such a position that there was no immediate danger of food scarcity or lack of production. We have sent our men, or we might say that they have gone in spite of us, impelled by their patriotism. There was no want in the first period of the war. We thought, as the people of England thought, that the war would last six months or a year, and we did not make the necessary provision at once for food production. But the war has lasted for four years, and it threatens to last another year or two. God only knows if by that time we shall have succeeded in driving the Hun out of Belgium and France. Unfortunately, everything points to the conclusion that we have a long and arduous task before us.

The latest regulations to be issued summoning every young man from 20 to 22 years of age will, especially at this time of the year, prove a serious impediment to the production of food for the Allies. I am not worrying so much about Canada, although we shall suffer as a result of the want of help for the farmers. It will not be the Canadian people who will suffer the most, it will be the allied armies and the civilian population of the allied countries that will suffer if there is a shortage of food.

That position will affect, more or less, certain portions of the country. In Canada there is not only production of food from the farm, but there is also production of food from the sea. In the Maritime Provinces, as the Acting Minister of Finance knows, we produce food not only from the soil, but from the sea, and that sea food is just as much needed to-day, for the sustenance of our Canadian soldiers and of the British and French armies, as is the wheat and the barley which is grown in the West.

Let me describe the situation which will be created in my constituency by the fact that all the young men of from 20 to 22 years will be taken away by conscription in the course of a few days. We have in that county what is known as the Gloucester Fishing Fleet, composed of some two hundred and fifty-six vessels of an average of twenty or thirty tons each. This fleet is manned by from eleven to twelve hundred men from the county of Gloucester, and the tribunals sitting in the county have heretofore exempted every young man so engaged during the fishing season, in order to maintain that fleet complete, and so that the production of fish might go on unimpaired, and those exemptions have been sustained. The idea was to continue the obtaining by this fleet of from four hundred to five hundred thousand quintals of cod and other fish for the use of the Canadian and British soldiers, that being the quantity secured last year and the year previous. Very often the crews of those vessels in the fishing fleet consist of four or five men, two or three young men of a family with the father, and perhaps some of their neighbours. There are hundreds of these young men, who, after having been exempted in the past because their aid was necessary in the production of food, will be called upon in a day or two to join up. The greater part of the crews of the fishing fleet will then have to remain ashore, and the Allies will be deprived of an immense quantity of food from this part of the Maritime Provinces which would serve to sustain our Canadian soldiers for a month.

I waited upon the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn) in connection with the matter, and I must say that I was received with great sympathy. However, I obtained no promise from him, and there is not in the statement made by him to the House to-day any indication that the conscripting of these young men will be delayed in order to facilitate food production during the coming season. The Minister of Militia has in his possession a petition from the fishermen and the people engaged in the fishing industry in Gloucester county, which I only received yesterday, urging the Government to exempt, for

the period of the fishing season, the young men to whom I have alluded. In presenting the petition of those fishermen I am not pleading the cause of slackers. Eleven hundred of these young Acadians, members of the same families as those for whom I am now pleading, have already gone voluntarily to the war. Every one of the young men in the fishing fleet has a brother or a cousin at the front; those who have remained at home have done so in order to carry on the necessary industries of the country, and to keep up the production of food, which is just as vital for the Empire as it is for Canada to-day. I am not now opposing the law which is now in force. It has gone into effect, and the young men for whom I am asking consideration are willing to submit to it; all they wish is to be exempted until the fishing season is over. The Minister of Militia, when he made his statement on conscription to-day, said that the calling of men from the farm would be deferred as late as possible until the seeding was over. But how is he going to arrange for the necessary labour when the harvest time comes and the young men who in ordinary times have helped in that harvest are not available by reason of having gone to the front? In the case of the fishing industry we would like, as I already said, to have the services of the young men, who form such an important part of the fishing fleet, retained during the continuance of the present season. The season usually lasts until about the 15th of September, but if their calling up was deferred until the 1st of September these young men would then be willing to go as quickly as they could be sent to the assistance of their brothers and cousins. In addition to the petition which I yesterday presented to the minister from the people of Caraquet, I received the following telegram on the same subject from Shippigan:

> Strict enforcement of Conscription here ties up fishing fleet with heavy expenses already involved; if no compromise by judicious selection locality and trade will suffer severely.
>
> Signed: A. J. Trudel, parish priest,
> A. D. Chiasson, merchant,
> G. D. Leriche.

In dealing with the tariff question we should not only bear in mind the present needs of the country, but also pay due regard to future requirements when the war is over. We must be prepared for the future and put ourselves in a position to meet the conditions that will arise after peace is concluded. We should so place ourselves that when the munition factories are no longer operating we may direct the efforts of the working people employed in them into other industrial channels, and so be to stand the transition period between the close of the munition factories and the opening of other industries. We must be prepared. For that very reason, we should also be prepared to secure the good will of other nations. Free trade, or low tariff, has been the basic principle of the prosperity of the British Empire. Her prosperity and happiness have been sustained by the freedom of her institutions which in turn have been sustained by the principle of free trade. Free trade creates mutual interest, and mutual interest creates good understanding between nations. Even nations on the Allied side have made a mistake during this war in seeking to effect an economic combination against the enemy countries after the war. While we are fighting for liberty and justice in the world, we are bound to win. We have done this from the beginning, we have done it voluntarily, as was so eloquently said a few days ago in this House by one of the greatest orators of the United States, Mr. Samuel Gompers. He said that Canada was not bound to enter this war, that Australia was not compelled to enter this war, and that South Africa did not have to go into this war. We have all gone into it voluntarily because the British Empire was exposed to danger. Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand have gone voluntarily into this war because of sentiment and interest in behalf of the British Empire, and not because the British Empire imposed compulsion upon its daughter nations.

That sentiment of generosity towards our Crown was not created by blood and iron, it was not even by conscription; it was merely by the breadth of their love for the Empire that millions of subjects blended into one common soul, under the smile of Providence, to fight for the maintenance of British institutions, liberty and justice all over the world. It is in recognition of this sentiment that Canada to a man has gone freely and voluntarily to the help of the Empire, and that same principle of freedom and justice must be maintained during the war and after the war. Let us not make the mistake of desiring to establish again after the war protection against the nations which we are now fighting. That mistake may perhaps have been made at the Paris Economic Conference held two years ago, when, owing to the influence of the men favouring protection on the British as well as on

the French side, it was decided to wage economic war against the Central Empires after the war. That decision has given the Kaiser and Prussian plutocracy the chance to make their people feel that after the war they will have to fight the allied nations to maintain their economic existence. Let us not repeat that mistake to-day. Every nation will be welcome to the principles of justice and equality all over the world through democracy. We are talking and writing of democracy these days, yet we have been on many occasions introducing Prussian methods into this country. While the exigencies of war compel a certain centralization of authority, and an apparent lessening of democracy, we must at the same time be on guard against this tendency holding sway after the war is over.

There is another tendency which exists in the present Cabinet, and which existed, I may say, in the late Government. As my right hon. leader said, this is the same old Government; there has been some new blood introduced into it, but it is the same Government. To-day we see our friends who have left our side and gone over to the other side proclaiming the very doctrine that they fought against until the last day of the last session of Parliament. On the other side of the House every hon. member who rises to speak on behalf of the future success of our armies seems to take pleasure in saying that they have no consideration for the constitution of Canada. The other day my dearest friend on the other side, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) whom I regret not to see in his seat to-night—a friend with whom I have co-operated ever since we have been in Parliament together, who has had no more sincere and devoted follower than his humble servant the member for Gloucester—said that if it was necessary to win the war to puncture the Constitution he was prepared to do it. My hon. friend was not prepared to do it during last session or previous sessions. I am sure that the Acting Minister of Finance was never in a mood to transgress the Constitution. Yet the Constitution was transgressed when the Order in Council was passed taking from the provinces the right of issuing securities and putting control in this matter into the hands of the Federal Government. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance and all the members of the old Government know that when I criticize this action of the Government it is not a new inspiration with me. They know that for the last ten years I have always been advocating the

maintenance of every clause of our Constitution.

I find it almost incredible that certain gentlemen from the western provinces who have deserted the Liberal party have deserted also their belief in the principle that provincial rights should be maintained—a principle which they advocated so eloquently and so forcibly when they were at the head of affairs in their respective provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. No condition created by the war could possibly justify the course taken by the Government in this respect. Conferences of representatives from the provinces have been held in the interest of production, and good results have been obtained from them. Why was not a conference held in this case? I do not say that the Federal Government should not be able to control, as far as possible, the borrowing facilities of the different provinces, but I do submit that the matter should have been discussed at a conference with the premiers of the different provinces. The Confederation which was brought about by the efforts of such great men as Sir John A. Macdonald, Brown, Howe, and others, will last as long as the British Empire lasts, but only by providing that every principle embodied in our constitution is respected can we have absolute harmony and absolute agreement between different races and creeds within our country.

Reference was made during the last election campaign to the province of Quebec. I do not represent a Quebec constituency, but I am a native of that province. When I left college I went to another French section of the community, and have devoted my lifetime to extending the principles which brought about Confederation. The French Acadian people in our part of the country have lived in harmony and happiness ever since Confederation. When I hear it said that the people of Quebec have not been loyal to the Empire in this war, I feel sometimes that I cannot but resent the suggestion as much as if I were still living in that province. I feel on the subject as a Canadian, if not as a Quebecer, and also as a citizen of the Maritime Provinces, where the French minority receives, I must say, generous treatment at the hands of the majority. If any nationality in the Maritime Provinces has declared special devotion to British institutions, it is the French-Acadian population. I affirm that my admiration for British institutions is not surpassed by that of any British-born in this country. I am here as a Canadian, as a Frenchman, as a Catholic, protected

by the British flag, and I resent the attitude taken during the last election by certain gentlemen with regard to the province of Quebec.

It has been suggested that the people of Quebec are not loyal because they have not enlisted as numerously as the people of the other provinces. There is only one reason for that state of things. Every Canadian knows that that condition is due to the fact that the Nationalist school was established in 1909 and 1910—and the doctrines of that school were made the chief topic in the province of Quebec during the elections of 1911 by the Conservative party in order that they might win. They sowed the seeds of discord, of disloyalty, using their own money and their own friends for that purpose. In twenty-two or twenty-three constituencies Nationalists were returned in the elections of 1911, having been inspired by disloyal sentiments; having been educated to the theory that we owed nothing to England and that we should not send one man across the seas for the defence of the Empire at any time or under any conditions. I lay it at the door of the leaders of the Conservative party that they favoured and encouraged that school of disloyalty in Canada. I admit that it was a school of many attractions and many allurements. Its chief exponent was one of the ablest men Canada ever produced, one of the greatest orators the French Canadian people ever heard, a man with a most versatile pen. They took advantage of his talent; they even paid him to disseminate his doctrine in the province of Quebec. Doubtless these false doctrines appealed to many when a young speaker went through the back settlements of Quebec—Drummond and Arthabaska for instance—and told the people that Laurier wanted to take their children and send them off to fight in the army and navy of England. Even the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) sent a famous telegram to Drummond and Arthabaska—and he has since had time to repent and to be haunted by remorse for having encouraged such a doctrine.

I lay upon the Government all the blame for all the results that that school may have brought about in Canada, because the morning after the election, when they were able to secure the reins of power in Canada with the assistance of those twenty-two or twenty-three Nationalists who were elected because of their doctrine that Canada should not participate in the wars of the Empire, my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden), as a reward for the doctrine which they had propagated in the province of Quebec, rushed those men, one after another, as vacancies occurred, into the Cabinet or upon the bench or upon various commissions. To-day, my hon. friends opposite say that the people of Quebec have not been as loyal as they should be. Separate the Nationalist element from the people of the province of Quebec, and the other half of the people of Quebec were as faithful and generous in their response to voluntary enlistment in the beginning of the war as the people of any other province of Canada.

It has been stated on many occasions, and I have seen it stated in the press of the western provinces, that the French Canadian people of the Maritime Provinces have enlisted more freely than the French Canadian people of Quebec. There is a good reason for that. It is that the Nationalist doctrine did not take root amongst the French Canadian people of the Maritime Provinces. They resisted it. I appeal to-day to my colleagues from New Brunswick, the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) and the others who may be here. I regret that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) is not in the House. I say that amongst all those men who have worked to stem the tide of Nationalism in New Brunswick the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) has been one of the chief instruments. I have been assisted by my younger colleague, the hon. member for Restigouche and Madawaska (Mr. Michaud). The people of New Brunswick have paid no heed to the doctrine of Bourassa, because we Liberals, knowing the danger of that school, stemmed the tide at once. For that reason the French Canadian people of the Maritime Provinces have enlisted as freely as the English-speaking people of those and the other provinces. The reason why the French Canadian people of Quebec have not enlisted so freely is because they have been corrupted by that school which has been the mainstay of the Government. It was stated only a few days ago by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) that, had it not been for Mr. Lavergne and Mr. Bourassa, his friends would not have been in power in 1911.

The Conscription Bill which we opposed is now the law of the land. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition stated that the moment it became the law of the land it would be respected by himself and by the people of Quebec, and whatever incidents may have taken place since then

it is easy now to see that the people of Quebec at large are accepting the conscription law as patriotically as the people of any other race in Canada. We can see now that my honoured leader, owing to his energy, owing to his vision of the future, owing to his ambition to create harmony in this country, was right when he took that stand against the Nationalists of 1911, and to-day, owing to his constant efforts, he has stamped out from the province of Quebec that Nationalist inspiration, and not a single Nationalist was returned at the last election. There have come into this House sixty-two members from the province of Quebec, every one a straight Liberal, at all times opposed to the doctrine of Bourassa and the Nationalist party. The right hon. leader of the Opposition has been able to redeem the province of Quebec from the state into which it had been misled by the Nationalists with the assistance of the Conservative party; he has been able to bring Quebec back to the condition in which it was in time past. And for that reason alone, if for no other consideration, our hon. friends who, from conscientious motives have left this side of the House to follow the leader of the Government, should cross over to this side of the House and support the leader of the Opposition.

Canada will live as long as the British Empire lives, and I hope that will be as long as the world exists. We have a great future before use. Peoples of different races and creeds have been placed here to live together in harmony, in happiness. It is only lately that that harmony and that happiness have been destroyed. Let us hope that that harmony will be renewed and that it will continue for all time to come. I have, with great regret, read on many occasions in many newspapers the statement that we should have one flag, one school and but one language. Confederation has made Canada a country of two languages, and that is bound to be the case as long as the British Empire exists. What are those languages? We have the English language, the language of Shakespeare and Milton who have given it lofty aims; the language of Edmund Burke, of Daniel O'Connell, of Gladstone who have given it eloquence to stir up the masses, to impel the Governments and Parliaments of the British Empire in the establishment of justice, equality and democracy throughout the world; the language of Adam Smith in regard to trade and commerce which has reached every shore of every ocean, which has penetrated throughout every part of every country where there is a store or a bank, or a shop, the language which always leaves in its train the impression of moral character and fraternity. That is the beauty of the English language. The other is the French language, the language of love and affection, the language of the arts, the international language to-day, the language of international treaties, the language in which is written the treaty ceding Canada to England with all the privileges of the French people as to language and religion, the language in which will be written the treaty of peace when peace is declared, I hope, for all time to come.

If the British nation has been able to expand its trade and commerce to such an extent that it has become the greatest industrial and commercial nation of the world, and if the French nation, with a language expressing more sentiment than words can tell, has been able to become the most artistic nation of the world—if these two nations have been able to become the two greatest nations of the world, what a great nation might not Canada become if there was harmony between those speaking different languages? Canada has immense natural resources, of the mine, of the forest, and of the soil, and great water powers. The future of Canada ought to appeal to every Canadian here. It will surpass in prosperity that of any other country in the world. I think of her future as that great British-Canadian, Joseph Howe, thought of Canada at the time of Confederation, when he predicted that in the West our resources would bring a population and lead to such a development that perhaps the seat of the Empire might be centred in Canada. But even if that never comes, we shall be able to help maintain here the principles of liberty and of democracy with the assistance of the United States. It is said by some that after the war Canada should join with the United States and that these two countries should remain apart from the rest of the world, far removed from all its dangers. Canada, I repeat, has a future, and in my judgment it will better serve the purposes of humanity by remaining a part of the British Empire than by joining in with the United States with its one hundred millions of people. A magnificent destiny awaits Canada if we will but take advantage of our opportunities. Immigration will pour into this country after the war, and we shall have a population which will be imbued with sentiments of justice and liberty—liberty and justice for your neighbour and

for your neighbour-nation too. We shall have here a nation ready to put an end, if necessary, to troubles that may arise in the different countries of Europe. Do not let us think that our country will be a nation of idleness or indifference after the war. It has a mission in connection with the future development of all other nations. I have always stood firm in my belief in the right hon. leader of the Liberal party, stood firm when we have been under the lash, if I may say so, during the last six months, and it is because I realize that he is possessed of the very sentiments that the greatest statesmen of the Empire have expressed on different occasions since the war began. General Jan C. Smuts is a great British statesman, not of Great Britain, not of Canada, not of Australia, but of South Africa, and he was so much admired at the War Conference in London last year that he was made a member of the War Council. Speaking at the banquet of the House of Lords and Commons in London recently, he said:

I pray that you may have the clearness of vision and purpose, and the strength of soul in the coming days which will be even more necessary than strength of arms. It will depend largely upon us whether in the present struggle the prize is achieved or whether the world shall once more be plunged into disaster. The prize is within our grasp, if we have the strength of soul to see the thing through until victory crowns the efforts of our brave men in the field.

Further on in the same speech he expressed sentiments in harmony with the sentiment which ought to prevail in Canada. He said:

Even nations which have fought against the British Empire like my own, must feel that their interests, their language and their religion are as safe and secure under the British flag as are those of the children of your own blood. It is only in proportion as this is realized that you will fulfil the true mission which is yours. Therefore, it seems to me that there is only one solution, and that is the solution supplied by our past traditions of freedom, self-government and fullest development.

Those words attracted not only the attention of his audience, but the next morning the Daily Telegraph, of London, in an encomium upon the eloquent words of this great statesman, had this to say of another great statesman whom we all know and admire:

There is one other great Imperial statesman who will certainly applaud and endorse that statement—Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It is exactly the point upon which he has always laid stress when Imperial Federationalists have seemed to press forward at too rapid a pace.

If the views of this statesman, so eloquently expressed, as to the future greatness of the Empire, have been acclaimed by the British Empire, and if the sentiments of that other great imperial statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, so nobly expressed on different occasions, have evoked the admiration and applause of the people of the British Empire, I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am willing to stand as proudly by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to-day as a good Canadian and British subject as a citizen of South Africa is proud to stand by General Jan Christian Smuts. I recognize in Sir Wilfrid Laurier the firm upholder of freedom, justice and equality in Canada. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has always been in Canada, in his vision of the future, in his conception of the high destiny of this country, in his aspirations for the welfare of Canada, and in his ambition to see British principles and British institutions established more firmly all over the world, what Jan Christian Smuts has been in South Africa.

In conclusion, permit me to ask pardon for having kept you so long. I had not expected to detain the House at such great length when I rose to speak. This is an occasion when sentiments have to be expressed, and I thought I should take advantage of the indulgence granted me to express the views which I hold on some of the questions which are engaging our attention to-day. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House most cordially and I hope that it will not be necessary for me to again trespass at such length upon your time.

On the motion of Mr. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

Wednesday, May 1, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Ninth annual report of the Commission of Conservation.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

PURCHASE OF INCUBATORS.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Has the Government bought from Chas. Hearson and Company, of London, three incubators for the price of $157.93 and a hot-air sterilizer for the price of $50.45, as mentioned in the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916?

2. If so, what use has been made of these incubators and sterilizer?

3. Where have they been utilized?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. They were placed in hospitals of the Canadian military authorities at Salisbury and elsewhere in England for use in the laboratories, for the culture of germs.

3. Answered by No. 2.

PORK, BACON AND HAM IN COLD STORAGE.

Mr. KAY:

1. What was the number of pounds of (a) pork, (b) ham, and (c) bacon held in cold storage in Canada on March 1, 1917, and on March 1, 1918, respectively?

2. What was the estimated number of pigs in Canada on the same dates?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Reports from 83 per cent of cold storage companies show quantities in cold storage March 1, 1917, as follows:

Bacon	5,687,767 pounds.
Ham	2,942,667 "
*Smoked meats	8,873,564 "
Pork	23,946,100 "

(Judging from the holdings reported later, when returns were made by all cold storage companies, the holdings reported for March 1, 1917, represented about 97 per cent of the total.)

Quantities in cold storage March 1, 1918, were as follows:

Bacon	4,087,565 pounds.
Ham	1,421,985 "
*Smoked meats	8,114,571 "
Pork	19,895,869 "

*Represents bacon and ham not reported separately.

2. The estimated number of pigs in Canada in June, 1917, was 3,618,382, as compared with 3,474,840 in June, 1916. There are no figures available for March 1, 1917 or 1918.

ACCOUNT OF P. NEWHOUSE.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

With respect to the following item which appears in the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1916, at page ZZ-247; Newhouse, P., advance and imprest account unaccounted for $9,733.33.

1. Has the said P. Newhouse rendered an account of said advances since the said report was tabled?

2. If not, has the Government taken any step to obtain such an account?

Major-General MEWBURN: This information is being requested by letter from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.

[Mr. Papineau.]

L'ASSOMPTION AND MONTCALM RETURNING OFFICER.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the name and address of the returning officer who acted in the county of L'Assomption and Montcalm at the election of December 17, 1917?

2. What amount has he received for his services, and has he been paid in full?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: The returning officer for L'Assomption-Montcalm for the election of December 17, 1917, was Dr. Louis Azarie Foisy, of L'Epiphanie, Quebec. He has received an advance of $200 on account of election expenses for his district, and has in his possession the forfeited deposit of Mr. J. B. T. Richard, amounting to $200. His accounts have not been paid, other than the advances as above.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INFORMATION.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

April 22—Referring to question answered by the Government on March 21, in regard to the Director of Public Information for Canada—

1. How many persons are employed in this office at the present time?

2. By whom was Mr. Frank Yeigh employed as lecturer and organizer at $350 a month prior to taking up this work?

3. By whom was Mr. W. S. LeSueur employed as advertising manager at $200 a month prior to taking up this work?

4. By whom was Miss M. Wilson employed as journalist at $100 a month prior to taking up this work?

5. Is the Federal Press referred to in the case of the employment of Miss M. Currie, the same office as was generally known as the Conservative Headquarters, Slater Street, Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Ten, with two in addition, temporarily employed.

2. Mr. Frank Yeigh was engaged in special work for the Y.M.C.A., and in addition, in lecturing and literary work, and reports that he was in receipt for this work of at least $350 a month.

3. Mr. LeSueur was receiving $150 a month from the Y.M.C.A., and had an additional income of $50 a month from other special literary work.

4. Montreal Daily Mail.

5. Miss Currie was formerly employed in the Federal Press, Slater Street, Ottawa. She resigned from the Department of Public Information on 31st March, 1918.

LETTER CARRIERS' SALARIES.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to undertake a fair readjustment of the letter carriers' salaries in Canada, on account of the high cost of living?

2. Why do the letter carriers in Eastern Canada not receive a salary equal to that paid to the letter carriers in Western Canada?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The question is under consideration.

2. An addition has long been in existence in the West, based on the higher cost of living.

MR. MAIN JOHNSON.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Referring to an answer of the Honourable the President of the Council, reported on page 595 of Unrevised Hansard, of April 10, 1918.

1. Was Mr. Main Johnson appointed to his present position under section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

2. If so, was a certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Johnson was not appointed under section 21 of the Civil Service Act, but by Order in Council under the War Measures Act, and in accordance with section 39 of the Civil Service Act as amended in 1912.

STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE HOSPITAL.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Is the building of the hospital for invalid soldiers, at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, under Government control?

2. If not, through whose agency? Is it being built by contract or under the supervision of any public body?

3. What sum has been paid by the Government for the land where this hospital is being erected?

4. What will be the cost of construction?

5. How many invalid soldiers will it accommodate?

6. How far is this hospital from Macdonald College?

7. Has the Government considered the very grave inconvenience which may result from the erecting of such an institution in the vicinity of a college where hundreds of young ladies are being educated?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: The answer to this question is in the form of a return, which I now lay on the table of the House.

MR. W. F. O'CONNOR, K.C.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has the Prime Minister taken cognizance of the correspondence tabled by the Minister of Labour concerning the resignation of W. F. O'Connor?

2. Is it not true that another letter was delivered on the 15th instant and received by the Minister of Labour concerning said resignation of W. F. O'Connor, and is the Prime Minister to have the same produced?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. The Prime Minister is informed by the Minister of Labour that there was a subsequent letter which reached him after the return was brought down. There is no objection to having it produced.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When was Mr. W. F. O'Connor first employed in the Labour Department, in which branch thereof, and what duties were assigned him, who had previously performed them, and what were his qualifications therefor?

2. Was he given absolute control of the staff in that branch?

3. Had Mr. O'Connor a position in another department of the Government when so employed in the Labour Department?

4. If so, in which other department, and is he still employed there?

5. What salary was he paid in the other department, and has it since been continued?

6. What was he paid for the work done in the Labour Department?

7. Who gathered the information upon which his published reports were based, and were they all prepared by him?

8. Has a successor to Mr. O'Connor been appointed? If so, who? And what are his qualifications for the position?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Early in November, 1916, when the Order in Council was passed authorizing inquiries and investigations under oath respecting food, fuel and clothing, and placing the administration thereof in the Department of Labour, Miss Bessie McKenna, B.A., (now Mrs. Geo. Hambleton), was placed in charge of that work and in pursuance thereof proceeded to prepare questionnaires and forward them to merchants and manufacturers interested throughout the country. In the latter part of December, 1916, Mr. W. F. O'Connor, a barrister with some experience as an accountant, was appointed chiefly as an examiner to execute some of the provisions of that Order.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. (a) As a secretary in the Department of Justice; (b) yes.

5. (a) $5,000 per year; (b) yes.

6. $2,000 per year, stipulated at $166.66 per month.

7. Miss Bessie McKenna, B.A., (now Mrs. Geo. Hambleton), who also prepared the most of the reports of the work done under that Order.

8. (a) Yes; (b) R. J. McFall, M.A., Ph.D.; (c) he took courses in economics in Glasgow and Columbia Universities, and for two years was professor of transportation and regulation of monopolies in Minnesota University, and for the last year has been engaged in the Department of Trade and Commerce and in doing special work for the Food Board.

25th N. S. BATTALION.

Mr. DUFF:

1. When did the 25th Nova Scotia regiment or battalion leave Halifax, Nova Scotia, for England?

2. At what date did this regiment or battalion leave England for France?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. The 25th Overseas Battalion, Nova Scotia Regiment, left Halifax May 20, 1915, for England.

2. This Battalion left England for France on September 15, 1915.

BISHOP FALLON OF LONDON.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has the following item in "La Patrie," of April 25th, 1918, been brought to the attention of the Government:—

"Mgr. Fallon, Bishop of London, has left for England to visit the Canadian camps, and investigate religious conditions there as they affect Catholic soldiers. Since the beginning of the war, the Bishop of London has been authorized by the Government to choose the Catholic chaplains for the Army."

2. Has Mgr. Fallon gone to London in an official capacity for the Government, and at public expense?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No.

2. At the request of the Overseas Minister, an invitation was tendered to Monseigneur Fallon, Bishop of London, to visit the troops overseas and at front, as was done for high dignitaries of other churches, at public expense. It is also the intention of the Government to tender an invitation through His Eminence Cardinal Begin for him to select a high church dignitary of French-Canadian nationality to visit the Front.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

With reference to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 31st March, 1916, Volume IV, page ZZ—220, stewards gratuities account as follows,—R.M.S. Franconia, $1,460; page ZZ—227, payments on account of gratuities to stewards, $4,049.07; page ZZ—246, gratuities to stewards on transports, $11,626.40; and page ZZ—248, gratuities to stewards, $16,230.62.

To whom were these different amounts paid?

Mr. CURRIE:

1. How many Commissions and Boards appointed by the Government are in existence in Canada and abroad at the present time, and what was the administrative cost of these Commissions and Boards during the last fiscal year?

2. How many Boards and Commissions appointed by foreign governments are operating in Canada at the present time?

Give the following information relative to Boards and Commissions categorically:

[Mr. Crothers.]

1. Name and object of the Commission.
2. If appointed by Order in Council or by Statute.
3. If under the War Measures Act.
4. Date when established.
5. Name of the present members.
6. Salaries or expenses of any kind paid to individual members of Commissions and Boards during the past fiscal year.
7. Number of persons engaged on the staff of each Commission. Salaries and expenses of administration of each Commission, including members and officials.
8. What authority has been given to any Commission or Board to impose taxation by license or otherwise?
9. How much public money has been expended by these Boards or Commissions during the past fiscal year?

FEDERAL ELECTION DOCUMENT.

On the notice of motion being called:

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of envelope Nos 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 39, 53, 56, 59 and 99, polling booth No. 9, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last and placed in Military bag No. 446 of the North American Continent Military Votes. Also, a copy of the envelopes numbers 65 and 70, polling booth No. 4, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last, and placed in Military bag Number 451 of the North American Continent Military Votes.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: When this question came up on a previous occasion I explained the reasons why it seemed to me that the Order should not pass. I understood from the right hon. leader of the Opposition that he would call the attention of the mover to what I said then on the subject. It would appear to me that the reasons I gave are sufficient.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Stand.

Motion stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BUREAU:

For a return showing, (a) whether the Canadian Government Railways Employees Magazine, published at Moncton, N.B., is owned by the Government; (b) if so, the names of the Editor, Business Manager, Advertising Solicitor, and of other persons engaged in connection with the magazine and the amounts of salary or other remuneration paid to them, respectively, since its establishment; (c) the positions, if any, such persons also occupy in the Canadian Government Railways Service, and what salaries they receive in such service; (d) the revenue and expenditure in connection with the publication of the magazine from its inception to December 31, 1917, showing separately the amounts received from advertising, subscriptions, and from other sources respectively; also separately the amounts disbursed for personal service, printing and other expenses of publication; (e) the sums of money paid by the Government or by the Canadian Government Railways in con-

nection with the publication of the magazine with dates and amounts and showing for what purposes such payments were made; (f) a copy of the correspondence between the Minister of Railways and Canals, any officials of that Department, particularly the Purchasing Agent, the General Manager and other officials of the Canadian Government Railways and any officials or employees of the Magazine and of all correspondence from the minister or from any officials of the department or from any officials of the Canadian Government Railways for the purpose of inducing manufacturers and others to advertise in the magazine; and (g) whether the Post Office Department has admitted the Magazine to second-class postal privileges, and if so, on what date, and whether such privileges extend only to copies sent to bona fide subscribers or if they include copies supplied gratuitously to Canadian Government Railways officials and employees.

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): May I inquire whether the Government has adopted the policy that a constituency has no right to be consulted concerning any governmental appointment to be made in or for that constituency?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not quite know what my hon. friend means by consulting the constituency. With regard to appointments, the policy of the Government is to get the best information available—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Therefore they do not consult the members.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: —with regard to the qualifications of any person who is appointed to public office, there is no reason why the member for the constituency should not be consulted. There is no reason why other sources of information should not be sought. The purpose is to appoint the persons best qualified for the position.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.—ARMY CORPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the Government any information concerning the proposed breaking up of the Canadian corps at the front? I shall put my question in another form. Is it true that one or more divisions of the Canadian Army Corps at the front have been dropped from the Canadian corps and are now serving with the British Army Corps, in other words, making two army corps instead of one, as should have been done long ago?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: According to any information in possession of the Government, the Canadian Army Corps has not been broken up. It may be true that, for a certain temporary purpose, one of the divisions was sent to reinforce the British troops who were defending a particular place. There is nothing more in the suggestion than that.

MEDICAL SERVICE AND FORESTRY CORPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish again to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a cable despatch which appears in this morning's Montreal Gazette in regard to the Medical Service Corps and the Forestry Corps in England. It is a very severe condemnation of the system, and the minister is asked on behalf of our fellowmen on the other side to act, not to inquire.

Major-General MEWBURN: That question was raised the other day. Some little time ago there was received from the Overseas Minister a letter enclosing a letter from the Officer Commanding, Brigadier-General Alexander MacDougall, stating that everything in the Forestry Corps was in splendid shape. The Overseas Minister remarked that he had inspected the Forestry Corps in England and had found the discipline of the men of a very high character. He also reported he had organized a culling out system throughout the whole of England with a view to seeing if there were in England any men who were not fit for overseas service in France, the purpose being that men unfit for service in France, who could be spared, should be sent back to Canada. All the men in the Forestry Corps who are fit for service at the front are being sent to France. I have already sent word to the Overseas Minister in regard to this report which evidently emanated from England. We had no previous knowledge of it here. I asked him to have the matter investigated immediately. As regards the Medical Service Corps, we have no knowledge, whatever, of any such charge as is stated in that article. I have also asked the Overseas Minister for an immediate explanation in regard to it, so that we may have the information.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I beg to make a correction, not that the Minister of Militia is making a mistake, but the words are placed in his mouth that somebody insti-

tuted this movement to cull out these men. That movement was started long before the present Overseas Minister of Militia went to England.

QUEBEC PILOTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata): Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made any decision in regard to the five Quebec pilots who, after being examined by Dr. Fritz, of Halifax, have been declared unfit for service on account of their eyesight? I spoke to the minister before in regard to the matter.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I took the matter up immediately, but I have not as yet received word from Quebec. As soon as I do, I shall be glad to inform the hon. member.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—MEDICAL BOARDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): I should like to know from the Minister of Militia if there are in existence, and, if not, if there will be established immediately in the country districts, medical boards at which the men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two may be examined without delay?

Major-General MEWBURN: The men betweeen the ages of twenty and twenty-two who have been ordered to report are receiving notices to report at certain specified places. The Registrars in each district, in sending out those notices, are giving the men the actual places at which they are to report. Medical Boards have been or are being established at those points, so that the men will have their medical examination with as little delay as possible. I do not think it will be possible to have those medical boards established in all parts of the country. The great difficulty in carrying out the Military Service Act is to get sufficient medical officers to conduct the examinations. The men, however, will be ordered to report at the headquarters of the various depot battalions, and in the notice ordering each man to report, the name of the place at which he is to report will be given.

COMMANDING OFFICERS FIFTH DIVISION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I should like to ask the Minister of Militia with regard to the correctness of the following Canadian Associated Press cable despatch, and as to whether he has any information to give the House on the matter:

> London, April 29.—The following are gazetted as ceasing to command battalions: Lieut.-Cols. A. E. Wings, M. Barre, B. M. Green, T. P. Rowland, H. E. Cutcliffe, D. M. Sutherland.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have no direct information from overseas, but it is quite fair to conclude that those officers were officers commanding battalions in the Fifth Division, which was subsequently broken up. As they gave up the command of the various battalions in the Fifth Division on the units being transferred to the reserve battalions, the battalions as battalions would thus cease to exist.

THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means (resumed from April 30).

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): Mr. Speaker, complaint has been made both inside and outside of this House that its members occasionally occupy too much time in discussing matters not pertaining to the very pressing questions before the nation at this time. I venture, however, to think that this session will stand out in comparison with those of former days as, in the main, innocent of any such charge. In any event, if I may be allowed to say a word as representing the new members, they will, I think, be proved to be innocent of any such breach, no matter into what evil habits they may fall in later years. The subject before the House is one of vital importance, and for that reason I venture to offer some comment and criticism on the Budget. It deals with one of the five indispensible requisites without which we are unable to carry on the war. Those requisites, as commonly stated, are men, money, munitions, ships and food. First one and then another is forced to the front as perhaps of more immediate need; but, if we hope to succeed, none of them can be discarded.

From the first day of the war until the dawn of the day of peace—yes, and even far beyond that whitest stone in all the calendar—the need of money and of sound financing will be urgent. Thus far in the debate I have not noticed any criticism of the main scheme of this country's financing of the

war, nor does it seem to me that any such criticism could fairly be made. The measures presented so lucidly and with such admirable brevity by the Acting Minister of Finance deserve, in my humble opinion, nothing but praise, and I believe that the firm and resolute lines upon which for more than three and one-half of courage testing years the Minister of Finance has advanced have been in the main the correct lines. There are in truth but three methods whereby a country such as Canada can hope to finance her war needs. First, by taxation; second, by borrowings, and, third—a method which I hope is wholly unthinkable for Canada—by the issue of fiat or paper money. To meet the entire cost of the war out of taxation is impossible even for the wealthiest nation. Great Britain, the wealthiest of all the great belligerents, has managed to pay out of her current income 17 per cent of her war expenditure. The United States hopes to raise in the present year by taxation about 14 per cent of the nineteen billions of dollars which she will require for herself and her Allies in waging the war. When, therefore, we find that Canada has up to date paid 11 per cent of her total war expenditure out of current income we have reason to feel that we have at least started on the right road. In contrast with these examples, France has found herself unable to pay even her ordinary expenditure out of taxation, and has been forced to raise all the money she requires for the war by domestic loans or by borrowings from her Allies. Germany has paid but a small fraction out of her taxes, and by cultivating not only huge loans, but increasingly large issues of paper she will reap a whirlwind of panic and disaster.

As the success of the eighth German war loan has been announced to-day, it is worth while considering the methods adopted in that country whereby such a result is obtainable. At the outbreak of the war Germany formed Darlehnskassen, or loaning bureaus, for the special purpose of advancing moneys to the Government and private investors on the security of treasury bills and war loans issued by the Government. To supply the funds necessary for these purposes this new type of bank was authorized to issue bank notes or paper money altogether unsecured by gold, and in the last report which I have seen the outstanding issue was placed at the sum of one and one-half billions of dollars. This amount is wholly independent of the very great increase in paper money issued by the Imperial Bank of Germany, the Reichsbank, which has brought down the ratio of gold held by the bank from something over seventy per cent at the outbreak of the war to about twenty per cent at the present time. It is therefore not hard to understand how the investor in the first German war loan, we will say, after putting all his savings in that loan, being encouraged to borrow ninety per cent of the face value of his bond from these loaning institutions, has been able to subscribe to a second, and by repeating the process to a third, fourth, fifth and sixth loan. It is, of course, simply a pyramiding of debt and credit which, if the war ends without the hughest kind of indemnities to Germany, must bring her people down in ruin.

We have reason therefore to be satisfied that Canadian financing has been built on a firm foundation, and having in mind the increased taxation now in force we believe the country will endeavour, so far as can be done without undue pressure on her people, more and more to pay the cost of the war out of current income. We shall thus keep in check as far as practicable the formidable growth of our national debt. That debt is without doubt formidable. We are told that it now or will in the near future amount to $1,200,000,000 an average of over $150 for every person in Canada. Lest the parent of the many olive branches referred to by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) should take fresh alarm at this restatement of our position I might encourage him by repeating what the Acting Minister of Finance brought out yesterday, that in the autumn of last year there was subscribed to the Victory Loan a sum equivalent to $58 for every man, woman and child in Canada. Therefore our sorrowing father may console himself with the thought that his numerous progeny will be able by their industry and thrift to relieve themselves very rapidly of the crushing burden of debt which my hon. friend has placed upon them. At all events I think the argument I have adduced by way of relief is quite as sound as the argument used by the financial critic of the Opposition. There are others who will find a source of comfort in the fact that the per capita debt of the United States has jumped in one short year from $14 to $70, while that of both France and England is now in excess of $500.

Before leaving this question of our borrowings I venture to support the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir

Herbert Ames), if my memory serves me correctly, that future loans should not be exempt from taxation. Hitherto,—I speak subject to correction,—all our domestic loans have been exempt from federal taxation. Last year, when the present hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) brought up this point to the Minister of Finance, he was told that to issue a loan subject to taxation and to make it a success, the yield rate must be made more attractive and that therefore the matter was as broad as it was long. With very great deference to a man for whose opinion I have the highest respect, and whose experience and judgment in these matters is in quite a different class from my own, I venture to differ from him on that point. I think that if you will take a concrete statement—an absurd statement if you like, but simply for the purpose of illustration,—it will show wherein the difference lies. Let us suppose an investor with an income of $200,000 free to change his investments. If he holds no war loan, under the new scale, he will be liable to the payment of a tax of nearly $50,000; that is, that about one-quarter of his entire income will go in taxation. If, however, he be free to invest in the war loan, he escapes any taxation. I do not say that this is a possible case, because no man has his investments in such shape that he could realize on them without loss and invest in war loans, but for the purpose of an illustration it will answer. Take a hundred married men with incomes of $2,000 and let these incomes be derived purely from the war loan. They would pay no tax because their incomes are not over $2,000. If, then, we issue a taxable loan at a higher rate, the man of small means will receive the higher rate, and either pay no tax, because his income is under the limit, or pay a very light tax; whereas, the wealthy man, while he also does receive the higher rate, is subject to a tax that far more than offsets the additional amount the country must pay by way of increased interest. I would therefore strongly support the suggestion of the former speaker that the Minister of Finance and those advising him should carefully consider this phase of the question.

I quite understand that last year, when we had to issue not one but two loans, and when our financial position both with Great Britain and the United States of America was not clearly defined, it might have been a risk to attempt to take such a step. But I am inclined to think that with the work done on the Victory Loan, and with the stimulus throughout the country caused by that work, a loan, subject to taxation could be successfully floated.

I would add to that suggestion a second one, and it is that the convertible feature of these loans should be now dropped. We all hope, just as we hope for peace, that this may be the last of these loans, but if there are others to follow, and others at a still higher rate of interest, it greatly increases the burden of the country if the holders of the former issues can convert them into those paying a higher rate. The effect of that action will perhaps not be great this year. It would only affect, if at all, the wealthy investor, but its full effect would come into operation so soon as a further loan was floated.

I now enter upon what we may fairly term debatable ground and that is the question as to the method by which our taxes are raised. As one of the former speakers has remarked, the criticism directed against the Budget was somewhat in line with the old-time debates which have for so long been heard in this House. In examining the revenue which the country secures from one source or another, we see that indirect taxes still contribute the major portion of our income. I want to say to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who invited us on this side of the House to partake of his simple and magic process of healing, that I was born, and have lived beside the true Jordan all my life and neither the Abana or Pharphar nor any of the rivers of Damascus hold superior attractions for me. The ideals which one carries, more or less dormant, perhaps, throughout life, have pictured a people deep-rooted in the soil, and a yeomanry, satisfied, hardy and intelligent, who would carry on the great career of our race. Whether from prejudice or other insufficient reason, my imagination has never been greatly stirred by the appeal of huge industries and the ceaseless whirr of the wheels of commerce.

Perhaps, too, closely associated with these are the slums of the big cities, the penury and hardship of the poor, and the sharp contrasts which there exist between wealth and poverty. I make this explanation so that I may feel myself free to say, starting from such a standpoint, I would not urge during the present war any great change in tariff conditions. We have seen growing up of late years in the United States those huge combinations of capital and industry very often termed trusts. We have read much of their ruthless powers,

and their sometimes wholly indefensible methods of competition. I do not think this is the day to do anything which would deprive the Parliament of Canada of the control it should have over those who manufacture or sell goods within her borders.

Another point, which is of still later discovery, and I think is now admitted by most military writers: No nation can undertake any part in modern warfare unless she is wholly organized in industry. That is an admission we dare not hope this war will be the last war. Whether that be so or not, it would be well to wait and do nothing to affect the standing of our industries during the present crisis. Even with more diffidence than in the case of the former suggestion, I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Finance and his colleagues to consider the advisability of the appointment of a permanent tariff and financial commission. The whole world of finance has so altered in the last few years that most of us feel we should be again at school in considering questions such as these. The first thing that is necessary in formulating a tariff, or making a financial decision, is to know the facts, and so far as I am aware we are in woeful ignorance of many of the facts governing the industries which we presume either to aid, or as they claim injure, by the imposition or reduction of customs duties.

There is one other point which I would like to also mention, and that is in connection with the Excess Profits Tax. I have no interest in any institution making a profit out of the war. Nay, rather, every institution with which I am connected has been injured rather than helped, and the struggle has been rather to maintain prewar earnings than to reap benefits from war conditions. But, endeavouring to look at this question from an impartial standpoint, it does seem to me that the very sharp rise from a tax of one-fourth when profits amount to fifteen per cent to one-half of those profits when they amount to twenty per cent, and a further increase to a seventy-five per cent tax on additional profits will act as a check on the expansion of many of the fundamental industries of the country, and will, moreover, deter the entry of fresh capital into Canada. We must not forget that we can obtain a high return from the best form of investments which do not call for any personal energy, and where there is an almost absolute absence of risk. When, therefore, sums are put into industries where risk is always a predominant feature, where a series of lean years may occur, it is wise, I think, both from the point of view of the industry and of the country, that that industry be allowed to accumulate a very substantial reserve to meet the possible hard times ahead of it. Then, too, we must not forget the effect of our increased Income Tax and of our Excess Profits Tax on future Government loans. There can be no doubt, as one writer has put it, "the ultimate source of a national loan is the unspent income of the nation's producers." Hitherto it is possible we have been able to find investors whose money has been lying by awaiting some suitable security, but that reservoir will soon be emptied and we must then depend upon the thrift and productiveness of the nation to yield each year a sufficient sum which can be turned over to the Government to aid in the war. As one American financial writer has put it:

> When a nation declares war it is turning its face towards commercial bankruptcy, and the task of the financier at that time is to so control both the machinery of credit and the machinery of taxation that the productive power of the country may be used to make headway against unproductive consumption, and at the same time to hold under control those forces that tend to wreck the industrial organization by which that power is maintained.

Canada, to my mind, is in one sense the most marvelous factory of the world, a plant ready and waiting for the workers. It is true that we may have, for the moment, too heavy an overhead cost; we may have a multiplicity of legislative machinery, more than sufficient for our population. But, looking to the future, and believing, as I think we all do, in the progress this country will make once times become normal, every care should be taken not to place barriers against that progress.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that the country is prepared to accept any burden imposed by this budget cheerfully and in the best spirit. It has been said that some section or other of the country does not realize that we are at war. I think, sir, we do realize that we are at war; but, perhaps a majority of us do not realize the personal obligation cast upon every one to do his or her share. The habits of a lifetime, the love of ease, the conventions which surround us, prevent us from giving full effect to the force which we could exercise in aid of the nation. We do not forget the claim of those who have

given up their all, and who say to us in the words of the poet:

> O you that still have rain and sun,
> Kisses of children and of wife,
> And the good earth to tread upon,
> And the mere sweetness that is life,
> Forget not us, who gave all these
> For something dearer, and for you!
> Think in what cause we crossed the seas!
> Remember, he who fails to challenge
> Fails us too.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this country will fail the challenge; it will rise to the heights; it will gird its loins, and bend its back to meet whatever burden may be put upon it for the one end we have in view.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words in this debate, I wish, in the first place, to congratulate most heartily the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean) for the able way in which he presented his case yesterday to this House and to the country. I also wish to pay my respects to my colleague the hon. member for the city of London (Mr. Cronyn) upon the excellent matter of his maiden speech in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCOIG: I wish also to add that, so far as I am personally concerned, and I believe I am speaking for all the members on this side of the House, I am not here to oppose the financial arrangements put forward by the acting Minister of Finance yesterday for raising funds to prosecute the war; I am here to give the Government every possible assistance in raising the money required, so long as it is honestly spent for the carrying on of the war. I would even go further and place myself on record as being in favour of even more drastic legislation to secure funds for the prosecution of the war. I would support legislation that would be retroactive, and which would further tax the profits already made by the food profiteers and place more of their takings in the treasury for the carrying on of the war, and for the protection of the widows and orphans of this young Canadian nation. Further, I believe it would be more commendable to do as I have suggested than to place a tax of 5 cents per pound upon tobacco that is grown in this country, which will discourage the growing of tobacco and enhance its cost to the consumer. Indeed, tobacco should not be considered as a luxury, but as a necessity for all those who have formed the habit of using it. Besides, it is a reflection to a certain extent upon the men who are defending this country, who must have tobacco in the trenches, to compel them to pay more for it in the future than they have done in the past. This tax will also affect those great patriotic institutions of our country known as the Daughters of the Empire and the Red Cross Society, which are raising funds to purchase tobacco to send to the men overseas. If the Acting Minister of Finance will give this matter his serious consideration, he will see that the small amount that will be raised by this particular taxation will cause great inconvenience both to men in humble circumstances and to those who are doing our fighting. I believe that the people of this country, particularly those in humble circumstances, and particularly the women who are large users of tea, will find that this tax bears very heavily upon them. I believe, Sir, that the small amount that will be realized from the tea tax could be far more easily secured from other sources which would not bear so hard on people in humble circumstances. The minister might, after considering this matter, decide not to exact this burdensome tax on tea.

4 p.m.

I regret also that the Acting Minister of Finance did not see fit to continue to keep on the free list tractor ditchers, which were placed on the free list a few years ago. For what purpose were they made free of duty? In order that the farmers of this country could drain their land and raise larger crops, which are so essential. But, as the price of tractor ditchers has increased to over $300, which was the limit specified for free entry, farmers will now be unable to bring them in, and they will be deprived of the use of these machines in the future. This will be a detriment to the engineering organizations established by our Provincial Governments, whereby the farmers secure engineers to lay out their farms so that they will be properly drained. These engineers have been working for some months past in my section of the country, and to-day the men who have placed their orders for these ditchers will be unable to get them, because they cannot come in as formerly free of duty.

May I add my congratulations for allowing the importation of farm tractors free of duty. The Government has decided to do that, but the Acting Minister did not say yesterday whether this concession would continue or not. In purchasing one hundred tractors and turning them over to the producers of this country without the

middleman's profit, the Government has done a commendable thing; which will have a good effect.

But, Sir, it is a matter of regret that the Food Board, which has been established by the Government at a cost of millions of dollars, has ordered that farmers' boards and organizations throughout the country which have purchased carloads of sugar, flour, potatoes and other foodstuffs, must return them to the place whence they came, permitting the middleman still to retain the profit which he obtained through the sale of the goods so disposed of. The farmers' clubs which have been formed for the purpose of obtaining goods at first cost and thus avoiding the middleman will resent this action on the part of the Food Board. In my city last winter the labour organization brought their goods in by the carload and distributed them among the labouring men of Chatham with great credit to themselves and with large saving to consumers. Under the present order of the Food Board, however, this organization will be unable to carry on their work in that regard.

Is it not a fact that the arguments in favour of free farm tractors apply also to the free admission of agricultural implements? If it is a benefit to the farmers to enable them to obtain tractors at first cost, then I take exception to the assertion of the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) the other night that this Government was put in office not to interfere with the tariff, but to pass legislation connected with the prosecution of the war. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) represents the city of St. Thomas in this House. If the member for Brantford will look up his price list for 1918 and obtain quotations from the concern manufacturing similar implements in St. Thomas, he will find that the Cockshutt Plow Company is charging twenty-five per cent more for plows, harrows and land rollers than the concern in St. Thomas. Is it surprising, then, that the member for Brantford hesitates to say that the tariff on agricultural implements should be interfered with at this particular time? I have in my possession the wholesale price list of the Cockshutt Plow Company, and I have invoices of similar goods—harrows, ploughs, rollers—of the same size and of equal quality, sold by the company in St. Thomas at twenty-five per cent less than the price of the product of the Cockshutt Plow Company. I challenge contradiction of my assertion with regard to these prices. Other large concerns—the International Harvester Company, the Massey Harris Company—are charging the same prices as those charged by the Cockshutt Plow Company. Is it not reasonable to suggest that at a time when we need greater production, at a time when we particularly require such agricultural implements as I have referred to, an investigation should be made by a committee of this House or by the Minister of Labour with regard to this matter? The people and the Government should know exactly what is going on; steps should be taken to see that unfair prices are not extracted from agricultural producers. The Government should ascertain whether these exorbitant prices are being distributed among the men who are engaged in the workshops of those factories; whether the labouring men are getting their share of the huge profits that are being made to-day on the sale of other agricultural implements, the prices of which are practically double what they were when war broke out in 1914. I suggest that the Minister of Trade and Commerce give this matter attention. He has been energetic in doing everything that is detrimental to production, and this applies to every Bill that he has introduced during this session—daylight saving, the marketing of hay, the weighing of eggs, and so on. In order to put himself right with the producers regarding these measures which he has introduced, I suggest that he assist in the investigation of the matter which I have put before the House.

Last night the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) told the House in mournful tones that we all have to make great sacrifices. I was reminded of the statement made by a gentleman who was so widely advertised during the last campaign, and who said on one occasion, "We have to make sacrifices; to hell with profits." Only a few months ago the Minister of Labour heard that in my city three or four cobblers had agreed to raise the price of patches five cents and half soles ten cents, whereupon the minister notified them that they would be liable to prosecution under the Combines Act if they proceeded with their intention. His letter reads as follows:

Ottawa, December 13, 1916.

Dear Sir:

I am advised that a few days ago yourself and several others entered into an agreement to raise the price of shoe repairing in the city of Chatham from the 8th instant.

I am enclosing you a copy of an Order in Council recently passed, whereby you will see

that if any such agreement was made you have laid yourself liable to prosecution under that Order. It prohibits the entry into any such agreement.

Yours truly,
(Sgd) T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour.

The member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), who was telling us so much about the way our finances should be conducted, knows that the burning question among the labouring classes is the high cost of shoes. As a matter of fact, I believe that the hon. gentleman knows more about the manufacture of shoes than he does about finances. The other day a man with only one arm came into my office and said to me: "McCoig, the shoes for the child that I am sending to school to-morrow cost me $3, while the shoes that I bought for his brother five years ago cost me only 98 cents." A cattle merchant who was standing by said: "I can assure you, Mr. McCoig, that the price of hides is practically the same as it was five years ago." Is it not time that this matter was taken up by Parliament and an investigation held? Many children were kept home last winter because their parents could not buy shoes for them. If it is true that millions of dollars worth of hides are stored throughout the country, should not the Government see that these hides are manufactured and that our boys, the great asset of this country, are supplied with shoes in order that they may be enabled to get an education?

I say this because I believe these are matters that have very little to do with the prosecution of the war, but they have a great deal to do with the peace and harmony which we hope will prevail in this country. At this particular time we lack a Postmaster General. Demands are coming from all parts of the country that the postal service be improved. We have requests for better pay from postmasters whose labours are greater than they ever were before. The mail carriers in the cities are also asking for better pay, and above all, the mail carriers on the rural routes of this country, who accepted contracts at a time when the cost of living was not as high, as it is now, have been compelled by the Government to fulfil the duties required of them. I do not mean to cast any reflections upon the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Doherty), but I believe the duties of the Post Office Department are such that we should have in this House a man who would give his whole attention to the department so as to ensure that the proud position that Canada has in the past occupied, as far as our mail service is concerned, will be continued in the future.

The other night when the proposition was before Parliament to exempt the men who were producing on the farms of this country, I supported that amendment. My reason for doing so was that we had received letters and pamphlets up to as late a date as the 28th of March, signed by the Prime Minister, asking for greater production. I have here a resolution, passed in the provincial legislature, moved by Sir William Hearst, and seconded by Mr. Proudfoot. I believe it to be perfectly in order to read a portion of it:

Resolved, That we the members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario recognising as we do the grave and anxious crisis which confronts Great Britain and France owing to the acute shortage of food in these countries, and the momentous issues that are thus placed in jeopardy, hereby affirm our resolve and determination to do everything that lies in our power to sustain Great Britain and her Allies in the bitter struggle that lies ahead. We realise that the world shortage of food, together with the fact that the destruction of shipping prevents Great Britain drawing supplies from Australia and South America, compels that country and France to depend almost entirely on Canada and the United States for the necessary food to maintain her armies and her civilian population. We desire to express our willingness to assume to the full our responsibility in this perilous emergency. Ontario has with a true spirit of patriotism and unselfishness risen to every demand hitherto made upon her by the war, whether for men, money, munitions or food, and must not fail now in doing her part in meeting this new and grave crisis. At a time when the whole civilian population of Great Britain is on meagre rations, when even the soldiers' rations have been reduced, and when France is threatened with famine, it behooves all the inhabitants of this favoured province to examine closely their individual responsibility and privileges, and resolve upon making unprecedented efforts to increase food production.

The resolution goes on further, but that is the important part of it. This is the report of a statement that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) made to the live-stock men from the West. It is copied from the Globe of November 8, 1917:

Mr. Crerar assured his hearers that it was not the intention of the Government or the Militia Department to conscript men whose experience rendered their services more valuable on the farm than at the front.

On account of these requests to produce, from the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, from the Prime Minister of the Ontario and the leader of the Opposition in that legislature, and with this assurance given by the Minister of Agriculture, many of the farmers have made arrange-

ments to produce greater crops than they have ever had before. I hold no brief for the farmers, because they have the same right to defend their country as the labouring men or any other class in the land; but this demand for men has come at seeding time, just when such a demand is most inopportune, if we want to produce the results which every hon. member is anxious to have produced. In my constituency there are a number of exceptional cases, for instance, where the son is the only man on the farm who can be depended upon to render effective service, or where the boy is the only son of a widowed mother, and the success of the farm depends upon him, or where a boy is the only one available for work on the farm, his parents being in poor health. I regret very much that there was not some exemption made in the regulations so that such men might be exempted. I hope from time to time, the Government, as these matters appear before them, will feel justified in making such exemptions as will meet the demand. I have perhaps spoken longer than I intended to do, but I wish to say this in conclusion. We may differ in this House as far as the Budget and other legislation are concerned, as to how it will bear on the weak or the strong, the rich or the poor. I was, however, extremely gratified the other day to meet an old friend of mine who had just returned from the front, having been honourably discharged. That gentleman said to me: "There is one thing, Mr. McCoig, you can depend upon, and that is that a man who is a private will receive in old England the same treatment and kind attention at the hands of the officials of the hospitals that a man of high standing will receive." He said: "I received a wound in the jaw, and I was compelled to go into a hospital in England. I was taken into the Duchess of Connaught's hospital on the Astor Estate. I had to have about half an inch removed from my lower jaw. That operation was prepared for, and I am glad to tell you that eminent physician, Col. Mewburn, was in charge of the hospital and took charge of my case, and he is a brother of Major-General Mewburn, the Minister of Militia. He gave me the same attention that I would have received had I been a colonel or a general. I am glad to tell you also that the Red Cross nurses extended their kind and sympathetic assistance." He said to me that, after he had been discharged, he went to the city of Detroit in which his brother was a practising physician, and there a number of American physicians examined his wound and pronounced the operation one of the greatest they had ever examined, and they commended and congratulated the officials of the British hospitals on the noble work they were doing. I am glad to be able to refer to this case, because I believe it is the desire of every member of this House to give every encouragement possible to that noble organization of Red Cross nurses who have rendered such great service from the beginning of the war up to the present time.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, we are at war, and with the proverbial tenacity of the British bulldog, we are quite prepared to hang on until we have brought it to a successful termination. The big thing that confronts this Parliament, and which it was elected to deal with, is the prosecution of the war; how best that can be done is what should concern us to-day. We can well recall for a moment the old song:

We don't want to fight but by Jingo, if we do,
We've got the ships, we've got the men,
We've got the money too.

The determination of our boys to fight has been impressed upon the Hun more than once. There is probably no part of the line the Huns hate to attack more than the sector that is held by the Canadians. We have got the ships. The British navy is keeping the foe from our shores. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this House has told us that every shipyard in the land is occupied with a ship, and he promises to keep them all full; we are going to keep on building more and more ships. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) is somewhat afraid lest the United States will attain mercantile supremacy, but I say it is not within the bounds of possibility that this country should be possessed in the not far distant future of sufficient ships to carry her own lake and ocean tonnage. I believe we can do that, and probably just as well, if not better, with the present minister at the helm of the Marine and Fisheries Department than any one else we can find. As to men, we have a lot and are getting more. Our men are producing food, making munitions, and fighting the Huns. They are rushing to the colours so fast that the Minister of Militia and Defence is beginning to look somewhat grave from his increasing efforts day by day. It will not be very long before we shall have our five hundred

thousand, and I am satisfied we shall have more than that.

I do not wish to drive any wedge between any of the parties in this House, but I do hope to be able to cement and bind together the two great parties probably a little better than they have been united heretofore. After all, Parliament unanimously consented to the prosecution of the war; there was a time when we were all united, and there is no reason why we should not be united now. We should not make other people's sins an excuse for our shortcomings, and that old saying applies equally well to provinces as to individuals. We have heard from the Minister of Militia and Defence the number of exemptions applied for in each province, and if the hon. members who in the early weeks of this session indulged in such fiery utterances, so much so that on one occasion the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) was inclined to regard it as throwing of mud. If they had exerted as much energy trying to remedy the conditions in their own provinces, they would have done more good than was accomplished by those exhibitions. First cast the mote out of your own eye before pointing out the mote in your neighbour's eye. Let me refer for a moment to last year's Hansard, page 5564, when Mr. McCraney, then the member for Saskatoon, was speaking of the very small concern the West had in the troubles of the East. He said:

> We were very much stirred up in Ontario and Quebec over the Manitoba School Question and on election day Manitoba was the only province that gave a majority for the Conservative Government . . . In 1905 I was in the West when the Northwest School Question was up under the terms of the Automony Act. We were not very much disturbed about it out there . . . . Most of the troubles that we get into in Western Canada are fomented in Ontario and Quebec; I am glad that we live 1,500 miles away from both of those provinces. Ontario and Quebec have fattened on their religious differences and racial strifes.

It reminds me of a report on the Irish trouble many years ago, and which I think is reported in D'Arcy McGee's history of Ireland. A commission was sent to Ireland to inquire into the cause of all the trouble, and after much consideration they came to this conclusion and reported, "We found them fighting like devils for conciliation's sake, and hating one another for the love of God." I think that is about the state of affairs we are coming to. What we want in Canada is a united people, and I am sure we are approaching that ideal in this Parliament. The fiery utterances are falling off and we are getting down to business. If we are ever going to make Canada the greatest country in the world, which I verily believe we have possibilities of doing, we shall not do it by fighting, but by a united effort. I verily believe that within the next ten years Manitoba will be the greatest gold and copper producing country in the world. The hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) claims that for Alberta. We shall have to wait and see. Winnipeg to-day is the greatest wheat market in the world. When I went to Manitoba ten years ago, before the boundaries were extended, if I remember rightly, only five per cent of the province was under cultivation. About five years after that the amount under cultivation in Saskatchewan was only equal to the road allowances; the fields were all untouched. When the West is producing twenty and probably thirty times as much as it is to-day, and with its minerals galore the Minister of Finance will have no trouble with trade balances; his only trouble will be how to get all the money in, and he will have to sit up at nights considering what is the highest rate of exchange he can conscientiously extract to settle these old scores of to-day when the rate of exchange is against us.

I had the pleasure of visiting Three Rivers last Sunday with the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Bureau) and he told me his constituency runs back to James Bay, and that it was settled for about fifty-five miles back. In the last ten years, by his efforts, forty-two corporations have been brought into the constituency, five large pulp mills and two shipbuilding plants. The place is really going ahead at a great rate. In all fairness to the hon. member for Three Rivers, we must say that he has not been more pugilistically inclined this session than the average member, and if he continues to develop his constituency at the rate he has been keeping up for the last ten years, he will have a wonderful city and a wonderful constituency, and no time for fighting except for the rights of his constituents. I will not say that his city will rival Montreal, but with its great water powers and other great natural resources, it will develop into a city that will be of no mean proportions, and one that Canada may well be proud of. Every member will find sufficient to do working for the benefit of his constituency and for the good of his country at large without fighting on the floor of this House. The whole talk around this

building for the last few days has been how rapidly the men are coming to the colours in the province of Quebec. I have not heard of any men in any of the other provinces lately falling over one another or breaking any legs in their rush to the colours. I think that every member of this House—I do not say of the Opposition, but every member of the House—who has declared himself, has expressed himself as being entirely in favour of the prosecution of this war and will be only too glad when it is terminated. I am satisfied that when every member goes out from this House, with probably a bigger and better determination than he has ever had before to encourage recruiting, the response to the call will surpass our expectations. The people of Quebec, I am satisfied, have too much pride to take any second place to any other province when it comes to doing their duty. I am sure that Colonel Lavergne would be only too pleased to lead a battalion, and I would urge the Minister of Militia to show his good faith towards Quebec by making such an offer at once and to-day. I feel convinced, from what I have heard, that it will be accepted. I spoke a few days ago regarding France and Britain waking up, and I prophesied that soon Canada would waken up. It looks to me as if Quebec ever alert had first heard the morning tap upon the door, was already quite awake, and was going on with the business of the war with a determination unequalled by that of any other province at the present time. I want now to make another prediction. It is that before this House of Parliament meets next year the province of Quebec will lead the way in recruiting and show forth more men than any other province of the Dominion will in the same time. They have not had more exemptions in Quebec than in some of the other provinces.

Then, I want to say one other word regarding the process of securing men. With reference to the call which the Government has made, and which takes in the agricultural class, I think the Minister of Militia and the Government will be well advised to call no more men from the farm where only one son is left. I know of one case in Manitoba, I think near Brandon, where there were four sons on the farm, all of military age, and from the Exemption Board all got exemption. I would call three of them, certainly, but I would say that one at least should be left on the farm. If a man owns his own farm and has no help, he should be left on the farm too. Production in that way could still be kept up, and by closing down non-essential industries, which were spoken of in a debate in this House a few days ago, the extra men could be secured to maintain the forces at the front. Not in a thousand years would these industries ever do anything in the slightest to help to win the war while the men on the farm can do much. I think the Government ought to give very serious and careful consideration to the question of handling these non-essential industries.

When we get the men we must have money to maintain them. The problem of money, like that of the poor, is always with us. That almighty dollar. How to procure sufficient money to prosecute the war is a question that has been considered by the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I consider that he did very well in his budget, but he did not go far enough. He is a very timid gentleman. I believe that every hon. member of this House is prepared to go farther, and would have gone farther, and I think the people were prepared for greater taxation, and would have readily submitted to it. Last year three-quarters of one per cent of the people were reached, and now the minister hopes to hit eight per cent of the people. But the minister is only getting started. The people are in favour of prosecuting the war and they are willing to help to pay for it. That is the essential point. Some very considerable number of the people need to be wakened up to the fact that we are at war by having their pockets touched by this taxation. If there are any who are not prepared to do their part, and to pay their money for the protection they are getting from our boys at the front, they are unworthy of this free country and they should be made to pay.

We have heard a great deal about war profiteering, and the Minister of Finance has turned his attention in that direction. But let us take the farmer. He is making a lot of money nowadays—wheat, $2.21 a bushel; pork, $20 to $21 a hundredweight; butter, 50 cents a pound, eggs, accordingly. How many of these men keep books and how many of them have an income of $3,000, which would be the limit for a married man, or even $2,000? Very few of them. Yet they are making money a great deal faster than they have ever made it before, and they are not being touched by this tax. I am satisfied they are able and willing to pay, I have not spoken to one who was not prepared to do his bit in help-

ing the financing of this country. That must apply to every man who owns property. That perhaps does not apply to our western cities where real estate has had a great swing and where every man is holding ten, twenty, or thirty times as much land as he has any need for or can ever hope to utilize. There will be some hardship done under those circumstances if there is a direct tax imposed, but I would strongly urge the Minister of Finance to levy, through the municipalities a rate of say, five mills on the dollar, and in that way secure about $25,000,000 from this country. It is a debatable question whether it should be put on the land alone or put upon the land and buildings. A fact to be remembered in connection with the imposition of direct taxation of this kind is that the machinery is all intact to collect it. You can require the municipalities, when they are levying their own taxes, to levy five mills more, and turn it into the federal treasury. It is true that many of the cities are heavily taxed, but we cannot help that. That does not help the federal treasury, and that is what we are here to consider. Apparently the assessments in this country are so lacking in uniformity that it is impossible to get any very accurate knowledge concerning them. It is true that assessments in certain municipalities are very low while others are high, many being up to the full value of the land and three-quarters of the value of the buildings. Some represent half the real value of the property. It would be unequal taxation, but even an imposition of two mills this year would yield half that amount which I have named and that would be no small item. People who cannot go and fight should not hesitate to pay. If the people who stay at home gave up every dollar they make over and above what they need for a bare living and to pay interest, taxation and insurance, they would not be giving up too much. That is what the people may have to do yet—give up every dollar over and above a bare living, which would include interest, insurance and taxes. If the people had been asked to do that, they might, with some show of reason, make complaint; but as what they have really been asked to do is such a small thing it is up to the people of Canada to do their bit in this way. If they did this they would still retain their lives, their health and their property when the war is over; and yet all these are being risked by the boys who are at the front defending them to-day. The people who are staying at home are not risking their lives, and even if they did what is proposed, the discrepancy would still be very great and very much in their favour. Is there any hon. member of this House who would shirk his duty if he were called upon to stake so much? Not one, Sir. Then if the members of the House would agree to make that great sacrifice, and if the winning of the war depended upon it, surely the people of Canada also would—and I think I am safe in saying they would—be prepared to meet that sacrifice, terrible though it might be. Would even that be too high a price to pay for victory, for liberty and for freedom? I claim it would not. The soldier is working for a bare living for himself and his family and undergoing great hardships and privations. He is doing more than that, he is risking his life—and many of them have already laid down their lives. What they are putting into this war is the risk of their lives and a bare living. Under such circumstances should any one of our people who are staying at home in comfort offer one word of criticism of the war taxes which this Government is asking, except it be this: To some of them the taxation of war profits and large incomes may not seem sufficient. If some men have made five or six million dollars out of the manufacture of shells and munitions since the war began, they should be more heavily taxed, and the tax should be made retroactive so as to take a share of their profits from the beginning of the war. A man who had made five or six million dollars in this manner might reasonably give up one-half of those profits to the Government and still have enough to make him happy; in fact, he should be happier because he would not have so much money to look after. I think the taxation of large incomes should also receive more careful consideration from the Finance Minister and from the Government. When a man's private income reaches the limit of $50,000, in my opinion we would be perfectly justified in taxing him to a far greater extent than is here proposed. And he would not suffer any hardship thereby, because $50,000 is a fair sum to live upon.

If the people of this country are honest with themselves, honest to their God, and honest to their country and to the great cause for which we are fighting, they will acquit themselves like men, and nobly and smilingly carry out their duty. At the battle of Trafalgar Nelson hoisted the signal "England expects every man to do his duty." To-day Canada is displaying the

same signal and calling upon every Canadian to do his duty. There was only one response when Nelson issued his order to his fleet, and there will be only one answer, I am convinced, to the call which Canada is making to-day. Canadians by coming smilingly forward and "dropping their nickel in the hat," as Kipling said, will be doing their duty and helping to maintain their freedom unimpaired. If all the profits were given up, which are subjected to taxation, in my opinion it would be a small thing in order to achieve victory. But if we fail to achieve victory, and if, in consequence, we should come under German domination, what would happen? Every man would pack his trunk and get across the line out of Canada, and every interest that he held here would be lost. It has been truly said by a distinguished member of this House that nothing matters but the winning of the war. That is how we should look at this question, and at any further levies of taxation which may be necessary before this struggle is finally ended. Canada is only now beginning to realize what was meant at the outset of the war when a declaration was made that we were going into this fight with every man and with every dollar. We have not yet yielded up the profits that are being made from day to day out of the war, let alone the last dollar. The pledge made was a serious one, but I think the people of this country are thoroughly determined to stand by it.

I feel, Sir, that we should to a greater extent pay our way as we go. Many a man in the wild and woolly West bought more property than he should have done. He did not pay for it at the time, which was bad business, and he is having his difficulties now. Our people should pay their way from year to year and not leave a legacy of debt to posterity, to their descendants in this country for years to come.

The Minister of Finance might have extended the scope of taxation in the matter of musical instruments so as to include pianos. The piano, like the talking machine, is pretty much of a luxury and might very well have been brought under taxation.

We have a tax on patent medicines, and the druggist who does a fair amount of business is kept busy licking stamps and applying them to bottles of Castoria for infants and to bottles of cough mixture for adults. I am not defending patent medicines, but there are some which a medical practitioner finds it necessary to recommend. For example, there is Castoria, which is just as useful and as much of a necessity as milk for the infant. I feel that there should be a tax on all business dealings. The dealer, when a man buys a suit of clothes, he might well be compelled to collect a tax of one per cent. In that way all commercial dealings would be reached. If it is a fair thing to get after the druggist—and the tax on patent medicines has proved to be a hardship in many cases because when a man is taken sick he should have recourse to good remedies, notably essence of pepsin—why not tax other dealers, why not tax the boot sales and the clothing sales? A tax of one per cent, or even one-half of one per cent, would yield an enormous revenue and would materially aid us in the policy of paying as we go.

The war profits tax should, I think, have been developed to a greater extent. In the case of a man who is conducting an ordinary business, who has no war contracts and is only making a reasonable profit, the income tax should be sufficient for him. But the man who is making money hand over fist out of munitions and war orders, the man who is making money out of the calamities of the nation, should be taxed to the extent of ninety or one hundred per cent. Undoubtedly in some cases his plant will only be scrapped when the war is over, but to meet that he can establish a sinking fund as he goes along, because he knows what will be the duration of his war contracts.

Now, as to the duty on farm implements. If a heavier tax were levied upon war profits the Government could, without difficulty, cut down the duty on agricultural implements by one-half and still leave the manufacturer a fair degree of protection. If I remember the figures, the sum of $987,000 was collected last year in duties on farming implements. If I am not right in that statement, the Acting Minister of Finance will correct me.

The amount realized was less than a million dollars. Half that amount could have been easily sacrificed with a slight increase in the tax on war profits. The reduction would have pleased the farmer; it would have increased production, and it would still have left the manufacturer on this side very well protected, even with the duty he has to pay on his imported raw material.

The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in his speech last night urged the Minister of Finance to meet the trade balance by a greater increase in our ex-

ports of raw material. I think if that hon. member would have a talk with the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) the latter would tell him whether or not natural products should be sent out of this country unmanufactured. I am certain that the only way we can build up this country, despite our trade balance, is by sending out our goods manufactured; and when we have developed our natural resources, and are utilizing them to the fullest extent, then we will be in a position to talk free trade. I am a free trader, but I am not willing to commence to build up free trade until the country is in a position, as I see it, to adopt it. Iron is the big commodity that concerns the manufacturer most, and the Government would be well advised to pay very great attention to developing our natural resources required for the manufacture of iron. And when we manufacture sufficient iron to meet our own wants, and possibly some to export, and are able to compete with our friends across the line, then the manufacturer here will get his raw material at as good a price, if not a little better, than he can get it by purchasing it across the line. We will be in a position to talk free trade only after we have fully developed our natural resources. I do not say that the tariff might not be trimmed down somewhat. It might be an advantage if some lines were adjusted. But we did not come here to adjust the tariff; we came here to prosecute the war. I think this Budget as presented will be of much assistance; it would have been of even more assistance if we had made it just a little bit larger.

The member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) made a great plea that part of their profits should be left with the manufacturing corporations, so that these might extend their business after the war. How many of these corporations extend their business out of profits? When they make extensions, it is generally by means of offering bonds or selling more stock and getting in more capital; it is not done to any great extent by saving up their profits. I do not think that that matter is one to which the Minister of Finance should give very much consideration next year, because, as I said, if all profits were paid to the Government, and only a bare living allowed to everybody in this country, we would then be getting down to business, and even then we would not be paying as great a price as are the men at the front.

[Mr. Blake.]

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, I read some time ago a very interesting statement made in the British House of Commons by Mr. Andrew Bonar Law on November 23, 1914. He said:

> I wish at all events to make this clear protest, that it is the right not only of every member of this House but of every newspaper in this country, and of every speaker on any platform, if he honestly believes a member of the Government to be incompentent, or that he is not properly doing his work, to try to get rid of that member, even though his doing so does cause a weakening of confidence in the Government that is carrying on the war.

With that statement the Right Hon. Mr. McKenna agreed absolutely. This proposition laid down by Mr. Bonar Law is a perfectly sound one, and I give it my adhesion, because when in similar circumstances some members of the two great parties in this country individually coalesce to form a so-called Union Government there is more or less danger of abuses and corruption creeping in; and therefore it is more than necessary in the interests of the country to have a strong opposition party to watch them, to scrutinize their acts, and to exercise a general surveillance over them.

But, Sir, to scrutinize, verify and control the administration of the country does not involve the making of captious and useless criticism. It involves rather co-operation, and I sincerely believe this co-operation to be necessary. Ministers, although they may be able and perspicacious, do not verify everything themselves. This verification is generally done by their officers who are not infallible. And when these officers have made mistakes, do you not think, Sir, that, instead of trying to make amends for their faults, they will rather try to excuse their own errors. Consequently, the control of the administration by the representatives of the people must be added to the purely administrative control of the Government. Even if the ministers were able to see to everything for themselves, yet, as Mr. Bonar Law said in the speech referred to, they are human, and he continued:

5 p.m.

> If they find they are not criticised and that they can exercise powers of all kinds without being called to question, the powers grow and they become more and more inclined to be dictatorial.

They, as does the present Government, rule the country by ukases and Orders in Council, without consulting Parliament even when it is in session.

It is with the intention of faithfully serving my country, and of fulfilling my duties as a representative of the people, and of preventing, if possible, abuses of power, that I shall make some observations on the Budget now under consideration. Hon. gentlemen opposite may argue that the great outstanding issue is the winning of the war, that all other matters must be subordinated to that supreme task, and that therefore, criticism, verification, suggestions and scrutiny should be postponed until after the war. I respectfully submit, Sir, that there are occasions when we must prevent evils, which once perpetrated are incurable. Contracts badly or tardily concluded, errors in providing for clothing, ammunition, provisions; mistakes in the sanitary service, are evidenced by deaths which the most elaborate reports are unable to change into resurrections, and are the causes of disasters that the most eloquent speeches cannot transform into victories. We must prevent what is irreparable. The right hon. leader of the Opposition was, therefore, acting very patriotically when in the last Parliament, with the able aid of his followers—some of whom are now occupying the Treasury benches and will not, I am convinced, be bold enough to reproach us for our criticism—he vigorously denounced the war scandals and the nefarious financial policy of the Government.

Sir, the objection that all criticism should be postponed is unfounded. During time of war, as in time of peace, Parliament has a paramount duty as a legislative or controlling body. In England it has never been thought for a moment that Parliament should stand back during a tremendous crisis. On the contrary, it has always been held that a war should be conducted with the assistance of Parliament and of the nation; that every member of Parliament and every citizen has an absolute right to legitimate criticism, and that an arbitrary limitation of such criticism, to use the words of Mr. Bonar Law, "might be found to be detrimental to the real interests of the country and to the successful carrying on of the war."

I had opportunity as a member of the Quebec legislative assembly to express officially my views on the war in moving the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne on January 8, 1915. After giving in detail the generous subscriptions of the provincial government for the war, which at that time amounted to nearly $700,000, I said:

> Let the Government continue this policy which is completely in accordance with the aspirations of our people towards nobleness and justice, and this House will do right to vote all legitimate measures in order to help those whom we cherish and who fight for the triumph of liberty, right and humanity.

Having been since twice re-elected by acclamation in the county of Nicolet, I can truly say that this policy concerning the war has been heartily approved by my constituents.

I am desirous that the Allies shall be victorious and triumphant and that Canada shall do her part in this war, but I submit that our participation in the war must be proportionate to our resources, and be kept within just bounds. We all desire, Sir, to win the war; we differ only as to the method of participating in it. Why? I will try to explain that in a very few words, and to demonstrate that our viewpoint is based on the purest economic patriotism.

The striking feature of the Unionists, or Imperialists, is that they have a great regard for the British Empire generally. But one part of the British Empire they seem always to forget, and that is the Dominion of Canada, consisting of 8,000,000 people. Perhaps this is due to the fact that being new-comers in this country, although they admit no divided allegiance to Canada and her interests, they cannot deny that they have at least a divided affection as between the Old Country and the new. Such an affection, kept within reasonable limits is, I concede, right and creditable. On the other hand, we, who are by birth British Canadians, and have no divided affections, speaking of Canada, we are always proud to say: "This is my own, my native land."

Allow me to quote part of a speech delivered by Colonel Rankin during the Confederation debates, in which he describes well the nature of our feelings. Colonel Rankin then represented the county of Essex; he was in favour of confederation; and he said, on March 10, 1865:

> Even those who are adverse to the scheme have not been behind its greatest advocates in their declarations of attachment to British institutions and British rule on this continent. And I am not disposed to insinuate that there is a solitary member of this House who entertains sentiments of disloyalty to Great Britain. We all have a right to express our views, and in fact it is our duty to do so, since we are sent here to consider what is best for the interests of Canada first; for though we owe allegiance to England, Canada is our country, and has the strongest and best claims to our devotion. I, Sir, am not one of those Canadians who place the interests of England first, and hold those of Canada in secondary estimation.

These are the fundamental differences of mentality between the Imperialists and

those who, though favouring the participation of Canada in the war, earnestly believe that we must not forget Canada's interests and Canada's future. The first are heartened by, perhaps, an exclusive military patriotism which is expressed by the policy of bankrupting Canada, spending her last dollar and sending the last man for the salvation of the Empire, thus putting British interests first and holding Canadian interests in secondary estimation. Against this policy I have protested and I now again protest against it strongly. If you have no men to cultivate the farms, what is the use of having farms to cultivate? If you have no men to finance industries what is the use of having industries? I repeat: We want victory for the Allies, but let us remember this: The war will come to an end, but Canada cannot die. We have, therefore, the paramount duty of looking after the interests of both with a great degree of concern. If we are not strictly obliged to unite them, we surely shall not divide them.

We have also the paramount duty to ensure, at all times, and especially during the war, the maintenance of the economic life of Canada. If we do not perform these duties, one of the consequences will be that the people of Canada, being neglected, sacrificed, will, sooner or later, energetically and strenuously insist on some regard being paid to their interests. Have the Government succeeded in maintaining the economic life of Canada? I regret to say that they have absolutely failed in this matter. This question raises many important problems, all of them closely connected. Some of these problems are preservation of credit, maintenance of labour and increase of production. Let us first consider the two last mentioned problems, which are of vital importance, not only for Canada but as aids in the winning of the war. It is useless to recall the innumerable utterances of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture in regard to increase of production. On April 6, 1918, the Montreal Daily Star, published a message from Lord Rhondda from which I quote the last sentence:

> The Canadian farmer and Canadian farmhand now have the opportunity to make an effective reply to the enemy's present onslaught, by bending their undivided energies to the increased production of those food supplies, for which we depend to such vital extent upon your great Dominion.

On April 12, 1918, there appeared in the Ottawa Journal-Press a significant cartoon. At the top we have this heading: "No wheat, no win." The cartoon is of a soldier speaking to a profusely perspiring farmer, and under the cartoon is to be read this sentence: "Mr. Farmer, thou art the man to win the war!" On April 29, there appeared in La Patrie the following message sent by Lord Rhondda: I translate:

> The British Food Minister cabled to the Food Bureau of Canada that the importations of wheat do not reach England in sufficient quantity to answer the weekly needs.
>
> Lord Rhondda adds: all effort that can be made in Canada to increase the expedition of wheat and meat shall be of an inestimable value.

What was the response of the Government to this appeal? How have they faced this situation? Their answer is contained in an Order in Council strengthening and making more drastic the Military Service Act, 1917. It is contained in the votes in this House by which they have refused exemption even to farmers.

The policy of compulsory military service, to which I was and am still unalterably opposed, is against the most elementary principles of economics, and it is, moreover, contrary, not only to Canadian welfare, but to the sacred cause of the Allies. Can one sincerely believe that the development of national wealth, the growth of population, and the cause of the Allies, will be greatly assisted by enforcing this law and by taking from workshops and farms the physical pick and intellectual flower of the nation? No, Sir, the result of such a policy will be a decrease of agricultural and industrial production, an increase in the cost of living, and above all, we shall, perhaps, have to face famine, and that will be the hardest blow given, not only to Canada, but to the Allies. We have an indication of that tendency to decrease production in the fact that, according to the Toronto Globe, Ontario farmers are, to an alarming extent, selling by auction their farms, agricultural implements and livestock. We cannot depend upon female labour to maintain our agricultural production. The example of France shows that this experiment has practically been a failure. Why then try such an experiment in Canada? Exclusive military patriotism constitutes, to my mind a dangerous fallacy. It must at all times, and especially under present conditions, be subordinated to and guided by economic patriotism, which alone can prevent famine in this and the Allied countries. It is imperative that we should adopt immediately a constructive policy for increased production in order that we may help the cause of the Allies and work

for the development and progress of our beloved Canada. How long the war will last we do not know. What we do know is that we are faced with most serious difficulties as to the high cost of living, increased production, and the maintenance of the labour supply. These are vital problems which we have to solve, not after the war, but now. They must be solved immediately if we are sincere in our desire to protect the consumer and do our utmost to avoid famine and help to win the war. I always listen with deep interest to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and I heartily approved his sentiments when the other day he said:

> The longer the war is going to last, the more the problem must be grasped of raising all the magnificent amounts that can be raised from those boundless tracts of arable land that we have in Western Canada.

And I shall add, in all parts of Canada.

That is sound, economic patriotism and if we practise it boldly and fearlessly, we shall serve our country best by preventing production from falling off and the cost of living from increasing. It will be too late to postpone these questions until after the war. Famine might then have done its work in the ranks of our Allied armies; even to-day they may be in danger of losing the battle because of our indifference and fear in these matters.

I blame the Government for not having the courage to apply remedies at once to this disastrous situation as regards agriculture and the consumers of this country. I regret that instead of continuing to be the slaves of a military patriotism, which after all is unproductive, they have not become the warm and ardent protagonists of a sound and economic patriotism. I regret they have not adopted the wise suggestion of the hon. member for Red Deer for free food and free agricultural implements. I am in favour of free food and free agricultural implements, and I shall support any measure introduced on either side of the House which I believe to be for the financial, agricultural and consumers' interests of this country. Unfortunately the Government are precluded by their militaristic ideas from proposing and enforcing a great national reform, and in this matter I wholly and essentially dissent from their policy.

Has the Government been successful in preserving our credit? It seems to me that question must be answered in the negative. Our trade, it is true has increased considerably, but it has increased in value rather than in volume. It was merely derived from the very high prices of certain articles, and we must not forget that the payments made by the Government for supplies for the soldiers, transport, munitions and war expenditure generally, came out of money advanced by the banks largely contributed to maintain a fictitious affluence of available capital. To support my argument I invoke the authority of the acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who in his criticism of the Budget last year made this interesting statement:

> While, in a general way, these trade and revenue figures indicate a pleasing activity in the trade and economic affairs of our country, we must remember that they are largely artificial and do not represent a normal or healthy condition, a condition that will endure for long in this country. The high prices which prevail to-day alone account very largely for the increased total money value of our export and import trade.

This doctrine was also advocated, if I remember well, by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who continually preached national and private economy as a palliative to that abnormal and irregular financing. But the best evidence that our financial credit is not so good as the value of our trade seems to indicate is furnished by the current rate of exchange, for when we have to pay $1,000 in New York we are obliged to send $1,020, and that condition is constantly growing worse. One of the reasons for this is our adverse trade balance with the United States, which was emphasized yesterday by the Acting Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, and the other reason is the fact that we cannot export gold. In fact, since the beginning of the war, we have exported no specie. Why? Because the Government have inconsistently increased our fiduciary circulation of Dominion notes without proportionately increasing our reserve of gold or specie. The following figures were given in answer to a question I put early in the session. At the outbreak of the war in 1914 our gold reserve in the hands of the Receiver General amounted to $97,136,426.88 and on March 1, 1918 to $120,005,662.45, an increase of $22,869,235.57. I would call the attention of the House to the following statement regarding the circulation of Dominion notes.

Circulation at outbreak of war, 1914	$112,793,833 28
Circulation on February 28th, 1918	255,316,552 92
Increase	$142,522,819 64

If you compare these figures you will see that in August, 1914, for each dollar of

Dominion notes we had a gold guarantee of 86 cents, and that in March, 1918, this gold guarantee was only 47 cents, thus showing a decrease of 39 per cent. We must not be surprised, then, if the current rate of exchange is so badly against us. The Government should cease to finance this country on paper. I warn them against the evils of such a policy. It will create further depreciation and economic tension. If they continue to increase this fiduciary circulation without adopting proper means to redeem it, they will make the trouble worse instead of better. I do not consider as sufficient the approved securities deposited to guarantee Dominion notes. We cannot sell them in the United States. We cannot even borrow there and pledge these securities as a guarantee. This shows that in financial matters there is no sentiment, passion or emotion. Interest alone guides the movement of money. This is the lesson of every past war, and this war is no exception to the rule.

We have also the fact that, according to the acting Minister of Finance himself, "We are borrowing too much and paying too little," and sometimes we borrow at rates which are certainly too high. I have endeavoured to study the public accounts. They are, I must confess, very complicated. I have found that the complexity of our public finance suggests anarchy and casts an impervious shadow on nearly all operations of the public service. Nevertheless, I venture to say that, up to March 31st, 1917, we have financed our war expenditures by loans only and not by taxation. This is a wrong policy. As was said by the acting Minister of Finance last year, "there should be more taxation and less borrowing." That is the English, or British, method. During the Boer war and the China expedition, from April 1st, 1899, to March 31st, 1902, the total war expenditure was £153,317,000, of which £108,046,000 was the product of loans and £45,271,000 the product of taxation, giving a percentage of nearly thirty per cent of the war expenditures paid out of taxation. For the year ended March 31st, 1918, if my calculations are correct, we have paid out of taxation hardly seven per cent of our war expenditure. Surely this is not sufficient. Whether the new proposed taxation will improve this condition time will tell.

May I be permitted to set forth briefly a resume showing the British war expenditures from April 1st, 1899, to March 31st, 1902, during the Boer War and the China Expedition, and indicating how the money was paid out:

Total war expenditure		£153,317,000
Paid by revenues derived from taxation:		
Surplus, 1899-1900	£ 9,350,000	
Suspension of sinking fund, 1900-01,1901-02	9,187,000	
New taxes imposed in 1900-01, 1901-02 ..	26,749,000	45,271,000
By the proceeds of loans:		
Treasury bonds ..	£13,000,000	
War loan	29,519,000	
Exchequer bonds	23,423,000	
Consols on (60 millions)	42,104,000	108,046,000
		£153,317,000

When dealing with this matter, I must remark that the Government's answer that "under the Audit Act all public moneys and revenues form one consolidated revenue fund and expenditures are not earmarked against any source of revenue," is not satisfactory. If we want to know exactly our financial standing, this Government should be able, as in other countries, to state plainly and distinctly what amount has been paid in connection with war expenditure by means of (a) war taxes; (b) treasury bonds or treasury bills; (c) short term loans, (d) long term loans, and also if they have used, towards the expenses of war, funds from postal savings banks, insurance deposits, or other sums deposited with them for any purpose. I believe that our public book-keeping could be improved and that the Government should adopt proper means to attain that purpose.

Notwithstanding the fact that since the war began we have borrowed $950,000,000, and that our war expenditure was only $878,000,000, the Minister of Finance announces his intention to borrow again and again. He intends to borrow a further $280,000,000, not including such sums as are necessary in connection with our railways. Does he not think we are approaching the limit of our borrowing power? He should stand and say, as did Sir Michael Hicks Beach, in the British House of Commons, on April 18, 1901:

I never will be responsible for the fatal policy of paying the whole cost of the war out

of loans without charging a reasonable amount to the taxpayers of the day.

Although I do not approve this policy of always borrowing, I hope the Government will realize in the transaction the following essential conditions: First, that they will undertake but the cheapest and most profitable loan; secondly, that they will adopt the most popular type of loan; and, thirdly, that they will realize the most important condition, and that is success. I also suggest that a clause concerning conversion be included in the bonds, and I express regret that such bonds have been exempted from taxation. The Budget should also fix annually the maximum amount of treasury bills to be issued by the Minister of Finance during the fiscal year. That is done everywhere else, and why should it not be done here?

As regards reduction in ordinary expenditure, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has to my mind fully demonstrated that as compared with the years for which the Liberal Administration is responsible, no substantial reductions have been made, but that, on the contrary, in various departments the ordinary expenditure is higher than it was when the Laurier Government was in power. I will not, therefore, deal with this branch of the question, but will simply, if you will allow me, Sir, make a humble suggestion:

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question put by me, the Government has said that it was not necessary at present to suspend during the continuance of the war the discretion it exercises in respect to the sinking fund on loans obtained prior to the commencement of hostilities. Yet the policy of temporarily suspending during war the discretionary sinking funds on previous loans is traditional in England. At the very beginning of the Boer War such a course was followed, and by that means nearly $70,000,000 was secured. This would be a very simple manner of reducing expenditure and of lessening the burden of taxation. It would also be advantageous to the country, because it is evidently inconsistent, on the one hand, to redeem debts bearing interest of 3 to 4 per cent, and, on the other hand, to create new debts at rates of interest from 5½ to 7 per cent, as has been done by this Government. In my humble opinion the Government should follow the example of England in the matter.

I have not much to say concerning the proposed new indirect taxation. I believe that the Budget proposals do not regard the best interests of national economy; they are contrary to the elementary principles of fiscal justice, and enlarge the doctrine, fashionable at the present time, that all indirect taxation should be taken off the rich and put upon the poor. To qualify its effects, I will quote the very words of the acting Minister of Finance in his speech in the Budget debate last year. Speaking of the supertax of 7½ per cent, he said:

> It adds to the cost of articles essential to life to-day; now oppressive in prices, thereby involving a great hardship to the masses of the people. And these are without any compensating advantage at all.

As to the income tax, I am pleased that it is increased. We must face the war expenditure, provide pensions for our soldiers, and provide also for their disembodiment and re-establishment in civil life. We shall be obliged to make an economic reorganization of the country, and to recuperate our finances. All these necessitate enormous sums of money, which gives to the rich the opportunity to invest their wealth. As was said by an old economist, "War is harvest time for capitalists." They benefit by it, they must pay for it; it is only justice. If the minister had made the rate of taxation higher still for the rich, I would have been more satisfied.

On the whole, Sir, this Budget looks peculiarly like the war menus prepared by the late food controller; it is too costly for the means of the people. Let me quote an extract which describes very well, I believe, our present situation. After giving some explanation of the Civil War, Mr. D'Arcy McGee, during the debates on confederation, proceeded to say:

> But it is not the revolution wrought in the minds of men of great intelligence that is most to be deplored, for the powerful will of such men may compel their thoughts back again to a philosophy of peace; no, it is the mercenary and military interests created under Mr. Lincoln which are represented, the former by an estimated governmental outlay of about $100,000,000, this year and the other by the 800,000 men whose blood is thus to be bought and paid for; by the armies out of uniform who prey upon the army; by the army of contractors who are to feed and clothe and arm the million; by that other army, the army of tax-collectors, who cover the land, seeing that no industry escapes unburthened, no possession unentered, no affection even, untaxed. Tax! tax! tax! is the cry from the rear! Blood! blood! blood!

is the cry from the front! Gold! gold! gold! is the chuckling undertone which comes up from the mushroom millionaires, well named a shoddy aristocracy. Nor do I think the army interest, the contracting interest, and the tax-gathering interest, the worst results that have grown out of this war. There is another and equally serious interest—the change that has come over the spirit, mind and principles of the people, that terrible change which has made war familiar and even attractive to them.

Well, Sir, we now have in our country all these cries, and the Government has answered each of them. By their military service law they try to satisfy those who cry "blood! blood! blood!" and as a consequence of this they are obliged themselves to cry "tax! tax! tax!" By their war scandals, their iniquitous railway transactions they have been very, very kind—to the detriment of the country—to the shoddy aristocracy who always want gold! gold! gold! Let us hope that soon that calamitous situation will end; let us hope that the people of this country will realize the unfathomable precipice to which the Government carries them.

We understand and share the sufferings of the people and desire with all our souls their early termination. We pray the Almighty to give to the world the benefits of a solid, profound and lasting peace which will be a permanent guarantee of safety, confidence, concord, harmony and progress for all civilized nations. Our earnest desire is that in every part of this our dear country will prevail the very noble sentiments expressed by the great Sir John A. Macdonald:

> We all feel the advantages we derive from our connection with England. So long as that alliance is maintained, we enjoy, under her protection, the privileges of constitutional liberty acording to the British system. We will enjoy here that which is the great test of constitutional freedom—we will have the rights of the minority respected. In all countries the rights of the majority take care of themselves, but it is only in countries like England, enjoying constitutional liberty, and safe from the tyranny of a single despot or of an unbridled democracy, that the rights of minorities are regarded.

If these ideals are realized; if the rights of minorities are regarded, protected, and safeguarded in every province of the Dominion, all racial and religious prejudices and appeals will disappear; we will have a real national unity; every race, every creed, every citizen will be faithful to Canada and her fortune, and will happily and enthusiastically endeavour to expand that faith in Canada which we should entertain, not only in the home, in each province and in the Dominion as a whole, but also throughout the entire world.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, as a new-comer in this Parliament I should like to congratulate very heartily the acting Minister of Finance (Hon. A. K. Maclean) on his extraordinarily fine effort in his Budget speech of yesterday. Probably he has made mistakes in that speech, but the statement may be made without fear of contradiction that a Finance Minister who never makes mistakes never makes anything.

To pay taxes, Sir, is always abhorrent. I have no doubt that if you could find in this world a human being who pays taxes with pleasure, you would find at the same time a curiosity worthy of being put in the British museum. For example, I have no doubt that pork-packing baronets would rather literally live up to the dictum "to hell with profits" than pay those profits over in taxes to this financially hard-pressed Government. Hon. gentlemen preceding me who expressed the opinion that these taxes on food profiteers should be retroactive have touched a chord which will find a responsive ring in the hearts of most of the Canadian people. Sir, it is easier to criticise Budgets than to make better ones. I have no intention of engaging to-night in any criticism of this Budget; I leave that to hon. gentlemen who are better political economists than I am. I purpose dealing with a branch of the subject which has not yet been touched upon during the course of this discussion of the manner of raising revenues to meet Canada's great obligations. The subject with which I am going to deal has only a general application to the question of revenues, but if the matter is given proper attention by the Government the prosperity of the country will be increased and additional revenues will be indirectly produced. The subject of which I am going to speak is the greater development of the mineral resources of this country.

The principle of free trade is held by some hon. members on both sides of the House. I know, Sir, of one on each side of the House who holds that principle—the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) on your left and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) on your right. The principle of protection is held by many hon. members on both sides of the House, but there is one principle which I believe, is held by all the members of this House, and that is the principle of developing the prosperity of this country of ours. After this war is over raw materials will

rule the world of commerce. Canada possesses those raw materials in great abundance, and to my mind, all that Canada needs is a national awakening to make her realize her great future, and to make her help to develop those great natural resources. There are hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces on the East to British Columbia on the West. In the Canada Year-book, of 1916-17, the author says:

So far no great beds of high grade ores have been found in Canada, but it must be noted that the supplies of high grade iron ores within the convenient reach of the blast furnaces of the great iron and steel making countries are now almost exhausted, and the low grade ores of Canada will not have to compete with them very long. In a paper read before the American Institute of Mining Engineers, Mr. James Galley says: There are vast deposits of magnetic iron ores in the United States and Canada that are too low in iron for use at the present time, but which can be mechanically concentrated into very rich material. The reclamation of these ore beds will add tremendously to the ore supplies of Canada and the United States.

At the Easter recess I went down to New York city, and in my hotel I offered, in payment of my hotel account, a Canadian $100 bank bill. I was charged $2 exchange on it. Before I had left this city I had visited my bankers here and asked for some American bills. They had none, and they told me that if they had had any, they would have to charge me one and a half to one and three-quarters per cent premium on those bills. I may say in passing that when I returned to Ottawa I had fifty or sixty dollars in American bills, and I offered them to the same bank, but the bank refused to buy them. In other words the banks will sell American bills at a premium to their depositors, but they refuse to buy them from their depositors. That is one of the methods by which the banks are able to pay large dividends. But the fact remains that the exchange between Canada and the United States is against us at the rate of 1½ to 1¾ per cent at the present time. The reason for that is because we import so heavily from the United States. The acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) quoted figures yesterday to show that we import nearly two dollar's worth of goods to one dollar's worth of goods that we export to the United States, and one of the heaviest imports is iron ore for use in our blast furnaces and steel plants. Last year we imported iron ore to the extent of 2,084,231 short tons, whereas of the Canadian ores we used only 92,065 tons, or about 4 per cent; that is four per cent of the iron ores used in the blast furnaces and steel plants of this country were of Canadian production. In 1916, the year previous, we imported 1,964,598 short tons and of Canadian ore we used only 221,773 short tons, or about 11 per cent. The percentage of Canadian ores used is getting less all the time. In 1896, it was 67 per cent of all the ore used in this country; in 1897 it was 49 per cent; in 1898 it was 42 per cent and it has kept decreasing until in 1909 it was 17 per cent; in 1916 it was 11 per cent and in 1917, only 4 per cent. In 1896, we imported from the United States 1,270 tons of iron ore and last year, twenty-two years later, we imported 2,084.231 tons, about 60 per cent of which came from United States and 40 per cent from Wabana, Newfoundland, or altogether nearly 2,000 times the amount we used in our steel plants and blast furnaces in 1896. Are we going to admit that the Almighty, in making this continent, put all the good iron ores on the southern side of the International boundary and all the poor iron ores on the northern side of the international boundary? I do not believe we should admit any such contention. I know the mining branch of the Government is not altogether optimistic as to the mineral deposits of this country, but I shall take the opportunity of quoting a few lines from some of the reports in which the writers are optimistic. On page 4 of volume "Iron Ore Occurrences in Canada," put out by the Mines Branch of Canada, the authors state:

In consideration of Canada's iron ore resources, a point that should not be lost sight of is that the total area comprised in the Dominion is very large and that much of it is practically unexplored so far as its iron ore possibilities are concerned. By reference to the general map at the end of the volume it will be seen that with very few exceptions all the known occurences are situated in the older and more or less settled and known districts. In the comparatively unexplored regions of the north large areas of iron bearing rocks occur at a number of points, but on account of their inaccessible location there is at the present time little to induce a thorough exploration of them in search for ore beds.

The authors also speak of the British Columbia deposits. By the way, a large deputation from British Columbia is in the city at the present time, asking for some assistance to the ore industry of that province. The authors, speaking of the British Columbia deposits, say:

There is little doubt also that active exploration would disclose many beds of iron ore at present unknown.

A little later on, speaking of northwestern Ontario, north of Lake Superior, they say:

> The most promising of the more accessible portions of the province have been pretty well gone over by the iron ore prospector, and the discovery of any large new ore beds in them is more likely to be made by the underground exploration and diamond drilling of known occurrences, rather than by ordinary surface prospecting.

This emphasizes the fact that the development of our ores would be very likely to bring forward heavy deposits of good iron ore.

In a report on examination of some iron ore deposits in the districts of Thunder Bay and Rainy river, Ontario, by F. Hille, mining engineer, also gotten out by the Department of Mines in 1908, Mr. Hille, after discussing the likelihood of the exhaustion of the immense iron ore deposits of the United States in the near future, says:

> Africa so far is an uncertain quantity and by the time that continent would be able to furnish any iron ore, this mineral will already be classed among the rare ones. Whence then can the deficiency be made up? The only possible source that I can see is Canada. The Province of Ontario alone contains immense deposits of ore scattered over a very large area, sufficient to furnish supply to the smelters both on this side and the other side of the International boundary for many years to come; although these ores to some extent consist of low grade magnetites it will not be long before the iron masters will be glad to get them at whatever price they are put upon the market.

A little later he says:

> These deposits are all situated in the Province of Ontario, but if an estimate were made of what is already known of the iron ore reserves throughout the whole Dominion, there can be little doubt that Canada would stand very high, if not first, among the nations of the world as a prospective iron producing country.

To any one who is interested in this subject, Mr. Hille's report would make interesting reading.

Sir, I believe that there are hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Along the north shore of lake Superior, along the Canadian Northern railway line east and west of Port Arthur and Fort William are immense iron deposits.

In reality we shall not know much of the real quantities of ore in Canada until further developmental work is done, as development will inevitably lead to a more thorough examination of deposits already known and the prospecting for others. This is what has happened in other iron-producing countries of the world.

[Mr. Manion.]

The rich ores of the American ranges on the south shore of lake Superior come into this country free. I am not arguing that we should put an embargo upon these American ores, but I do believe sincerely that by having a bounty on all Canadian ore used in the blast furnaces of Canada we could aid in the building up of a vast new industry in this country. I am told by capable mining engineers that ore with 33 per cent of iron is workable on a paying basis, and there have been hundreds of assays made from various properties with much higher percentages. Ores from the north shore of lake Superior run much heavier in iron than this percentage with very little foreign substance, some running as high as 60 per cent.

In this year's estimates, which we have been discussing in this House for some time, I note the following amounts allowed for different departments of this Government:

The Department of Mines.	$ 427,900.00
Immigration.	1,135,000.00
Mounted Police Department. . .	1,127,777.00
Dominion Lands and Parks. . .	2,531,645.00
Fisheries.	875,000.00
Penitentiaries.	991,600.00
Scientific institutions.	405,000.00

Every one of these departments, with the exception of the last, and I have chosen only the least important departments of the Government, is allowed two or more times the amount allowed for the Department of Mines; even the caring for our criminals costs over twice as much. Our country's expenditures are running four and five million dollars annually. With all this spending surely we can allow a couple of million dollars a year for the purpose of developing the mineral resources of the country.

Immigration at the present time is practically at a standstill compared with immigration into this country in the past, and yet the Department of Immigration is spending nearly three times the amount spent by the Department of Mines. I do not wish to be misconstrued as criticising the administration of the Department of Immigration or any other department. I simply wish to insist that as they are getting these generous allowances the Government should bring forward a constructive policy to develop the mineral resources of this country. The war is costing us four to five hundred million dollars annually. We voted five hundred million dollars for the war in this House only the other day, and I feel that we ought to spend two or three million dollars for the peaceful and prosperous de-

velopment of the mineral resources of our country.

The other evening the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in discussing the fuel situation, dealt at some length with the process of briquetting which is going to be fostered by this Government in conjunction with the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. In almost the same breath he said he did not believe it was the duty of this Government to aid financially in the development of our mineral resources. I agree that we should help in the briquetting of lignites in the western provinces; it is a development of our natural resources. I also maintain that the Government should assist in the development of the mineral resources of this country. Canada's mineral production in 1915 was $137,109,171, in 1916 $176,357,454, and for 1917 the estimated amount is $192,982,837. The value of the fisheries product amounted, in 1915, to $31,264,631, and in 1916 to $35,860,708. In other words, you will find, on comparing those figures, that the fisheries brought in one-fifth the value of the minerals, and yet the cost of the fisheries was twice the amount spent on mineral development. The taxes of this country are increasing, and they are bound to continue to increase. There is only one method by which we can cut down the taxes per capita in this country, and that is by increasing our population. If we double our population we cut the per capita tax in two. Europe, excluding Russia, has an area only one-half the area of Canada; that includes England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Italy, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and every other country with the exception of Russia. Though that area is only half the area of Canada they have about three hundred millions of people. It seems to me, therefore, we have plenty of room for an increase in population, and I maintain that mineral development will increase our population. A hundred years ago the population of Canada and that of the United States were not very far apart in numbers, and yet to-day we have between seven and a half and eight million people while they have one hundred and ten millions, and it is partly due to the fact that we have been assisting them to develop their natural resources and build up their commerce instead of developing our own natural resources.

As soon as the war is over our soldiers will be returning to this country to the number of perhaps four hundred thousand. Those men have given up everything they possessed in life to fight for democracy as opposed to German autocracy. I used to believe two or three years ago that much that was said in the British Press and on the street and in this House in praise of our Canadian soldiers was to a certain extent flattery. But one day a little over a year ago I stood on the crest of Vimy Ridge and all around me as far as the eye could see lay a shell-devastated area which three or four hours before had been entirely in the hands of the Germans, but which at that moment was entirely in the hands of the Canadians. I realized then, and I am positive of it now, that Canadian soldiers are the equal of, if not superior to, any other soldiers on the western front. The reason I mention that is that those boys who have shown so nobly the qualities of which they are made, deserve the best of care when they return to this country. It is going to be a very great problem for this Government or whatever other Government may be in power at that time to look after those boys when they return, and I pity any Government which neglects that duty. Why should not this Government kill two birds with one stone by developing so far as it is able the mineral resources of this country? Build up a new industry, and at the same time provide employment for many of these boys when they return. I have heard it said by many hon. gentlemen and have seen it stated in the newspapers that many of these boys when they return will go on the farm. I venture to say that not more than one-fifth of them will go on the farm. I think that probably three hundred thousand or more of them will have to be given employment of some kind. It is very easy for us sitting here in this comfortable house, for in spite of all the complaints we hear, it is very much more comfortable than the trenches—to ask those boys to go and take up a farm twenty-five miles away from a railway, and to pioneer. I repeat, I do not think that more than one-fifth of the boys will go on the farm, and it is therefore our duty to provide employment for them on their return.

I might go on at great length and take up the question of the railways and point out that we have 1,300 miles of railway on three different lines between Ottawa and Winnipeg, and there are many people in this country, and I am one of them, who think there is at least one line too many through that territory; but we have

these three lines of railway running through that unproductive territory. We have in this country altogether 40,000 miles of railway, or roughly speaking, one mile to every 190 or 200 people. The United States has one mile to every 400 people, Great Britain one mile to every 2,000 and Russia one mile to every 4,000 people. Our mileage exceeds the mileage of Great Britain with her 45,000,000 people, exceeds that of France with her 40,000,000 people, and equals the mileage of Germany with her 65,000,000 people. In other words, we have not the population to develop the traffic for these roads. The development of our minerals along the north shore of lake Superior, in British Columbia, in the Maritime Provinces and other parts of Canada, would develop a great amount of traffic for these railways. The people of this country are tired of paying out bounties to railways, tired of taking over defunct railways whose promoters have let them fall down after failing to make for themselves millions. We should develop some method of producing traffic for these roads, and to save this country from taking over these defunct railways whose promoters have decided they cannot carry them on any longer. In the United States 47 per cent of the traffic of their railways comes from the mines. One of the greatest assets any people can have is faith in themselves. Let us have faith in ourselves and help develop our mineral resources.

A number of different methods have been proposed. I am now speaking particularly of iron. The first method is by putting a duty on iron ore coming from the United States. I am not advocating protection, because I do not think at the present, or at any time probably, it would be a wise thing to put up a barrier against the iron and steel industry and block trade coming through its natural channels. The second proposal is that the Government might build a large steel plant in this country, but I do not think the Government is in a financial position to do that. The third proposal is that the Government might guarantee the bonds of a private corporation, but this Government and many of the provincial governments, have had a good deal of experience in guaranteeing bonds, so I do not think the people of this country would be enamoured of that idea. The fourth proposal is that they might guarantee the dividends of the bonds of a private company, but that is in the same category as the last. The fifth proposal is that the Government might pay a bounty of so much per ton on all iron ore produced from Canadian mines and smelted in Canada. That proposition appears to be the most reasonable and the least dangerous to any government. Until the ore was mined there would be no bounty to pay. At the present time we are only mining a couple of hundred thousand tons a year or less, so it would amount to very little on the present output of the mines. We should not have to pay at all events until the iron ore was forthcoming, and if it was not forthcoming no bounty would have to be paid.

I believe, Sir, that a deputation from British Columbia is advocating the paying of a bounty upon steel produced from Canadian iron ore. I believe that the true way of nourishing this industry is to pay a bounty on the iron ores themselves, that is nourish the root of the commercial tree.

Canada has paid bounties in the past. Away back in 1895 or 1896 she paid bounties on iron and steel and she was able to build up vast industries in that way, but, unfortunately, in building up those industries, she used the iron resources of the United States. We do not build up the commercial prosperity of our own country in that way. Then we have paid bounties on fisheries and on oil production. My hon. friend from Shelbourne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), speaking to me the other day, mentioned that the fisheries bounties were paid out of moneys which we received from the award in the fisheries arbitration between United States and Canada. We have paid fairly heavy silver lead bounties on the silver lead ores of British Columbia. By these bounties we have developed a wonderful silver lead industry in British Columbia. The other evening, when discussing the question of fuel, it was pointed out that there was paid about 50 cents per ton on all coal imported into this country with the exception of anthracite. That amounts to some millions of dollars per annum. That 50 cents per ton paid by the people, mostly of central Canada, upon the coal that they bring in from Pennsylvania is virtually a bounty paid to the coal producers in the East and the West. I am not objecting to it at all; if we can afford to pay bounties in that way, we can also afford to pay bounties on iron ore produced from our own iron mines. Any duty paid in this country on materials which are produced in the country is practically a bounty to the producers of that article. To-day no bounty is being paid by the Dominion Government for the development of the iron ores of this country. I believe

that British Columbia pays some bounties upon ore produced in that province but the Dominion Government does not pay any bounty of that kind. We have in Canada twenty blast furnaces, but only fourteen of them were in use in 1916 and 1917. By the payment of a bounty, or possibly by some other method of encouragement, it appears to me that we might encourage the working of all these furnaces and the construction of others. In 1900 the production of pig iron in Canada was 96,575 tons; in 1916 the production had grown to 1,169,257 tons; an increase of twelve times, but most of this was made from imported ores. A bounty on Canadians ores would develop our iron resources, and in any case the money is paid only as the iron is produced.

The other evening my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in a very able manner, outlined to the House the shipbuilding programme of this Government and he and the Government deserve the most cordial congratulations of the House and the country on the development of this vast industry. Shipbuilding we should have in this country but it should be accompanied by the development of our own iron resources to supply the steel necessary for those ships. There is a shortage of steel in every plant using steel in this country. I happened to have an interview the other day with the War Trades Board and I was informed that it was almost impossible to get steel from the United States. To establish the shipbuilding industry in this country it is necessary to have a constant and adequate supply of steel and the way to develop our own steel industries is to develop our own iron mines. Canada is the world's second largest silver producer and produces copper in great quantities, as well as gold, lead, zinc, nickle and iron. By increasing our iron production we will build up our own commerce, railways, steamship lines and general prosperity instead of those of the United States.

The objection might be made that we require coal for smelting purposes and that Canada does not possess this coal. It is true that coal for the central portion of Canada comes over very cheaply by water frieght from Pennsylvania, but at any rate we have in this country the possibility of electric smelting. There are two great sources of energy in any country—coal and water power. Coal is exhaustible but water power is one of the few things that you can go on using for all time without exhausting the supply. Last year there were in Canada 54 electric smelters with a capacity of 173,000 tons of iron and steel. The British Forgings plant at Toronto has 10 electric smelters with a total capacity of 72,000 tons per annum, making it the largest electric process steel plant in the world. Canada has 18,000,000 h.p. of electricity in its water-powers. Of this only one-tenth has been developed, so that our water powers may probably solve the question of fuel shortage for the smelters that we will have if we take advantage of our possibilities.

There is in medicine what we sometimes call a vicious circle. One bad symptom reacts upon another bad symptom, and, reacting one upon the other, a vicious circle is formed. By developing our mineral resources we would aid in developing our water-powers, and that in turn would aid in developing our mineral resources, so forming what I might term a virtuous circle.

The United States Steel Corporation controls the price of iron ore in this country, as they have immense iron deposits, their own railway lines, steamship lines and all subsidiary plants. They have been talking for 10 years about establishing an immense plant at Ojibway, near Windsor, but they have never built that plant. Every time that any one in Canada proposes to develop our own iron resources the United States Steel company threatens to build a plant in order to scare our own Canadian people from going ahead. By proper assistance the Government of Canada can develop these resources and attract capital to them. These Ontario steel plants have been getting their ore from the United States and you cannot get capital to invest in the development of our own iron mines when ore of such good quality can be got so cheaply from the United States. If you will look, Sir, over the commercial development of any of the great commercial countries of the world—England, the United States, Germany, or France—you will find that their commercial development was directly in proportion to their production of pig iron and steel. Germany, in 1870, took Alsace-Lorraine from France for the purpose of obtaining the iron fields of that territory, and I venture to say she will never willingly give up Alsace-Lorraine, as she obtains three-quarters of her iron ore from that territory. She increased her steel production twelve times in the quarter of a century immediately preceding this war. The United States increased her steel production thirteen times in the same period and England's output increased only two and a half times, and all the members

of this House know that the United States and Germany were rapidly forging in advance among the commercial nations of the world. The United States, Great Britain, Germany and France are the great iron producers of the world and are also the leaders in commercial progress. Iron and steel are necessary basic elements of commercial progress. If we do not develop our resources we are lacking in progressive and aggressive commercial qualities. Boards of trade, legislatures of different provinces, and mining conventions have passed resolutions, and the press has presented arguments in favour of the Government of Canada taking a hand in the development of our iron ore resources. Just the other day I cut out from a western trade journal, the Grain and Trade News, the following editorial:

> At the present time there is no diminution of consumption of iron and steel in sight, and in face of the fact that we have the raw material in undoubted quantities we are amply justified in seeking public assistance to establish this country in the one business aside from agriculture that will enable us to meet the demands for interest and principal caused by expenditures made on account of the war.

I respectfully lay this suggestion before this Government for its serious consideration. As to my mind it is one of the possible methods by which we may increase our prosperity, produce a market for our agricultural products, give employment to our returned soldiers, develop freight revenue for our over-developed railway systems, and generally help to give this great Dominion the propulsive power to place it, after the war, among the advancing commercial countries of the world.

Mr. PAMPHILE REAL DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): Mr. Speaker, we listened with great pleasure yesterday to the able speech delivered by the Acting Minister of Finance, and I must congratulate him upon the manner in which he discharged his duty, because he had a hard and ungrateful task to perform, to submit in some presentable form the difficult financial statement of Canada. The financial position of this country is not flourishing, nor does it give any cause for rejoicing, I therefore expected to hear from the Acting Finance Minister some proposition that would tend to alleviate in some degree the conditions of the masses in this country. I am sorry to say, however, that the only measure proposed in the Budget Speech was the imposition of still heavier taxes and still heavier burdens on the people.

The Acting Finance Minister estimated that for the fiscal year 1918-1919 we should be able to meet our ordinary and capital expenditure out of revenue, and have, as in the past two years, an appreciable sum over, which we could apply to war purposes. I cannot agree, Mr. Speaker, with that anticipation, because I do not think there will be any surplus left out of revenue when all the expenses for the current year are paid. The estimates submitted to the House call for a vote of $252,000,000. In addition the Minister of Railways a short time ago asked for a vote of $50,000,000 with which to purchase rolling stock for the Government railway system, and in doing so asked for authority to expend an equivalent sum annually until a year or two after the war had terminated. We also know that the Government has purchased, or acquired, certain railways in Canada, the revenues from which will not be sufficient to meet the outlays, and the deficit from which the Government will have to make good. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) figured this amount at $10,000,000 per annum, and probably at the end of the present year we shall have to face a still larger deficit. No doubt, the Minister of Railways will say that the $50,000,000 should be charged to capital account, but I cannot concur in that contention because the annual depreciation of rolling stock which has to be made good every year is so large that in all probability for many years to come the $50,000,000 in question will be required to be expended by the Government. Now if we total the three items which I have enumerated it will yield the huge sum of $317,000,000. In order to meet this immense sum what revenue is there available? The Acting Minister of Finance has told us that he hopes this year to realize a revenue of $270,000,000, which will leave a deficit of about $47,000,000, to meet which we must have recourse to borrowing. Therefore, of what avail have been all the sacrifices of the people of Canada? For some years past, especially since the outbreak of the war, heavy taxes, including direct taxes, have been levied upon the people. We are now paying duties on cheques, stamp duties and various other forms of taxes, and the Government still comes forward with fresh impositions. The people have heretofore cheerfully paid them in the belief that the revenue thus derived would be expended for war purposes, but they will be sorry to learn, after all their sacrifices, that the large sums of money taken from them in

9 p.m.

the form of fresh taxation are devoted to meeting the internal expenses of the country, and that not a cent from all these taxes is going directly towards war purposes.

And what is the financial situation of Canada to-day? We have voted at the request of the Prime Minister the very large sum of $500,000,000. We did so after stating our objections, but the responsibility for the expenditure of this money rests upon the Government. Canada will be called upon at some time or other to finance the purchases of England in this country, which will, in all probability, approximate $350,000,000, of supplies of food and munitions of war. Taking all these facts into consideration, if my figures are correct, and I think they are, we shall have to provide this year sums reaching the enormous total of $1,167,000,000, and not as the Acting Finance Minister states, $980,000,000.

I am sorry to differ with the figures of the hon. minister. Therefore, Sir, the deficit of this country including current expenses and war purposes will amount to about $467,000,000, which sum will have to be found by the Minister of Finance.

Why are we in such a poor financial position to-day? I do not hesitate to say that it is on account of the extravagance practiced by this and the previous Government since 1911. It was conclusively proved last night by my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) that we could have saved each year since 1911 about thirty million dollars. If the business of the country had been properly carried on, therefore, we would have had a few hundred million dollars to our credit for the pressing needs of to-day. What will the Government be compelled to do now? As has been pointed out, they cannot borrow in the United States or in England. They will have to go again to the Canadian people probably this fall to borrow half a billion dollars. I was somewhat astounded yesterday and this afternoon to hear the Acting Minister of Finance and other hon. gentlemen opposite glorify the success of these loans. These loans have been many times over-subscribed by the people, as stated by hon. gentlemen. That is a proof that there was a lot of money in this country, I admit. It is also a proof of the patriotism of our people. But it is not a proof of the business acumen of the Government. Why? Because the fact that these loans have been oversubscribed prove that it was easy to obtain the money, and that the Government could have obtained these loans at smaller rates of interest than they are paying. The Government has been making rapprochements with the United States. But the people of the United States are receiving only three and one-half per cent interest on the money they have loaned to their Government, while this Government is paying five per cent and over on the Victory Loan, and it also paid a large sum for commission, and spent a lot of money for advertising. Consequently the floating of the loan has cost the country a great deal. These loans are for periods of ten, fifteen and twenty years. If you make up the difference of one and a half per cent between the interest paid by the United States and the interest paid by the Canadian Government, say for fifteen years on $700,000,000, it represents the sum of $157,500,000 that will be paid by the Canadian people to the subscribers to these loans. If I have any suggestion to make to the Minister of Finance it is that, instead of proposing in the future, possibly, to impose a tax on these loans, he should offer the coming loan at three and a half per cent, as was done in the United States.

As I said at the commencement of my remarks, I had hoped that the Government would offer some proposal to relieve the high cost of living. Some time ago, the Government appointed a commission to diminish the consumption of foodstuffs in Canada. That is not sufficient. In countries like Australia and New Zealand, not to mention England, the boards appointed have authority to fix the price of foodstuffs. In Australia, especially, the Board of Food Control has had such success that in certain necessaries of life, such as flour, the price paid to-day is less than before the war. Requests to fix prices of foodstuffs were made some time ago by the representatives of organized labour, when they assembled in the city of Ottawa, and the Women's Conference, if I am not mistaken, made a similar request to the Minister of Labour. The people generally are asking the Government to do something along that line. To-day, I received the last issue of the Labour Gazette, which shows how the cost of living is increasing. Details are given showing the amount necessary to maintain a small family, and it appears that in the month of March, 1914, $7.68 a week was required for the maintenance of a small family budget, which increased in February last to $12.54, and in March to $12.65, representing an increase of nearly one hundred per cent since 1914. I submit that the income of the labouring man has not by any means increased one hundred per cent. Under the Act passed

a short time ago the Government have power to appoint one or two ministers. I suggest that a Minister of Food Control be appointed, with power to investigate this matter, to examine witnesses, to confer with wholesalers, to fix the price of foodstuffs and thus help the people.

What else could be done to diminish the high cost of living? This Government could help the farmers, could help agriculture, in many ways. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate have suggested that foods coming from the United States should be allowed into Canada free of duty, thus not only enabling consumers to obtain these foods at lower prices, but preventing the packers of Canada from controlling the market as they do at present. I realize that it is a difficult problem to increase farm production. If the Government send all available men to the other side; if they continue to refuse to listen to the good advice of the British Food Controller; if they do not grasp thoroughly the position of the country, the increase in the price of foodstuffs will continue.

During the last election I told my electors that I was against conscription. I represent a constituency which bears the name of Laurier-Outremont, in the city of Montreal. This riding consists half English-speaking and half French-speaking people, and I am glad to say that I received the support of the majority of the English-speaking men voters in my constituency and of the French-speaking people. I am still against the principle of conscription because I think we could by other means help the Allies and this country more than we are doing to-day. Therefore I hope the the Government will appoint a commission whose duty it will be to investigate and report what steps should be taken to decrease the cost of living.

As to the taxes imposed by this new legislation, the revenue to be obtained is fair enough, though there is certain injustice; the new provisions will not fall upon all with equal fairness. The taxes upon tea and tobacco should not have been increased. But, as I said at the beginning, all these taxes would be received, I would not say with pleasure, but at least without any murmurings, if the people were confident that the moneys received through the imposition of these taxes would be devoted to the carrying on of the war. But the more money this Government have, the more they spend for carrying on the business of the country, and that condition is not satisfactory to the people of Canada.

The member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) told us that during the war the Government did not intend to change the tariff; or at least that before doing so they would consider the matter carefully. I quite understand that those who like high tariffs and those who are profiteers do not approve any proposed change of tariffs which protect the manufacturers to the detriment of the people. But I submit that the Government should now prepare for the conditions which will prevail after the war. What steps is the Government taking to look after our people when the war is over? I understood that a commission was to be appointed to go to Europe with a view to finding out what we could sell to Europe after the war. As you know, Sir, those countries which have been devastated by the war will need many things that Canada can supply. This market will belong to the country that is the first to go out after it. We can supply wood, steel and many other materials. Nothing, however, has been done. We know that after the war, there will probably be stagnation in many industries in this country, and that probably thousands upon thousands of our labouring men will not have employment. We on this side of the House some weeks ago suggested that the Government should appoint a commission to look into this matter and should seek to encourage technical education in this country so as to give our workmen the necessary skill, thereby relieving us of the necessity of looking to other countries for skilled labour. We have technical schools at the present time in certain provinces. We have in the city of Montreal a technical school which gives great assistance to the labouring people of the province of Quebec. Why should the Federal Government not grant subsidies to those technical schools? All these are measures that we would like to have seen provided for in the budget, but I am sorry to say that we did not see any hope held out in that direction. There was nothing to help the people, but only more taxes and still more taxes, the money received from which will be spent not only in the prosecution of the war but in carrying on the ordinary affairs of the country. We on this side of the House are anxious to help the Government in carrying on the war, but we want the Government to act in accordance with the resources of the country. I trust it will not be forgotten, as it was well said this after-

noon, that we are first of all Canadians, and that we shall always, above all things, be Canadians.

Mr. JOHN FLAWS REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, as a new member, I crave the indulgence of the House. The first and greatest need is the recruiting and training of men to send overseas to back up our brave soldiers at the front. I am prepared to support this Government in every measure that will forward the prosecution of the war, and my address to-night will be along the lines of greater production.

The great need of Canada is farm production. The great need of the Empire and her Allies is foodstuffs. Canada cannot render better service to the Empire or make a better contribution towards winning the war than by increasing farm production. The Empire needs food for her men on all the battlefronts and a larger supply of foodstuffs to maintain her armies of industrials. The armies and citizens of her Allies are also calling for more food. The Empire and her Allies are willing to pay us enhanced prices—a double incentive—patriotism and profit. Canada needs an increase of farm production to meet financial obligations already incurred as well as to maintain her armies now fighting side by side with the Empire's soldiers. No commodity enters so much into the commercial life of the nation as does the product of the farm, and no other commodity contributes so much towards the maintenance of its transportation companies, financial institutions, commercial and industrial undertakings. Hence we see the importance of encouraging farm operations. This self-evident proposition has been recognized by all interests as manifested by the amount of exhortation given to farmers by all classes of the community. The press, the pulpit, the professions, commercial and financial institutions have indulged in a display of their patriotism by imploring farmers to increase production. No matter how anxious the farmers may be to help the Empire, no matter how keen they are to raise crops while high prices obtain, unless they are provided with the means of production their operations will be limited. It is encouraging to note that our Governments are alive to this fact. If we are to meet our obligation in the matter of farm production, something more than exhortation has to be undertaken.

Deprived largely of man-power, the best substitute farmers can secure is an ample supply of modern machinery. The Federal Government recognized this fact, and to help meet the case removed customs duties off tractor engines for a year, thus placing this help within the reach of many farmers. They also entered into arrangements to supply a large number of farmers with tractor engines at cost. Of course, there is no misunderstanding the Government's intentions in this regard. They want to supply tractor engines at a price a larger number of farmers can afford to pay and operate at a profit. If it is a good thing to remove the duty from tractor engines as a war measure to encourage production which only affects a comparatively few farmers, how much better service could we render to the Empire and Canada if the Government would remove the duty from all farm implements, as a war measure? Of the two hundred thousand farmers in the prairie provinces, probably not more than fifty thousand can purchase and operate tractor engines, all the rest of them require the latest improved farm implements so as to increase their efficiency and productive power, and nearly the whole of them are prepared to buy improved machinery, could it be purchased at reasonable prices. I know many farmers in western Canada who, early in the season and before prices for farm machinery were fixed, gave orders for new and larger implements, such as seed drills, but who cancelled their orders when they learned what the price was to be. Farmers who were using a 16 shoe drill wanted to purchase a 20 or 22 shoe drill, thus increasing the working power of a man 25 per cent in seeding. The same thing applies to harrows, ploughs, etc. Many farmers who have an extra colt or two ready to put to work would use a 6 or 8 horse team in place of a 4 horse team, and the 2 horse farmers would use 4 horses, but they are prevented from thus increasing their effective power by the excessive cost of machinery. Increased factory cost and war tax have increased the duty more than double. For instance, in 1914, the duty on a 20 shoe seed drill was $12.90, this year it is $32. Add to that the profit of the dealer, and the cost on account of customs duty would be $40. Eight dollars and thirty-six cents duty was imposed on a 12-inch two bottom gang plough in 1914, this year it is $19.60. A triple gang plough carried a duty of $13.50 in 1914, and to-day it is $32.65, and so on all along the line.

Those who know the needs of agriculture and the limit that will be placed on production by the lack of farm labour are convinced that the expansion of production can be brought about more by placing

modern farm implements at the disposal of farmers at a reasonable rate, and that it will contribute more to increase production than any other one thing the Government can do.

While there are many farmers in the prairie provinces who realized very satisfactory results from the operations of the farm during the last three years, there are many whose operations have not yielded more than a bare living. For instance. the provincial government reports indicate that in all centre and southern Manitoba the average yield of wheat for the last crop was around nine bushels an acre. A great many did not get the cost of production. This also applied to large areas in Saskatchewan.

The annual conventions of the three provincial grain growers' associations strongly urged the placing of farming implements at once on the free list, as a war measure. The business interests of the country towns and villages are joining with the farmers in this demand. Their knowledge of farm needs acquired by close proximity has convinced them that farmers must be supplied with the latest machinery, that the loss to them of man power due to the war can in a large measure be offset by the use of modern and improved farm implements. As business men acquainted with the situation they recognize that the loss of revenue to the Government through removal of custom duties from farm implements would be small compared to the advantage the country would secure by the efficiency and increasing capacity on the farm due to ample machinery of the right class and type. Many farmers are now supplied with all the implements of production needed for efficiency. The bulk of farmers, however, are not so situated.

It is easy to conceive that supplying farmers with farm machinery at the price that would rule were the duty immediately removed might easily increase the capacity for production, and the improvement of cultivation that would follow would result in an increased production of at least 5 per cent for 1918 and a larger increase for 1919.

We are all urged to make sacrifices for the sake of the Empire and to win the war. We are all urged to do "our bit." Cannot the Government submit to a small loss of revenue, and the few others who might be affected adversely by the removing of duties from farm implements submit to a reduction in profits in an effort to increase the farm production of Canada which all agree is so greatly needed by five to ten per cent?

Again, Sir, many of our returned soldiers are anxious to go back on to the land to make homes for themselves and their families. Is it right that our Canadian manufacturers should be allowed to tax our brave heroes who have risked their lives at the front for the protection of our Empire and for the cause of liberty, civilization, and democracy, and who now return to us suffering from shell-shock, and nervous wrecks? It is up to the manufacturers of agricultural implements to go "over the top" like men, with organized agriculture, and to ask our Government to remove the tariff on implements as a war measure, and thereby help in the great drive for greater production. Then thousands of souls now almost starving for the lack of bread would bless the generous action of our Canadian manufacturers whose chances of entering the realms of eternal bliss would thereby be greatly enhanced, if not assured. Let us remember, "even a cup of cold water, etc."

While there was nothing in the Budget speech about a reduction in the tariff, I have here the customs tariff of 1907, revised up to 1914, and find in it a provision whereby the Government can by Order in Council remove the duty on implements as a war measure, and I am sure if such a measure came before the House it would receive the unanimous support of hon. members.

The hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) suggested the appointment of a tariff commission. On behalf of the western organized farmers, I welcome the suggestion, provided the organized farmers have a representative on the commission—something we have not had in the past.

One thing more, Mr. Speaker. I wish to draw to the attention of our Government the loyalty of our western farmers in subscribing to the Victory bonds last fall. Many of them put every surplus dollar they could gather up into Government bonds, with the understanding that our chartered banks would loan them money to finance their business until the crop of 1918 came in, and to-day hundreds of our farmers are paying our chartered banks eight and ten per cent for moneys to finance their business until the fall, the banks deducting the interest from the principal. That is, when a farmer asks for a loan of one hundred dollars, he is handed out not one hundred dollars but ninety-two dollars, and in many cases only ninety dollars, for which he signs a note in full for one hun-

dred dollars. The small borrower is nearly always hardest hit.

This, I understand, Mr. Speaker, is for the purpose of evading the law and compelling the borrower to become a party to the agreement. I feel that it is the duty of our Government to bring in legislation to effectively stop this pernicious system prevailing in banking practice.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you and the House that if the hon. gentleman who has just sat down will move an amendment to the Budget resolutions for free agricultural implements he will have the unanimous suport of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Before entering on the principal question I intend to discuss, which is more or less a concrete one, I want to congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance on his concise and splendid presentation of the Budget. The only mistake in it, apart from taxing the poor man's tea and tobacco, is that he did not go far enough. At least two hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have said that this was not an opportune time to discuss tariff questions. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an opportune time for a Government to tackle the tariff it is now, when both classes are incorporated in the Government, the high-tariff and the low-tariff men. Surely there is enough judgment among them to get together and arrive at a compromise that will commend itself to both sides of the House so that this question of tariff reform can be put out of politics. Now is their opportunity.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was a marriage settlement.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Some of them deny that, but if there was such a marriage settlement, it is time to go to the divorce court. There is one other point which I wish to discuss. While I know that the Government is composed of different shades of politics in regard to the tariff question, it appears to me that there are members in it who are afflicted with what I would call cerebral embolism; that is some trouble in the brain that gives them the power to hypnotize the whole cabinet. The other evening the Government showed that it is a Government of hysteria. The last Order in Council doing away with the principle of selective conscription showed to the whole country and to the hon. gentlemen themselves that they were acting under the impulse of hysteria when they passed it without making any qualification whatever with reference to young men between twenty and twenty-three who are the owners, occupiers and tillers of farms all over Canada. I have had letters and telegrams by the dozen from men in that position and their friends. I just received a letter this afternoon from a gentleman who occupied in the local legislature the honourable position that you, Mr. Speaker, occupy here as the first commoner, the Hon. John Agnew. This gentleman has a son at the front, he has a son on the farm twenty-two years of age and he has another son near nineteen years of age who is willing to take his brother's place at the front. I went to the Militia Department about this—I did not go to the minister himself because I did not want to ask the minister to go against the law laid down by this peculiar Order in Council.

The writer of this letter says:

> I wrote you a few days ago in reference to the exemption of Sandy—

I might say that the Hon. John Agnew, late Speaker of Prince Edward Island, is an old country Scotchman whose loyalty nobody can impugn.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A good Scotchman.

Mr. READ: A good Scotchman, a good Britisher and a good Canadian, and not all old countrymen are that when they come out here.

> I enclose a clipping of General Mewburn's speech at Toronto in which he said that only Simon-pure farmers would be exempted.

In the name of common sense why should they pass an Order in Council contradicting the speech of the Minister of Militia and Defence at Toronto delivered only a few days before, in which he said that Simon-pure farmers would not be taken off the land. In the little island of Prince Edward alone there will be 150 of the best farms in Canada untilled this year unless the Government take some method of putting a stop to the enforcement of this iniquitous measure.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to call the hon. genleman to order but it is not in order for him to discuss a measure which has already been passed by this House during the present session.

Mr. READ: What would that measure be?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Order in Council was agreed to by this House and it is not in order for the hon. gentleman to call a measure "iniquitous" after it has been passed.

Mr. READ: It was only the action that I was speaking about, not the measure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is equally out of order in that statement. He is not in order in discussing that measure at this stage.

Mr. READ: We will leave that out. I suppose I may read the letter?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the letter is calling in question the action of this House with respect to Military Service?

Mr. READ: No, it is not.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that were its effect, it would not be in order for the hon. gentleman to pursue the reading of the letter.

Mr. READ: It is not protesting against the Act. You may read it and see what it says.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman had better continue his speech.

Mr. READ: The gentleman who sent me the letter is complaining that the last Order in Council is going to work a very great hardship to the farming community to the province of Prince Edward Island, and I state further that it is going to create a great deal of hardship all over Canada. The gentleman who writes that letter asks me to advise the Government that conditions are such that if they continue in the course which they have been pursuing it will produce a rebellion in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not attempt to pursue that subject further. I have already ruled that it is not in order to discuss the question of the Order in Council.

Mr. READ: All right, Sir. Referring again to the question of the tariff, an hon. gentleman last evening made the statement that the Liberal Government had not made reductions in the same proportion as the Conservatives had made during their regime. That may be true, because there was not so much room. Speaking for myself, I want to give my position to the House so that it will understand what I mean. I am a Canadian free trader to start with, not an old country free trader. I believe in the principle of free trade as applied to Canada, and it should be applied to Canada in the just sense—in the commonsense way if you like. English free trade has been the proper policy for Great Britain, but we must not forget that Great Britain was the most highly protected country in the world prior to its adoption of free trade. English free trade is not applicable to this country. The free trade that is applicable to this country should be based upon the principle laid down by the Liberal party in its platform of 1893. We will come to that again. I want to read over the tariff reductions that were made by the Liberals in 1896. They are as follows:

Article.	Conservative Tariff.	Liberal Tariff.
Indian Corn Meal.....	70½%	Free.
Rape Seed, sowing....	10 %	Free.
Seed Beans (Great Britain).	15c. bush.	Free.
Binder Twine.....	12½%	Free.

I want to make a little digression with regard to binder twine. Our friends of the Conservative party went throughout the length and breadth of Canada in 1896 and after declaring that the removal of the twelve and a half per cent ad valorem duty on binder twine had caused the price of binder twine to advance. That was the kind of chestnut they repeated all over Canada. It was an election dodge pure and simple. They tried to persuade the people that because the Laurier Government took the duty off binder twine they had put certain factories out of business and consequently sent up the price of binder twine. The price did go up that time but the removal of the duty was not responsible for the advance. Let me illustrate to you how the advance in the price of binder twine occurred. In the month of March I was master of a ship in the port of Mobile, Alabama. I bought a coil of manilla rope there and paid eleven and a quarter cents a pound for it. From Mobile I went to Buenos Ayres and entered that harbour on the very day that Admiral Dewey smashed the Spanish fleet in Manilla, that is making allowance for the six or seven hours' difference in time between the two places. I discharged my cargo and on returning to Mobile, about a month and a half later, went ashore to buy another coil of rope, and found the price had advanced to twenty-two and a half cents; it had gone up one hundred per cent in the meantime. What had the Canadian Government to do with the price of manilla rope going up in Mobile, Alabama? The price of binder twine had advanced, and why? Because the United States had gone to war with Spain, and the Manilla islands, in which practically all the manilla fibre was produced that went at that time into the making of binder twine, belonged to Spain. When the war was over the representatives of the two belligerent nations went to Paris to

negotiate a treaty, and if you remember—any of you who are as old as I am will remember—Uncle Sam, having conquered Spain, paid the Spanish government $20,000,000 for the Phillipine Islands. Now Uncle Sam does not pay any such sum as that for nothing: The United States put an embargo on the export of manilla fibre to any other country than their own, and accordingly the price of binder twine went up. It was not because the Laurier Government had taken the duty off binder twine but by reason of conditions that were altogether extraneous and outside of Canada. Yet Conservatives went all through Canada presenting to our poor innocent farmers the chestnut that the taking of the duty off the article had made the price go higher.

To continue my enumeration:

ARTICLE	Conservative	Liberal Tariff		
		British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
Books on the application of Science to Industries of all kinds	6c. per lb.	Free	Free	Free
Books for the use of Mechanics' Institutes, Libraries of Universities, Colleges or Schools	6c. per lb.	Free	Free	Free
Cream Separators	27½%	Free	Free	Free
Barbed Fencing Wire of iron or steel	2½c. per lb.	Free	Free	Free
Galvanized Wire, iron or steel, 9, 12 and 13 guage	25%	Free	Free	Free
Wire fencing, woven wire fencing of iron or steel	27½%	10%	12½%	15%
Wire of all kinds, n.o.p.	25%	15%	17½%	20%
Ferment Cultures for Butter-making	Rates varying from 20% upwards	Free	Free	Free
Agricultural Implements.				
Farm, Road or Field Rollers	35%	15%	22½%	25%
Forks, pronged	35%	15%	20%	22½%
Hay Tedders	35%	15%	22½%	25%
Hay Loaders	35%	15%	22½%	25%
Potato Diggers	35%	15%	22½%	25%
Hoes	35%	15%	20%	22½%

Now in order not to tire the House by going over all these items, I would suggest that they be placed on Hansard for the information of the public. I will read over the other articles without enumerating the figures, because there is nothing that grates so much upon people's minds as a lot of figures that are not taken into consideration in a concrete way.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to put anything on Hansard which is not read in the House.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will continue the enumeration: Pumps, locks, nails (wire, of all kinds), butts and hinges, sleighs, coal (bituminous), coal oil, lubricating oil (composed wholly or in part of petroleum), candles, common and colourless window glass, cotton duck—all a large reduction. Grey cotton fabrics, a large reduction. Cotton shirts, costing more than $3 per dozen, a large reduction. On cotton sewing thread, cotton fabrics (undyed), socks and stockings, blankets, woollen socks and stockings, undershirts and drawers, woollen cloth, flannels (plain), wheat flour, rice (cleaned), oranges, wall paper, head ropes for fishermen, refined cotton seed oil for canning fish, and a considerable number of other items, a very considerable reduction under the Liberals. But there were a great many Liberals, especially in our section of the country, who, through ignorance on trade matters, went so far as to talk of Free Trade as it is in England. As I stated on a former occasion, Free Trade as it is in England is not applicable to Canada, but there are certain things along

10 p.m.

tariff lines that the Government should take hold of and correct. There is no better time for them to do it and to do it correctly and in such a way that it should please at any rate the greatest number of people in Canada. Surely the Government can take the duties off foodstuffs, for example, seeing that they have already made wheat free. There are other articles in respect of which they should take action, because we do not want to see this Government defeated.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: At the present juncture I do not want to see them defeated; I want to see them punished, and punished well.

I believe that crime and punishment grow out of the same stem, that they are inseparable, and I believe that at any rate some hon. gentlemen on the other side will suffer remorse, regret and shame to an extent that I am satisfied—and I believe I speak for most of the members on this side of the House—they would rather not have to suffer. You know what Robert Burns said with regard to remorse:

Of all the numerous ills that hurt our peace,
That press the soul, and wring the mind with anguish
Beyond comparison the worst are those
Which to our folly and our guilt we owe.
In every other circumstance the mind has this to say,
"It was no fault of mine."
But when to all the evil of misfortune
This sting is added,
Blame thy foolish self.

Let me paraphrase:

Or worser far the pangs of keen remorse
The torturing, gnawing consciousness of guilt,
Of guilt, perhaps, where we have involved others
The old, the noble, who have loved us
Nay, more that very love the cause of ruin,
Oh, burning hell, in all thy store of torments
There is not a keener lash.

And so some of my hon. friends opposite will have to suffer that remorse, because I am satisfied that they are entitled to suffer it according to the laws of nature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make myself a little more plain upon this tariff question. There are certain things in Canada on which it is perfectly proper to impose a duty, not necessarily in the way of protection as such, but sometimes as protection, when it is justified, or when it is a matter of reprisal. I will give a case in point. I have here a letter, written by my son, a young gentleman who lives in British Columbia. And I want to say, in justification for speaking upon subjects outside of my own province and connected with British Columbia, that I am nearly as much interested in that province as I am in Prince Edward Island, for there are nearly as many Prince Edward Islanders in British Columbia as there are at home, and the same is true of the other western provinces. Their schools are filled with them; their colleges and universities are jammed with them; their public officers, doctors, lawyers, even some of their representatives in this House are from Prince Edward Island. So that we in Prince Edward Island are interested in the province of British Columbia directly as well as from the standpoint of Canadians. Every man in this House represents more than his own constituency; he represents the interest of Canada as a whole, his own constituency first, perhaps; his province, in the exercise of that virtue which we call civism; his country in that virtue which we call patriotism; and the Empire in that virtue which we call Laurier Imperialism. The letter referred to reads:

Dear Father,

Mr. Caldwell is going to Ottawa to see if he can get some kind of justice for the mine operations in British Columbia.

He was down here the other day.

We have a monopoly here in the shape of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, subsidiary of the C.P.R., which has the Standard Oil backed off the map—

He seems to be a chip off the old block, doesn't he?

—and their monopoly is made possible by the existing Canadian laws. There is a 5 per cent duty on lead and zinc ores going into the United States, while there is no duty on this side. Again at the present time the Canadian price for lead is $35 a ton higher than the New York market. The result is that the Consolidated, the only smelter here, brings ore in cheap from the States and sells it $35 a ton higher than the United States market price, besides getting their rake-off from smelting. Then they tell us they do not want our ore, and as a result the whole mining business in B.C. is on the bum. What we want is reciprocity in the future, and at the present a duty put on American ore equivalent to their duty on our ore.

That is proper protection; that is proper Canadian free trade—fair trade.

There has been talk about a committee being named to investigate smelter charges. Well, whatever one is named, the Consolidated will put it all over them, because there are very few mining operators in British Columbia who are not in their employ, or who dare find any fault with them. The only plan that would be any good would be a Royal Commission where any one could go before them and volunteer evidence, like what happened to Sir Joseph Flavelle. Any other solution of the difficulty would be a delusion and a snare and worse than nothing. At the present time the smelter can put any mine in the Kootenay district out of business just by refusing to take their ore, any mine management that doesn't suit them, and they do it whenever it suits them, that is what they do, and then the management have to come crawling on their knees to the smelter, for they can't produce here and pay the long haul and the American duty on top of their smelting charges. Besides, we are sure, although it cannot be proven, that the smelters on both sides of the line stand together.

Another combine.

The smelter can refuse a mine's ore, cause it to close down, and then buy it up at sherriff's sale for a song, for no one else would dare bid against them, and if they did they would have a white elephant on their hands. Unless something is done to curb this monopoly, we may as well pack up and get out of British Columbia.

Now, that is a serious condition of things, all for the sake of putting 5 per cent duty

on American lead ore when they put 5 per cent against ours. So you see that it is not necessary to impose duties on everything coming into this country or to impose all kinds of protection in order to be a genuine Canadian free trader, which I claim to be.

The principal subject with which I wish to deal to-night is one of which I gave notice on the Order Paper in the form of a resolution in favour of the removal of the duties on potatoes and vegetables to the end that we should have a reciprocal market with the United States. The reciprocity agreement of 1911 still stands on the United States statute book. When we take the duty off certain articles imported into Canada from the United States, as the Government did by Order in Council with respect to wheat, we get free access to the markets of the United States for that product, and the time is now opportune for the removal of the duty on potatoes and other vegetables, especially potatoes.

The potato is quite a modern field product. Germany's fighting force to-day is based upon potatoes. During several years before this war broke out the Germans were producing nearly as many potatoes as all the rest of the world put together; some years as many as 2,000,000,000 bushels, while big Canada—not little Canada,—was producing from 60,000,000 to 80,000,000 bushels. Now, 2,000,000,000 bushels is an inconceivable quantity, Mr. Speaker, unless you get down to concrete figuring and estimate how many cars they would fill or how many ships they would load. Potatoes have been food to the Germans; potatoes have enabled them to increase and multiply and replenish the earth. A few evenings ago I pointed out the natural law—this is very serious,—that the generative forces of mankind will always go on until they reach the limit of subsistence. We have evidence of that in the tribes which inhabited North America before it was discovered by Cabot and Columbus. Why did this great continent not become peopled by three or four hundred million Indians? Simply because they were continually pressing up against the limit of subsistence; because they knew nothing of pastoral life or of agriculture; and their limit of subsistence was the extent of their supply of wild animals and fish. When the Micmacs increased until they reached the limits of their preserves, they fought the Mohawks; the Mohawks fought the Iroquois, the Iroquois the Blackfeet, the Blackfeet the Crees, the Crees the Algonquins, and so on—internecine warfare, always fighting to widen the limit of their subsistence. When the white man came here he brought not only smallpox and other pox, but tuberculosis as well, from which the Indian tribes were not immune. People who are not exposed to diseases are susceptible to new diseases. Physicians in the House—and there are a number of them—know that an antitoxin is created in the human system when one is exposed to disease, and that antitoxin in the course of time causes the man to be immune from infection. You have an illustration of that in the case of tuberculosis. All members of this House have lived among tuberculosis patients at one time or another; yet they did not get it, for judging by their looks I should say that few hon. gentlemen here to-night are troubled with tuberculosis. I mention this matter only to show why the Indian population decrease since the whites came.

The introduction of the potato into Ireland by the friends of Sir Walter Raleigh a few hundred years ago had a marked effect on the population of that country. In 1846 the population of Ireland had increased to 9,000,000; to-day it is a paltry 4,000,000 or thereabouts. What happened in 1846? Potato blight. What happened then? Famine. What happened then? Emigration—and the population of Ireland has been decreasing ever since. Late in the century before last, when a famine was threatened in Scotland, the people of that country went to Ireland for potatoes, and relieved the famine. To-day the potato is recognized as the surest, the most certain and the most efficacious relief from the famine conditions which are, without doubt, facing the world. What follows famine? Pestilence, invariably, and pestilence and famine are ten thousand times worse than war. When a man is fighting he is thrilled by the glory of it; he is alive and happy; but famine—the child tugging at the dry breasts of his mother—think of it! This is a condition that the Government should take cognizance of as imminent.

It is possible for us to increase our potato production almost indefinitely—especially in Prince Edward Island, if we are given transportation facilities and a market. When I say, give us a market, I say give us a market to the south of us. I said to the Food Controller the other day: What is the basis upon which you gentlemen are working with regard to the markets of the United States? He said: We are working on the basis of a common bread basket. I said: What about a common potato basket? He

said: Well, it ought to be that, too. I told him that I would see the Government and ask them to make a common potato basket. In the press the other day I saw a letter from one of the boys at the front, who referred to Prince Edward Island as "Spud Island." They call it "Spud Island" sometimes. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the sobriquet "bluenose," as applied to the Nova Scotian, the New Brunswicker, and the Prince Edward Islander, originated in Prince Edward Island, and comes from the potato? In the latter part of the seventeenth century schooners were running from the little port which is now called Summerside down to Boston with our blue potatoes—Chenangoes, as they were called in the United States, McIntyres, as we call them, Calicoes, as they call them in Nova Scotia. These potatoes were taken to Boston every fall and were used largely in the hotels. Their flavour is excellent; the Prince Edward Island McIntyre is the best potato in the world. One day a hotel keeper saw an Island captain coming up the street towards the hotel and he exclaimed "Here comes Captain Bluenose." A newspaper man was present and fixed the sobriquet on all colonials—such is the power of the press.

I understand the people of Ontario are not accustomed to them, to the Prince Edward Island McIntyre. They do not understand them because they do not know how to cook them. It takes one-third more time to cook a McIntyre potato than to cook those white and red potatoes that are served at our hotel tables. But the McIntyre potato has a flavour. It has a pungent odour. Most people have to acquire a taste for a tomato, and the same thing is true in regard to the Prince Edward Island McIntyre potato. But once you learn its virtues, once you get that flavour, once you acquire that taste, you will not give a white or a red potato stomach room. So in the city of Halifax, which has been one of our great markets, in the city of Sydney, in the city of St. John's, Newfoundland, from the first of November, when telegrams come in ordering potatoes, and up to July, every telegram says: "Mind, nothing but Blues," or "Nothing but Calicoes," or "Nothing but McIntyre's." The people of those cities would not give the white or the red potato stomach room. They use the white and the red potatoes for their early potatoes. The white and red potatoes come in early, and they are used by our own people up to about November 1, but after that our pigs will scarcely eat white and red potatoes.

[Mr. Read.]

The question before the House is this: Is the Government justified in taking the duty off potatoes and vegetables? The only potatoes that are imported into Canada from the United States, which is now our only outside source of supply, come into Canada when we have none of our own. You have been fooling the farmers for the last forty years, or since whatever time it was that the so-called protective tariff came into force, by persuading them that you were protecting them against what? Was a duty on potatoes coming into Canada a protection? It is like putting a mill-dam above the source of the mill-stream. Our farmers do not want that kind of protection. We are protected by nature. Canada can produce 200 bushels of potatoes to the acre, while the average production per acre in the United States is only eighty bushels. What follows from mathematical necessity? It follows that because we can produce more than twice as much on an acre of land as can be produced on an acre of land in the United States, the people of the United States have to take our potatoes whether they will or not. We do not want protection because nature is on our side, and if you drive our nature with a fork, she will come running back. You have been fooling the farmer by pretending you were putting a duty on potatoes to protect them. You have not protected them at all; you have been doing just the reverse. More than that have you been protecting your manufacturers by putting a duty on potatoes? Just the reverse. You have been increasing the price of potatoes to the consumer, and thereby increasing the living wage, and increasing the living wage means that your manufacturers have to pay more wages, and consequently they cannot compete in the markets of the world. I think that is absolutely clear. You are, therefore, not only not protecting the farmers but not protecting the manufacturers. You are doing the very opposite; you are defrauding both. You are doing ten thousand times worse than that. That abominable barrier between us and the United States in the matter of potatoes has often absorbed twice the cost of production in waste, in smoke going up from those engines to feed the god of mammon in burnt offerings. In my capacity as manager of the firm of which I am a member I have shipped to British Columbia potatoes in 5,000 bushel lots, and we were paying 63 cents a bushel freight. The people of British Columbia could have got potatoes in Washington and thereby saved the bulk of that freight. If the duty had been removed, I could have shipped my

potatoes to Boston and saved fifty cents on every bushel of potatoes, and that is more than twice the cost of production. From Prince Edward Island I have shipped potatoes into Fernie, Nelson, Tabor, Edmonton, in fact, into all the large and small cities and towns of the great West, and even to the Yukon, when those people could have secured their potatoes from the state of Washington, had there not been an abominable duty that prevented any such trade and any calls for trade. By simply making a reciprocal agreement in the matter of customs, we could save more than twice the cost of production on potatoes. In the name of common sense why should this Government stand for a tariff that wastes in unnecessary transportation costs the whole cost of production of a supreme article of food? The freight rate from Ogdensburg, N.Y., to Ottawa is only 10½ cents per hundred pounds; the freight rate from Summerside to Ottawa is 38 cents, and the freight rate from Summerside to Boston is only 21 cents. You could save the whole difference between the 10½ cents and the 38 cents on a carload of potatoes shipped to the city of Ottawa. I sold five carloads of Prince Edward Island potatoes to-day in Toronto.

I am speaking upon a subject about which I know absolutely everything. I was brought up on a farm. I have planted potatoes; I have dug potatoes; I have eaten potatoes, and I have carried potatoes into all parts of the world. For the last eighteen years I have been one of the largest dealers of potatoes in Canada. I did not come here simply to feather my own nest, because it is only a question of a very few years until I shall be out of business. I am looking after the interest of my own province, the interest of the Maritime Provinces and the interest of Canada as a whole. I want to appeal to the intelligence of hon. members from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Agriculture has been destroyed in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on account of their juxtaposition to Prince Edward Island. The potato growers of Prince Edward Island, up to last year and this year when the price of potatoes rose on account of war conditions, were because of the high tariff in the United States—the United States was charging us 25 cents a bushel duty on potatoes going into that country thrown entirely upon Halifax, Sydney, St. John, Amherst and other local markets. In Prince Edward Island we can raise potatoes 50 per cent cheaper than in any other part of Canada; I make that statement on my reputation as a business man and as a member of the House of Commons. We have a light friable soil; you cannot get a stone to throw at a dog for a mile; it is the red soil, too, the best soil for growing potatoes. Then we are surrounded with seaweed, which is rich in potash, and potash is pre-eminently the manurial element necessary for a large production of potatoes. All you have to do is to tickle the soil and it will grow potatoes. The potatoes in our province are dug by women and children with their fingers; that will give you an idea of how easy it is to raise potatoes down there, and how it was that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were put out of the business. In the counties of Pictou, Halifax, Antigonish and Cape Breton you can see splendid vacant farms by the hundreds; the farmers dare not raise anything, for the first thing that would happen would be that Prince Edward Island potatoes would be coming in and selling for twenty-five cents a bushel, and they could not produce them for that. Think it over, hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and see if I am not correct. You never knew what was the matter with you, but I am telling you now. What I say is an actual fact. I know it from living and moving around in those three provinces and taking note of what I saw.

There is no reason why, up to now, Prince Edward Island has not been able to find a market for its potatoes. In 1912 our people insanely turned down the reciprocity agreement. They had better sense, I know, but they were stampeded for political purposes. Unfortunately, there is too much of this ambition on the part of our public men to get into office by playing politics. Ambition! The sin by which the angels fell! Cut it out. We have now got the connecting link between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Mr. Underwood, who took part of the duty off potatoes—I speak of him in a collective sense; I do not mean to say he was the whole United States, but he was the leader of the great Democratic party—Mr. Underwood made one mistake. He should have taken the whole duty off, and then I would not be standing here to-night imploring hon. gentlemen from the West and from Ontario for justice to my little province. You have free wheat, and why in the name of common sense don't you give us free potatoes? When the Kingston Board of Trade wrote to the Summerside Board of Trade a few years ago and asked us to assist them in getting the canals made free, I was a mem-

ber of the Summerside Board of Trade and was appointed a committee of one to answer that letter. I sent them a letter in reply, which they afterwards brought up in this House and had published with a red border round it, pointing out the national benefit it would be to Canada to have the canals free, and urging the members from the Maritime Provinces to support the proposal notwithstanding it was against our local interests in a certain sense. We were making free to the western provinces one hundred million dollars' worth of canals without a whimper. Heavens! If we can do that, cannot you western men allow this Government to take the duty off potatoes, which only amounts to $80,000 a year? Give us a free market in the United States for potatoes and vegetables, and in six years' time instead of producing seven million bushels of potatoes we will produce twenty millions, and instead of one car ferry we shall need three to convey our products across the Straits of Northumberland. We have the brightest little province and the most fertile piece of land in the Dominon of Canada, but we have been bled white for forty years by the octopus of Canada. Sir Robert Borden came down there during one election and promised us a car ferry. He aimed at an end that was quite aside from the public good, but the act has rearranged itself by an irresistible magnetism in a line with the poles of righteousness. We have our car ferry, and it is an absolute success, but what we want is some work for it to do. Let the Government start immediately to standardize our railroad, because the necessity exists. Famine is staring the people in the face. Justice is crying out to be done Nemesis the god of retribution, will be after you if you do not do your duties right.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): It is not my intention to discuss the Budget as delivered so gracefully and so ably by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I could have wished the taxes upon incomes had been a little larger, very considerably larger, if not double, in fact, in the case of large incomes, but perhaps that will come later.

As a westerner, I should also have liked to see the duty entirely removed from agricultural implements. However, I am not complaining of that at all. I have been contending for the last twenty-five or thirty years for free agricultural implements, but up to the present time we have been disappointed. I recognize, however, that there was a compact and an understanding between the two parties when they joined together last year to form a Union Government that the war was the paramount issue and that the tariff should remain in abeyance until after the war.

I loyally acquiesce in and accept that situation, and offer no criticism or complaint because of the Budget as announced. I take it that the Liberal and Conservative statesmen who constitute this Government have done the best they could under the circumstances. But I quite recognize that the people of Canada are very critical with regard to the Government, that they are watching them from day to day with the greatest care, and probably expecting from them much more than they will be able to concede. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance announced that the Government would be obliged to rely upon the Canadian people in future for the money required to carry on the war. He said that all the money that would be necessary must be obtained from the people. I want to point out that inasmuch as that is entirely the case, the people have come forward and are contributing very magnanimously, almost nobly, of their money for the purpose of carrying on the war. They are, however, very critical, and they will expect this Government to exercise the very greatest economy. They might under the circumstances go so far as to expect even parsimony on the part of the Government. The figures of expenditure for carrying on the war are undoubtedly appalling, and, no doubt, will appal the country. But these expenditures seem to be necessary. The people, as evidenced by their almost unanimous vote in favour of the late union of the Liberal and Conservative parties for the purpose of carrying on the war, are behind this war, and they expect the Government to practise the strictest economy in carrying it on.

I believe that a man who supports the Government, who frankly states the facts as they exist, and who gives them warning, is after all their best friend. One hears complaints from time to time with regard to the floating of our loans. The last loan of $300,000,000, I am told, cost the country $5,000,000 in commissions. I heard the Acting Minister of Finance admit that the other evening. If that is so, and there is no doubt that it is so, I do not believe that the people of Canada will approve of any such commission being paid. In the United States you will find that those vast loans, running up to billions of dollars, have been

raised without the payment of any commission to any one. It might be that the Government of Canada were unable to float this loan in any other way, I am not in a position to speak as to that; but I believe that the payment of a commission of $5,000,000 for the floating of that loan was not warranted and that the amount was much too large. I have to warn the Government against a repetition of the payment of a commission of that nature.

One hears from time to time statements about pensions being paid that are not warranted. I am not in a position to offer any specific criticism but the people will demand that the Government exercise the very greatest caution in the granting of all pensions. Canada has an immense debt and is faced with remarkable conditions. It possesses splendid natural resources and we have no doubt that ultimately it will come through triumphantly but the people will not respond with their millions, and hundreds of millions, of dollars unless they feel absolutely satisfied that the Government sets an example of the very greatest possible economy and that not a dollar is expended that should not be expended. My judgment as a public man has long been that we are squandering millions of dollars in connection with the Civil Service in Ottawa. It has always been my complaint that we have hundreds, if not thousands, of useless officials and a very great economy might be practised with regard to the Civil Service. It is a matter for congratulation that the Government has abolished the patronage system. We find the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) setting a splendid example with regard to paring down public expenditures. If other ministers will follow that example I believe that it will have an excellent effect throughout Canada. The people expect that and it will be a great pity if they should be disappointed in any way.

That by way of introduction. I now wish to refer to one or two matters arising out of the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). I intend to discuss some other questions, particularly the railway question, but I shall come to them later on. The railway question is, next to the war, the greatest issue before the people at the present time. I believe that very few of the citizens of Canada have thoroughly grasped the railway situation, thoroughly understand what the facts are, or are in a position to pass an intelligent judgment upon the facts.

The hon. member for Brome referred to the danger of lessening production and intimated that the Government was not acting fairly or properly towards the producers of newsprint paper and pulpwood. He intimated that the Government's action was influenced by a desire to please the newspapers. I take it that no member of the Government would care to reply to that charge on behalf of the Government. I thought it a very unworthy and improper charge, although I do not think my hon. friend meant to be particularly severe, because it was an intimation that the Government was coddling the newspapers with the idea of obtaining support. I hope by the presentation of the facts to satisfy the members of this House that this statement was a very improper and unworthy one and was not warranted by the facts. The price of newsprint, within the last twelve or eighteen months, has increased to the newspapers by nearly fifty per cent. The newspaper publishers, in order to guard their interests, represented to the Government that a criminal combine among the manufacturers and producers of newsprint existed and asked for protection. The Government extended that protection. The newspaper publishers, time and time again, made the statement to the members of the Government and to the commissioner, Mr. Pringle, who was appointed to act on behalf of the Government, that they did not ask that newsprint should be furnished to them at one farthing less than cost plus a good interest on the capital investment. We are able to establish to the satisfaction of the Government that an illegal combine existed. I never like to read extracts but I shall read to the House an extract from the New York World of April 13, 1917:

Seven Heads of News Print Paper Trust Indicted.

They are accused by a Federal Grand Jury of Control of the Industry and Illegal restraint of competition.

Organized to evade the Sherman Law, is charged.

Kept Down Output, Increased Prices, Discouraged New Mills, Refused to Deal with Each Other's Customers.

Indictments were handed up yesterday to Judge Cushman of the United States District Court against seven men charged with exercising actual control over the news print paper industry of the United States. The Grand Jury that returned the indictments has been in session since February 15 under Bainbridge Colby, a special assistant to the Attorney General, and Assistant Attorney General Mark Hyman.

The men indicted, and for whom bench warrants were issued by Judge Cushman, are the following:

George H. Mead, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the News Print Paper Manufacturers' Association, and President of the Spanish River Pulp and Paper Mills, the Lake

Superior Paper Company, and the G. H. Mead Company of Dayton, O.

He was a Canadian and the big toad in the puddle:

Philip T. Dodge, President of the International Paper Company and a member of the Executive Committee.

Edward W. Backus, President of the Minnesota and Ontario Power Company, and the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company;

A Canadian organization I may say:

a member of the Executive Committee.

George Cahoon, Jr., President of the Laurentide Company, and manager of the Canada Export Paper Company; a member of the Executive Committee.

Gordias H. P. Gould, President of the Gould Paper Company, the Donnaconna Paper Company and formerly of the St. Regis Paper Company; a member of the Executive Committee.

Alexander Smith, a banker of Chicago, who is described as having specialized in the underwriting of paper mills.

Frank J. Sensenbrenner, Vice President of the Kimberly Clark Company of Neenah, Wis., who is described as having actively participated in the development of the News Print Association.

Now five of these men, including one or two Canadians, were convicted of carrying on this criminal combination and were fined $2,500. The illegal combine was clearly established, and the accused parties practically pleaded guilty and were fined.

Mr. McCREA: Were these men convicted, or did they make admissions by way of a compromise?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. gentleman must recognize the absurdity of his question, because if they were not convicted, and my information is that they were convicted—

Mr. McCREA: No, they were not.

Mr. RICHARDSON: They pleaded guilty and were fined. If that is not equal to guilt, I would like the hon. member to point out how he would define guilt. Now, further with regard to these people:

The concerns in the association are declared in the indictment to manufacture 5,600 tons of the daily output of 6,300 in the United States and Canada. The companies represented by the members of the Executive Committee manufacture 3,500 tons a day. Of the operations of the association Mr. Colby said in a statement issued last night:

"The association was unincorporated. It had no articles of association, no by-laws. It kept no minutes of its meetings, nor was any record kept of the proceedings of its executive committee, which held meetings nearly every month. The informality of its procedure marks the latest phase in the progressive effort to invent some means of evading the Sherman Anti Trust Law. It was clearly the effort of the association to secure all the benefits of illegal combination without exposure to the risk of prosecution.

"To-day's indictment," Mr. Colby's statement added, "is in one respect different from those in numerous other prosecutions under the Sherman law. The Grand Jury has not sought to include in its arraignment the corporations and individuals constituting the entire membership of the industry, but has charged specifically the individuals regarded as the originators and directors of the alleged illegal combination and conspiracy.

"The men indicted control 55 per cent of the present output of news print paper. Five of them constitute the entire membership of the Executive Committee of the Manufacturers' Association, and the two others are practically members of the committee by virtue of their authority and constant participation in the direction of the association's affairs.

"The combination is a somewhat loosely articulated one, but, in my opinion clearly and obviously designed to circumvent the prohibitions against combinations in restraint of trade. The association gathered from its members not only data as to their capacity and output, but copies of outstanding contracts between publishers and every member of the association. The association thus had information as to how every newspaper in the country stood as to its supply of news print paper, and the date of expiration of every contract.

"Members of the association frequently refused to give quotations on newsprint paper to any publisher who had a contract with any other member. As the dates of expiration of contracts approached the newspapers were obliged to renew contracts for their current supply, but on asking quotations as to price were met by the refusal of manufacturers to deal with each other's customers. The publisher was committed to the concern with which his expiring contract was made, and was left helpless before the exactions as to price and other conditions of the manufacturer.

"Prices charged by members of the association are 40 to 50 per cent in excess of prices which independent producers even under war conditions are content to receive.

Now, I want to repeat that statement, because I want it to sink into the mind of every hon. member as it throws some light on the charge which has been made against the Government and the publishers:

Prices charged by members of this illegal association are forty or fifty per cent in excess of prices which independent producers even under war conditions, are content to receive. There has been a relatively slight advance in the cost of materials entering into the manufacture of news print paper, but nothing comparable to the advance in prices which has been made through the concerted action of the members of this combination, and under restricted competitive conditions brought about by the association whose purposes and methods are now directly challenged by the action of the Grand Jury."

It is set forth in the indictment that the association "required all concerns in carrying on their trade to refrain from competing with each other or with the Great Northern Paper Company in the matter of securing new customers; as to the quality of paper to be sold; as to the delivery and storage of paper; as to the terms

of credit and rate of interest upon accounts or as to dates of contracts and methods of sale."

It is also charged that all concerns were required "to manufacture insufficient quantities of paper, to allege increased cost of manufacture, to allege shortage, and to co-operate in discouraging the erection of new mills."

As to prices charged by the association, it is understood that the Grand Jury heard testimony that while paper is still supplied to some customers at 2¼ cents a pound, other large consumers are paying 3½ or 3 30/100 cents. Small newspapers are compelled to pay 6, 7 and 8 cents a pound. The inquiry recently made by the Federal Trade Commission showed 2½ cents to be a fair price for the manufacturer.

I want to read another exceedingly significant statement, and I would like to secure the attention of the House while I do so:

George Cahoon, Jr., President of the Laurentide Company, and a member of the Executive Commitee of the paper manufacturers, strongly advised at the recent meeting of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, that all manufacturers this year keep the profits they are making confidential so that publishers and others would not know how much profit they were making. It has been the custom in the past for many paper companies, whose stocks are listed on the exchanges, or sold generally to the public, to announce the earnings at each annual meeting. This has been found by the manufacturers to be bad policy in view of the very large earnings which they have been and are now making. At the recent meeting of the Abitibi Company the exact earnings were not announced. The necessity, however, of keeping the stock at the proper quotation obliges them to make some statement to hold the market value of their security, or to increase same that they may unload watered stock in this time of prosperity. The publishers will then note that for the past few weeks and for the future such profit statements will not appear. This coincidence is interesting in view of the claims of manufacturers that their cost advanced so rapidly that their margin of profit is still reasonable under present prices.

Now, with regard to the profits made by the Abitibi mill. I regret, Mr. Speaker, to take up the time of the House in giving these figures, but it is necessary to make out this case and I propose to go through with it. I will not promise to supply as much amusement as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Joseph Read), but perhaps later on we will get into something of lighter vein:

Abitibi Profits.

The annual meeting of the Abitibi Power & Paper Company was held on March 12th in Montreal, where an amazingly good report was presented to the shareholders.

This company is the newest and one of the largest and best known stock paper mill flotations in Canada, within recent years. It started as a promotion of two men in Montreal of very limited resources: F. H. Anson and Shirley Ogilvie. These two men bought in the timber limit around the Abitibi Lakes in Northern Ontario from the Ontario Government at a price of $16,000. This paltry sum gave them the exclusive right to cut on Ontario Government timber land to the extent of over one thousand square miles of the choicest pulpwood country, so that their investment in timber land is trifling. The Government even handles the fire patrol system.

These two men, after organizing the company, started to build a 100-ton groundwood pulp mill, with the idea of selling the pulp in the United States. To raise the money to build this mill and pay all expenses, they had a public issue of $1,500,000 six per cent first mortgage bonds, of which $1,000,000 were issued. They had $1,500,000 seven per cent cumulative convertible Preferred stock, of which $1,000,000 was issued. They had $3,500,000 of Common stock, of which $3,000,000 was issued. This Preferred stock was sold at $95.00 a share and carried a bonus of fifty per cent Common stock with it. The original issue Bonds were sold to insiders, that is directors and their friends, at 85, with seventy-five per cent bonus of Common stock and to be kept public at 95 with 50 per cent bonus of Common stock. All the rest of the Common stock went to the promoters, so that the entire Common stock, it will be seen, was water, either in the form of promotion stock or bonus stock. Not one dollar was ever paid in cash for a share of it.

This company has been built up by very large dividends.

A few statements from a prospectus dated November, 1916, issued by Peabody, Houghteling & Co., in connection with the sale of their convertible notes, are especially enlightening, in view of the statements absolutely contradictory to those made by Mr. Alexander Smith at the Chicago conference of Publishers and Manufacturers. In this he says: "The present earnings of the Company are eight times interest on the old 1915 prices." He further says that the mills at that time were making under those prices a profit of $15.83 per ton. With the additions now being built, the larger part of the cost of which is being paid for from earnings and only a very small proportion, which these convertible notes represent, being paid for by new financing, the earnings on the sale prices of 1915 would amount to seventeen times the interest charges, and that in November, 1916, the sale price of newsprint paper as of 1915 would have netted the company under the costs of November, 1916, a profit of not less than $15 per ton. Analyzing this, we find that the average delivery price of paper as mentioned was $41 per ton. The average price obtained by Abitibi Company for 1917 is $65 per ton at the mill, which with the freight added, makes a net advance in the price of paper of $30 a ton. Allowing for an advance in cost for this year, which the Federal Trade Commission found with this mill, of $4 a ton, this gives a net increased earning per ton of $26, which, in addition to the price which the prospectus of the Abitibi Company showed, would make the net profit for 1917, or at least for the present part of it, $41 per ton,—some profit.

The statement given out in Montreal at the annual meeting of the company was to the effect that after paying all interest charges, the company had earned under the old prices of 1916 over ten per cent on the Common stock, which Common stock was handed out or given out and taken out in the various and several methods above described.

It was announced that the stock was actually presented to the stockholders, and never cost them a dollar. Yet a ten per cent dividend was paid on that stock. And yet the publishers are charged with improper motives in asking the Government for simple protection from people of this kind.

Now, with regard to the Laurentide Paper Company:

The company without doubt, for the year ending June 30, 1917, showed earnings of not far less than $2,000,000; on January 1st, the company declared a dividend of 10 per cent on its capital stock. The dividends earned and paid on this capital stock since 1912 are shown as follows:

1912	$540,000
1913	576,000
1914	576,000
1915	768,000
1916	768,000

The dividend now received is equal to 20 per cent of the original stock holding, and has a market valuation on that stock basis of $400 per share. In 1909 the company gave valuable rights in the new stock issue at par, and in 1911 the shareholders were given what practically amounted to 100 per cent stock bonus. When this latter was effected, the common stock was receiving 8 per cent dividends, the increase from 7 to 8 per cent being declared in the last quarter of 1910.

The earnings of this company are, therefore, phenomenal and show the value of newsprint investment.

Now, with regard to the Brompton Pulp and Paper Company:

The following report has just been issued: Surplus revenue, after administration and legal expenses, salaries, etc., amounted to $617,263.19. From this has been deducted $45,989.16 for accrued interest on bonds; $70,000 accrued dividends on preferred stock; and $175,000 for two dividends on common stock, leaving a profit and loss surplus of $326,274.03. The profit and loss surplus is after deducting $150,000 for contingencies and war taxes.

The surplus revenue for the six months period works out at the rate of about 14½ per cent on the common stock for a full year period, which must be highly gratifying to shareholders. Though the balance sheet has not been published The Financial Times is informed that the current assets exceed current liability by about $1,500,000.

We are told by the member for Brome that the Government is interfering with enterprise, and is compelling the producers of newsprint to supply it to the publishers at less than cost, and that in face of the facts which I have just read. One other extract and I have done:

A brilliant year is reported by Price Bros. & Co., Limited, for the period to February 28. This concern earned a net surplus, after all charges of $805,218—more than double the surplus earned in the fifteen-month period covered by the previous statement and three and a half times the surplus in the twelve months prior to that.

[Mr. Richardson.]

Earnings were equal to 16.1 per cent on the share capital, so after providing for the 6 per cent dividend paid during the year, a substantial balance of $505,218 remained to be added to the profit and loss account. That account now stands at $1,908,787 and is equal to $38 a share on the capital stock.

"Some" profits, Mr. Speaker. I have other extracts which I could read, but that would be unnecessary, because I think I have fairly established the case that the Government was justified in intervening in the interest of common decency, and for the protection of the publishers of Canada, to see that the papers were not victimized in the manner that was attempted. The word has gone forth that the proceedings must be secret, the public must not know what the earnings of these companies are, because if the public did find out, the newspapers would be in a better position and would not be victimized to the extent desired.

Let me pause for a moment to refer to one other point which my hon. friend from Brome made. I must say that the speech of my hon. friend was most interesting, although it reads like a speech that might have been delivered ten or twelve years ago, or that might fairly be delivered five or six years from now; a speech of that nature under the circumstances impressed me as rather peculiar, although I understand and appreciate the enthusiasm of my hon. friend. I intended, before concluding my argument on the newsprint situation, to enquire from my hon. friend if he is a director of any one of these pulp and paper companies, or in any way connected with them, because otherwise I can hardly understand so philanthropic a gentleman taking the position he did. I pause for a reply.

Mr. McMASTER: I am not connected, directly or indirectly, as a director or otherwise, with any manufacturer of paper. I trust that the hon. gentleman is also as completely dissociated with the newspaper business.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that rejoinder rather clever, yet it is not. There is really nothing in it when you analyse it. He knows that I am a newspaper man; I have been one practically from childhood. But I have not sought to make any argument to bolster up my own position; I have presented the facts as fairly and succinctly as I can do to the House, and I leave it to the judgment of the House as to the justice of the position which the newspapers and the Government take.

The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) conscientiously believes that he is a real

Simon-pure Liberal, and he thinks that a great disaster has happened to this country. He honestly believes that had the so-called Liberal party—so-called, because the Liberal party is really identified with the other party over here—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. RICHARDSON: He honestly believes that had they come into office at the last election the millennium would have practically arrived. I do not know how old the hon. gentleman is—he cannot be much younger than I am—but it passes my comprehension how a man of his intelligence and education, who has read and studied the political history of Canada and the actions of the two parties on fiscal questions during the last thirty or forty years, can pat himself on the back and look as happy as he does in his belief that if the Liberal party still existed it would do better than the party here with regard to the tariff. I sat at the feet of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, whose personality I have always enjoyed—he possesses so many splendid social qualities which everybody admires. But I was taught as a boy that if the Liberal party got into office we would have free trade as they have it in England. As a young lad I stumped a constituency away back in Lisgar in the early days, practically on a coal oil can. We were to have free coal oil, free agricultural implements—in fact, we were to have so much free that I could not understand why the Lord had kept the Liberal party out of power so long. It took me all my time keeping out of jail for denouncing the Tory high priests of protection; in fact, I was constantly mixed up in libel suits. I served my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with a devotion that was pathetic in its simplicity. I believed that once we got that party in office the millennium would really have arrived. I knew that Alexander Mackenzie, Prime Minister of this country from 1873 to 1878, made an honest attempt to revise the tariff, and that when Sir John A. Macdonald came into office the average tariff was thirty-five per cent. I suppose I was very innocent—I am willing to admit it now, for years have passed, a great deal of water has flowed under the bridge, since then. But, assuming that if the Liberal party were returned to power we would have free trade as they had it in England, I assured the unsuspecting farmers that if they voted for this party everything, fiscal policy included, would be corrected. Imagine my surprise and my regret —I could add a number of expressive adjectives, but I shall refrain—when after the tariff was revised I heard Mr., now Sir George Foster, who was then the financial critic of the Opposition, declare that the total reduction made by the Liberals while in office in their revision of the tariff was 71-100 of 1 per cent. I never heard that statement challenged. I am prepared to say that with the British preference there were considerable reductions; I know about cream separators and two or three other things. But I learned my Liberalism at the feet of George Brown and Alexander Mackenzie and acquired my ideas on fiscal policy from Richard Cobden and John Bright. Incidentally, I am a member of the Cobden Club—I think my right hon. friend is also. I hope the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) will not laugh too much, because I am not speaking with the idea of bolstering up high tariff; I propose to tell the truth about that later. And I do not want my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who has grown old in harness and whom we all like as a man, to think that I wish to be offensive to him, although I do not know that I should care what he thinks, though I do not want to offend his susceptibilities. All I want to do is to state frankly the case as I see it.

If a reduction of 71-100 of 1 per cent took all the protection out of the tariff, then my innocence passes comprehension. A year or two after the tariff was revised in 1897, Mr., now Sir Clifford Sifton, who was then a prominent member of the Government of my right hon. friend, made a speech in Perth in which he declared that the tariff had been removed from the issues as between the parties; that the tariff was a settled issue. We all recall the position that the late Hon. J. Israel Tarte took with regard to the cotton manufacturers. My point is that the reductions made by the Liberal party when in office—I want the member for Brome to let this sink into his heart—were so infinitesmal that they did not really represent any substantial revision of the tariff looking in the direction of free trade. Seventy-one one hundredths of one per cent was a mere bagatelle, and we had an authoritative statement that that was to be the end of the reductions.

With regard to agricultural implements, the member for Brome broke into poetry. I think it was after Gilbert and Sullivan's

famous libretto that he modelled the following lines:

'The clock we have pushed forward
For gardening after tea;
But as for farming implements—
We can't admit THEM free.

After reading that, the poet laureate on this side of the House sent me the following:

In his celebrated platform
Of eighteen ninety-three,
Upon which he was returned to power,
Farm implements were free.

But when, later on, the tariff
Was brought down by Lauri-ee,
The combine was on top again
And the farmer up a tree!

I do not know whether that is an improvement on the poetry of my hon. friend, but it is about as bad.

Mr. McMASTER: It is worse.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Well, I am glad it is, although it would be hard to make it very much worse. Between 1890 and 1894 the average tariff on agricultural implements was thirty-five per cent, which was cut down by the Tory high priest protection Government to an average of twenty per cent. So that the West really got as much from the Conservative party as it did from any of the others. In fact, we got more. We got practically nothing from the others, although we did get one or two per cent a little later on; but when I arrived in Ottawa the average tariff was twenty per cent. I hope I am not giving away any secrets when I say that the question, so far as I could gather, was not whether the tariff should be removed from agricultural implements, but whether it should be increased. I remember when the Hon. Sir Lyman Melvin Jones spent almost an entire Sabbath with me endeavouring to persuade me as to the advisability of increasing the tariff on agricultural implements. I, of course, repelled that suggestion, because I always held that, so far as I was concerned, the newspaper which I controlled would advocate free agricultural implements and tariff for revenue only, with a view to free trade as it exists in England. On that principle I had stood and contended very strongly during the years I was in Parliament and also as a newspaper editor. I admit that I did not offer any strenuous objection in the House at that time. Probably I considered that was an instalment. I was very young, and I thought perhaps we would get more. But as the years went on we did not receive any further reductions. I am speaking now as an Independent, because at that time I made up my mind that there was not much use in following any party, and so I became an Independent. We, as Independents, have been looking to whichever party would go furthest in the reduction we desired. In my judgment we have had as many reductions in tariff from the Conservative party as we have ever had from the Liberal party. I want to pay this compliment to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He did, to his honour, be it said, take up the question of reciprocity. I endorsed that policy. I became a candidate in favour of that policy, and I did all I could to carry my right hon. friend and his party to victory on that policy. It was with great regret that I saw it defeated, and I believe it was not fairly defeated because the "loyalty cry" was improperly raised—I say it frankly—and that was the only time, in my judgment, when my right hon. friend really deserved success, and yet he was struck down. I think it would have been a better thing for Canada if the reciprocity policy had carried. The Conservative party has adopted free wheat and some other items in the reciprocity pact, and speaking as an Independent, I am hoping that by this union of the two parties, and now that the Radicals are co-operating with the older Conservatives, they will have an important influence on the Government in the direction of a reduction in the tariff. But we are in honour bound to wait until after the war is over. This radical element may ultimately leaven the whole lump, because there were Tories in the Liberal party and there were Liberals and tariff reformers in the Tory party. By the combination of the two parties there is opportunity of the real reformers getting together and securing something that will redound to the interest of the people.

My hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) spoke of the rare advance and prosperity coincident with the advent of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to office. This Labour Gazette, which is a Government publication, was placed in my hand to-day, by a colleague in this House, and I am going to read just one brief extract, and to refer to a table later on. I had better state that the cost of living had been jumping up steadily so that the Government of my right hon. friend, the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), appointed a commission to inquire into the cost, and that commission reported. Referring to the current inter-

est in the cost of living question the report states as follows:

> For some time past and especially since the beginning of the century one of the most important features of the general economic situation in Canada has been a rapid and continuous advance in prices and the cost of living. The upward tendency seemed to have reached its highest point in 1907, when prices attained a level unprecedented in many years previous. The financial panic of the autumn of that year operated in arresting this tendency, and in many departments set in motion a recession which extended over 1908. The check, however, proved but temporary; the comparative slightness of its effect and the early recovery of the upward trend constituted in fact an especially noteworthy feature of the stringency in Canada.

And then appears in the same issue a table showing how the cost had been reduced and how it had risen. In 1890, that is before the advent of my right hon. friend to office, the cost of living was 110 per cent. In 1897 it dropped to 92 per cent. From 1897 it made a rapid rise, until, in 1907, it was 126 per cent, so that the argument which a colleague of mine wished me to make was that, instead of the policy of the Government led by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition leading to an amelioration of conditions, it lead really to a very rapid increase in the cost of living.

I wish to refer to the railway situation. I suppose it might be stated that I could very well bring up the railway question when the railway Estimates are brought down, but the question is such a large one that I might perhaps make some rather extended reference to it to-night, and then later on, when the railway estimates are brought down, I shall be able to make further reference to it. As I said in my opening remarks, I am convinced that the Canadian people have no conception of the seriousness of the railway situation. I do not believe that two per cent of the Canadian people have followed the developments in this matter or have any conception of its meaning and its bearing upon the interests of the Canadian people. The Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) estimated that the Government would derive from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, through the tax they have levied by Order in Council, an amount equal to $7,000,000. The Government, upon the recommendation of the Board of Railway Commissioners, recently granted an increase in rates of fifteen per cent to the railway companies. That increase will result in an additional revenue to the railways of something like $40,000,000. Of that sum, the Canadian Pacific will receive approximately $25,000,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a corporation bonused by the Canadian people to the extent of practically its entire cost. The Canadian people gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway $35,000,000 worth of completed road. They gave them twenty-five million acres of land on which they have raised or will raise over two hundred million dollars. They gave the company exemption from taxation till the crack of doom on every dollar's worth it owns, and that exemption is worth, based on returns from the United States, $500,000,000 every thirty years. So the Canadian people have practically built and made the Canadian Pacific railway. It was in the early history of the country; the Northwest was not opened up, and there might be some excuse for that contract. But surely the Canadian people never should have made another colossal mistake, and yet we have made two or three blunders infinitely greater. The Canadian people have paid dollar for dollar for every inch of railyay that exists in the Dominion of Canada at the present time, and yet the people of this Dominion do not own these roads. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance said that the country would probably derive $7,000,000 from the taxes levied on the Canadian Pacific railway. Suppose we do. We have got to give them twenty to twenty-five million dollars in order to get back that seven million, so we are really presenting the Canadian Pacific railway with $18,000,000, and that corporation does not need one single dollar because it has vast surpluses, tens of millions of dollars, stored up from what it has earned in past years. Yet the Canadian people are to be obliged to pay in additional freight rates $25,000,000 in order to collect $7,000,000. The mistake in my judgment—and I am not charging that it was anything worse than a mistake— the tragedy of the increase in freight rates, is not that it will cost the consumers or the handlers of freight in this country $40,000,000 more, but the moment the increase went into effect all along the line throughout this country additions were made to the cost of sugar, of tea and other commodities that are transported, and it is my judgment that that increase in freight rates will cost the people of Canada directly or indirectly an amount not less than $100,000,000. The Government owns, as we are told, the Canadian Northern railway and the Transcontinental; the Government will also be obliged to take over

the Grand Trunk Pacific; and the commitments of the old Grand Trunk itself to the Government are so great that the Government will be compelled to take over that road. So as we shall own the railroads, would it not have been better for the Government to have taken over these concerns and refused to advance the rates, refused to give the Canadian Pacific railway this additional $25,000,000? If there had been a deficit in the operating of these other roads it would probably not have exceeded ten or fifteen million dollars, and it would have been infinitely better that the Government should pay that than that the rates should be increased and this vast loss thrust upon the people of Canada.

The interpretation of the overwhelming verdict at the polls last December was that the people desired to rule; that they did not want the interests any longer to dominate. It was the first time in the history of the country that the people had a real opportunity to make a pronouncement regardless of partisan and party considerations. In the past, no matter how the people voted, it always seemed as if the interests were paramount.

A new idea seems to have taken hold of the people last December, to elect a free Parliament, a legislature freed from party considerations and party shibboleths. At present Parliament is a great gathering of representative men elected by an overwhelming vote of the people to carry on the war. While this is the all-important issue, it must not be forgotten that Parliament should be, and is expected by the country to be, perfectly free to advocate all policies which, while making for the best service to the Dominion, will help the war.

The Government need have no fear that it will not be heartily and enthusiastically supported by the great following from both parties which has been sent to the House to back up all measures which made for the interest of the country, and consequently for the more effective carrying on of the war. The leader of the Government and his colleagues, no doubt, expect the members of this House to speak their minds freely, to present the views of their constituents, in order that the committee which Parliament has appointed to carry on the Government, namely, the Cabinet, will become thoroughly informed of the sentiments of the country and be in a position to carry out the policies which the nation demands.

Meantime the railway situation as a whole is more unsatisfactory than ever

before. We are told on the one hand that the Canadian Northern now virtually belongs to the Government, and that it is its intention to nationalize the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. But no definite action seems to be taken with a view to consolidating the properties and to operating them economically and scientifically as a unit. On the contrary, the companies are given rate increases, are having their obligations met by the Government as before, and are being furnished with new equipment by the Government, whilst still retaining their corporate identities. The Canadian Northern is applying for a charter for a new line. The whole situation is bewildering and discouraging, and seems to suggest the necessity for vigorous organized action by the people themselves if they wish the Government to understand that they, the people, henceforth are going to be the big interest in railway affairs, and are going to insist on the fact being recognized.

It is to be remembered that half or more than half of all the proceeds of the increased rates will go into the treasury of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific companies are all in default, not because the present rates on their actually required lines of railway are too low. They are in default because they are operating vast stretches of line in the wilderness where nobody lives, or desires to live at present, which produce no traffic, and where they are carrying on the ludicrous farce of "competition" for a business that does not exist. These stretches cannot be operated except at a heavy loss. The responsibility for the existence of those non-economic lines, and for, in many cases, the senseless duplication of lines really required rests primarily upon the financial managers of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk companies, whose badly thought out ambitions, whose stupidity or whose cupidity, suggested their construction. The statesmen of Canada, however, have had a heavy contributory responsibility. Not only did they commit the folly of permitting the building of these white elephant railways, which was in itself an economic blunder of criminal magnitude, but they committed the people of Canada to the responsibility of financing them.

As a result of this double blunder of the statesmen, the people of Canada have now to pay the cost. And let it be understood clearly that there is no way in which pay-

ment can be avoided. Heavy loss has been made, some of which is irrecoverable. But by drastic, clear-headed, and courageous action on the part of the Government now, by the assumption of all these delinquent railways, their consolidation with the existing Government railways, and the operation of the whole as a public service, and not merely as a basis for the issue of stock-exchange "securities," as heretofore, a system could be created which would soon be able, with present rates, not only to pay all operating expenses, but to pay all the capital charges for which it would be properly chargeable. It is even conceivable, and in fact here are reasons in the experience of other communities which make it almost certain, not only that in a remarkably short time this would be done, but that whilst doing it a reduction of present rates, and not an increase, would be indicated by the results. The Canadian Pacific Railway authorities are thoroughly alive to this contingency. They see that it is just here that the reason is why the country need not worry as to whether the Canadian Pacific Railway is embraced in the scheme of public ownership or not. The Government hold the trump cards. The Canadian Pacific Railway people know it. They are therefore opposed to public ownership, not only of their own, but of the other two large systems.

Of course, in order to achieve this result, it would be necessary to apply energy, organization capacity, common sense and common honesty in the administration of the system. No superhuman or even unusual qualities or experience are required. There is probably no business to-day in which moderate industry and ability are so certain to meet with success as in that of administering a railway which operates in a country in which people live and work and produce.

The Government has furnished no reason which would justify its failure to carry out the policy recommended by the Royal Commission, and which as a matter of fact is also its own policy. If it does so fail, it will be because of the existence of facts or considerations of which the public has no knowledge. If it does so fail, the failure will justify the public in believing that it is influenced by interests, or influences, or persons whose interests are not those of the public and who should have no influence with any Canadian Government. The public will also begin to believe, and they will be justified in believing, that the "invisible government," although invisible, is not altogether a ghostly or mythical body, but is in fact a very unpleasant reality.

All indirect taxes are borne most largely by the mass of the people, those least able to pay, and in Canada, fall with a special onerousness on the people of the West. But a tax collected under the guise of, or as an addition to, the cost, of the railway service, is probably more discriminatory against the western population than any other could be. For obvious geographical reasons, transportation charges are a much larger factor in the cost of everything that they consume and produce than they are in Eastern Canada, not only because of the greater length of the haulage, but because a much larger proportion of everything that is consumed and produced in the West is transported by railway. The customs tariff bears more heavily on the West than on the East and the substantial increase in customs duties, made by the Borden Government as a war measure, further emphasized this discrimination in the incidence of the tariff. The West, however, agreed, not expressedly but tacitly, to postpone the discussion of tariff questions till after the war, and more whole heartedly than any other section of Canada, went into the business of electing a Union Government which should vigorously prosecute the war.

The railway rate increase will more heavily discriminate against the West than did the advance in the tariff rate, and the total sum taken from the western taxpayers by its operation will be very much greater. This, from a western viewpoint, is a very serious and an obviously legitimate ground of objection to the increased railway rates. But there are still more serious objections. The Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern Railway Companies have defaulted in their contractual obligations. The Government of Canada has already paid many millions of dollars on behalf of these companies, and will have to pay many millions more. Their default has given the Government of Canada has already paid many millions of dolarls on behalf of these companies, and will have to pay many millions conditions produced by the blunders of the managers of these corporations, make it imperative that the Government should, in the high political and economic interest of the whole country, if necessary, exercise its inherent power of eminent domain and assume these lines without delay and without disputation.

The Government itself is quite alive not only to its powers, but to the urgency of the situation. It has expressed, through its organized press mouthpieces, its intention of nationalizing the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern systems, of consolidating them with the present Government railways, of operating them as a unit and of stopping the present futile waste, duplication, and overlapping. But the Government does not act on these express intentions. It would seem as if either the Government does not possess the required conviction and force to follow the plain course of duty and public interest, or some invisible paralyzing force is at work which renders its intentions nugatory.

The Canadian Northern promoters have loaded upon the country a huge white elephant, which the country has been obliged to house and feed, but which cannot earn nearly the value of its feed. As a sort of commission or remuneration to themselves for this great patriotic service, the promoters of the white elephant enterprise, issued to themselves common shares in the Canadian Northern Railway Company to the modest sum of one hundred millions of dollars, for which they gave nothing, but their services in furnishing the white elephant aforesaid. As, under all the circumstances, the presentation of such a claim was merely another example of the steel-plated effrontery, which only a modern "Empire-building" Canadian financier could possess, the people or Government of Canada was under no obligation, moral or legal, to take any cognizance of it. Yet an arbitration is now being gravely staged, whose ostensible object is to determine just how many millions (but not more than ten), the people of Canada should pay for sixty millions of these aqueous "securities"!

In my judgment the arbitration should be to ascertain how much the Canadian Northern railway should pay back to the Canadian people, instead of sitting to determine what the Canadian people should pay to the Canadian Northern railway.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company entered into a contract with the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which was probably the most amazing bargain ever made between a Government and a corporation. On the strength of that agreement, the Government constructed that preposterous, but thoroughly appropriate, "monument to the statesmanship of Sir Wilfrid Laurier," at a cost to the people of Canada of not less than two hundred millions of dollars, up to this date. Long before this transportation monstrosity was completed, the uselessness and unprofitableness of operating it, and the general folly of its conception, had been pretty fully realized. The Grand Trunk company simply declined to carry out its contract to operate the railway, and it was thrown on the hands of the people, by whom it is now held at a continuous heavy cost both in interest on capital and in operating expense deficits. By the same contract, the Grand Trunk company undertook to build a railway from Winnipeg, the western terminus of the National Transcontinental, to the Pacific coast, the Government guaranteeing the bonds covering a very large percentage of the cost. The railway was also built, and as was expected and predicted by all persons who had studied the enterprise, and whose intelligence had been developed beyond the kindergarten stage,—and these are much fewer than might be supposed,—it was also a commercial failure. The Government again had to get under the load. The Grand Trunk company is now operating this railway, but the people of Canada are paying the deficits, which are heavy.

As the Grand Trunk Railway Company has defaulted heavily in its contract with the Government and owes it an enormous amount of money, its own original lines, practically all in Eastern Canada, are now virtually forfeit to the Government. But the Grand Trunk financiers have no desire to lose their hold on the property, its manipulation being apparently a source of much profit to them. The comfortable old game of "heads I win, tails you lose," which the financiers have always been able to persuade Canadian Governments to play with them, is much too succulent a tid-bit to abandon without a strenuous resistance. Having left the Government with the heavy but unhealthy and unpromising National Transcontinental baby to hold, the Grand Trunk managers, with an effrontery that certainly could not be surpassed by even that of a Canadian Northern magnate, request that the Government take over the Grand Trunk Pacific, cancel the contract and cancel also the debt of many millions which the Grand Trunk owes the Government, on account of moneys advanced to pay interest on which the company defaulted. Not only this, but the Grand Trunk directors had the adamantine impudence to request that the Government repay the company some money which it had, in accordance with the contract, raised on its own credit and invested in the building

of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Mr. Smithers, Chairman of the Grand Trunk Board of Directors, came out from London and made a sort of stumping tour of this country, with a stereotyped statement which was a mixture of a whine and a "bluff" and was based on the most insidious sort of misrepresentation. He posed the Grand Trunk as a sort of benevolent altruist which had made the welfare and comfort of Canada and Canadians the sole thought of its waking hours, and whose philanthropic efforts some people in Canada would requite with scurvy ingratitude. It is to be feared that Mr. Smithers is culpably unfamiliar with the history of his own company and of Canada. It is also to be feared that many of our own statesmen are equally unfamiliar with that history, at least in so far as it relates to the Grand Trunk Railway. As a matter of fact, a true and unvarnished recital of the histories of all our great railway corporations is much needed just now. For there has developed in recent times a tendency on the part of the magnates of these concerns to wander into the fields of romance, using the early history of their own enterprise as the subject matter on which they build elaborate superstructures of weird and erratic fantasy. The transformation of the grub into the butterfly is a no more wonderful phenomenon than is the ethical evolution of the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern as described by the magnates. The flaw in this analogy, however, is that in the magnates' romances these corporations were ethical butterflies to start with. Their evolution has not been from the sordid to the glorious, but from one glory to another infinitely greater.

The people of Canada were under no legal obligation to arbitrate the value of the Canadian Northern Railway stock, which is worth exactly nothing, nor to negotiate with the shareholders of the Grand Trunk. These concerns are now endeavouring to evade their responsibilities, to throw the entire loss on the country, and in one of the cases to actually obtain a remuneration from the country for their agency in causing its loss. To permit such treatment is not to maintain "the credit of Canada". It is simply to proclaim the folly and the discredit of Canada. We are told that the "credit of Canada" requires that we shall negotiate for things that have no value, and shall arbitrate the question as to whether we shall pay to a person to whom we owe nothing, but who, on the other hand, has caused us enormous loss, ten or twenty or sixty millions of dollars! We are told that we must maintain, in the eyes of the financial world, a reputation for scrupulous honesty. This "credit of Canada" bogey has always so effectively freightened our statesmen that their vision has been distorted and their sense of perspective hopelessly impaired.

Now I want to inquire if the recommendations of the Royal Commission in regard to these railways have been adopted by the Government. I dislike to keep the House but it is important that the country, as well as the House itself, should know the facts. I would recommend every hon. gentleman to study the report of the Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into the transportation systems of Canada. It is known as the Drayton-Acworth report. This is the authorized governmental body, appointed by the Government, and constituted for the purpose of directing the country in the matter of its railway policy. That Commission made a very exhaustive report. I had intended reading something as to the cost of the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific and the aid which the country has given them from time to time, but perhaps I had better defer that until the railway estimates are brought down. I might, however, say a word or two with regard to the plan which the Commission suggested. Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, because you come from Nova Scotia, the cry has been raised in the Maritime Provinces all these years against public ownership, and how everybody throughout Canada has pointed as an argument against public ownership to the results of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. I myself have met this argument on every occasion: "For Heaven's sake, do not let us have public ownership, look at the Intercolonial." I want to point out, so that the country and the House may understand the facts, that the Intercolonial was built not as a commercial undertaking, but as a condition of Confederation. When the Maritime Provinces were brought into Confederation it was agreed that the Intercolonial should traverse those provinces. It did not take a direct course but ran from one town or village to another in order to serve the people. Let me emphasize another point: The rates charged on the Intercolonial for years and years were less than a quarter of the rates charged on privately owned railways in other parts of Canada. I am told that cars holding a very large amount of freight were credited with but a small quantity; all sorts of stories were circulated in regard

to that railway. No wonder it did not pay. Then, moreover, it was under political management, it was always in the hands of the dominant party; and no railway or other enterprise can be successfully operated under political management. In the Australasian colonies where public ownership prevails, the railways are managed by commissions, appointed not by the government, but by the legislatures and only removable by them for cause.

Now, Sir Henry Drayton and his associates studied the railway situation very carefully. They saw the difficulties to which I have alluded and in their excellent report made recommendations intended to obviate them. I have often wondered why the Government has not adopted that report. Why is the Canadian Northern not put into the hands of an independent commission, responsible to this Parliament, as suggested in Sir Henry Drayton's report? That report contains these recommendations:

Having then arrived at the conclusion that the transfer of the three undertakings to a commercial company is not feasible, we recommend that they be handed over to a board of trustees to control and manage on behalf of, and on account of, the people of Canada. The trustees should be organized as a company with a nominal capital. But in effect they would be a public authority.

Before going further we desire to make a fundamental point clear. We express the conclusion to which we have come both in negative and positive forms. We recommend:—

1. That the Government do not acquire or undertake to operate any further railways; but:

2. That these three railways, Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, and Grand Trunk Pacific, be transferred by Act of Parliament to an independent Board of Trustees (incorporated as a company), constituted as we shall hereafter describe.

These recommendations, from our point of view, hang together and must be regarded as inseparable. We do not recommend the transfer of the three companies at all, unless our recommendations as to the method to be followed are also substantially accepted. That the Government should itself take over the railways, and they should then be operated under the control of a Parliamentary Minister of Railways, is a policy which in our judgment would not be in the best interest of Canada.

Our personal belief is strong that, in normal circumstances, railway enterprise is a matter best left in private hands, subject to proper regulation by the Government. Were we asked to advise in the case of the railways of the United Kingdom or the United States, which have been constructed by private companies, with money found by private investors, we should give effect to this belief. We go further and consider that, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as to which the Government does instruct us to advise, the fact that it received large help from public sources in its early days, is not any reason why the existing status of the company should now be disturbed. This company has carried out its bargain. It has repaid to the Government large advances made in earlier years. We believe that Canada has had good value for what it has given. We think that it is in the interest of the country that this company should be rich and properous, for such companies can be expected, not only to give the best service, but to be best able to provide in time to meet new developments as they arise. We have had no hesitation, therefore, in coming to the conclusion that the status of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be left undisturbed.

But in the case of the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific the circumstances are not normal. These companies have broken down. We see no way to organize new companies to take their place. Their only possible successor is in our view a public authority. We are confronted with a condition and not a theory.

Our formal recommendations are:—

1. That a Board of Trustees be constituted by Act of Parliament and incorporated as "The Dominion Railway Company."

2. That the ownership of the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways be vested in this company.

3. That the Government assume responsibility to the company for the interest on the existing securities of these undertakings.

4. That the Intercolonial (including the Prince Edward Island) and National Transcontinental Railways be also handed over by the Government to the company.

5. That the whole of these railways, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Intercolonial, and the National Transcontinental, be operated by the company as one united system.

I shall not read all the recommendations, although it had been my intention to do so if time permitted. The House will see that if such management as is suggested here were adopted it would absolutely eliminate the idea of political interference or political patronage in the management of Government railways. It is not necessary to take over the Canadian Pacific railway. Let that road go on doing its work. It is a well managed system which is serving the people of this country, and there seems to be no reason under the sun why it should be acquired by the Government. If we take the three of four railways that we have, eliminate all the unnecessary mileage, cut off the capitalization represented by that mileage, and have it apply to actual mileage that is required, we shall be able to fix reasonable rates—much lower rates even than those which prevail to-day—and even pay interest on the legitimate capital.

I would like to tell the House of the value of public ownership as we have it in the city of Winnipeg. We have there an electric light and power system which we established some seven or eight years ago.

Prior to that a private company, the Winnipeg Electric Railway Company, operated the electric lighting sysem of the city. But the people decided to establish a system of their own, and did so. In this connection I want to read a brief letter from the manager of that company, which I received from him when I was in Winnipeg last week:

Dear Mr. Richardson:—

Regarding the reduction in rates for electric lighting and power in the city of Winnipeg resulting from the construction of the Municipal Light and Power Plant in Winnipeg, the charge made per K.W.H. for ordinary power in 1906 was 10c per K.W.H. with varying discounts depending on the amount and conditions under which taken.

The rates now applying are on a sliding scale, as shown on the enclosed rate card (Schedule "C"), commencing at 3 1-3c and reducing to 8-10c gross with two successive discounts to be deducted therefrom, viz,—wholesale and prompt payment. The net cost of power now varies from 2½c per K.W.H. net to ½c net.

The three million dollar annual saving stated by Mr. Kensit to be effected comprises not only the saving made by the City Light and Power consumers but also. The following figures give in a nut-shell the results of operation:—

Year to 30th of April.	Total Investment.	Revenue.	Expenses.	Deficit.	Surplus.
1912	(6 months)	$ 68,534.15	$127,375.89	$58,841.74	
1913	$6,143,693.04	544,736.03	628,168.93	83,432.90	
1914	6,724,372.58	865,805.19	805,582.58		$60,222.61
1915	7,339,537.99	976,854.70	897,627.78		79,191.92
1916	7,443,771.74	995,511.37	915,781.70		79,729.67
1917	7,559,492.15	1,020,480.25	935,905.72		84,574.53

Increase in load.

Year to April 30th.	No. of Customers.	Units generated in K.W.hrs.
1912	6,686	7,071,735
1913	21,724	39,071,750
1914	28,788	59,138,154
1915	32,953	70,743,274
1916	34,345	76,234,740
1917	35,392	82,278,970

The reduction in rates effected by the construction of the City Light and Power Plant is best illustrated by the reduction in the domestic lighting rate. The original money appropriation bylaw was passed in 1906.

In 1906 the rate was 20c per K.W. Hour.
In 1907 the rate was 10c per K.W. Hour.
In 1911 the rate was 7½c per K.W. Hour.
In 1912 the rate was 3 1-3c per K.W. Hour.

The estimated saving to citizens in their domestic lighting bills alone since October 15th, 1911, when the civic plant was put into operation, is four million dollars. H. E. M. Kensit's estimate of a total saving of three million dollars per year would give a total saving of nineteen million five hundred thousand dollars since the plant has been in operation six and one-half years.

I trust these figures and information will meet your requirements.

Yours truly,

City Light and Power Department,

R. A. SARA,
Sales Manager.

I read this for the purpose of demonstrating to this House the great value of public ownership. Naturally, there is very great opposition to public ownership. I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway will oppose public ownership and operation of the proposed railway system, but it is the only plan. If we adopt the suggestions made in the Drayton-Acworth Report, I believe that Canada will be able satisfactorily to solve its railway problem. I do not know how it can be solved in any other way.

Before I sit down, there is another matter I desire to take up, because on the Budget one can discuss almost anything. I wish to refer to attacks made upon one of the greatest apostles of public ownership in this country, the greatest apostle of that gospel Canada has yet produced. I refer to Sir Adam Beck, of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, and a member of the Ontario Government. In one of the committees of which I am a member, a Bill came up recently in which that commission is interested. I received a marked paper a week or two ago, a copy of The Financial Times, of Montreal, and I propose to spread this article on Hansard, because I do not believe a more vicious or contemptible attack upon a noble Canadian public servant has ever been made. The article begins:

It is not a coincident that Sir Adam Beck is a German and that the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario has only one law—that of Might. It is cause and effect! The German cannot get away from the whip and spur policy. If anything is in the way, run over it; crush it under foot, and then set it ablaze if there is anything left to burn. That is the Kaiser policy; it is the Hindenburg policy; it is the policy of those in humbler walks of life. In fact, it is German, with a Capital Germ. It is not Canadian policy. Five hundred thousand Canadians are fighting that very policy in France to-day; fifty thousand Canadians have either died or have been blinded or crippled in an endeavour to crush the pretention that Might is Rigt.

You see how the creature who writes this article endeavours to bring in patriotism, utilizing even the blood of the noble men

who have fallen in defence of freedom, when striking his deadly blow against this apostle of public ownership, Sir Adam Beck.

Bloodthirsty as the Germans have shown themselves to be, they don't want war for war's sake alone, however. War is only a means to an end with them. They want civic domination over the whole world, and as other nations have a little self-respect and a natural desire to hold what they have, the Germans were compelled to use force.

One German has tried the German game in Ontario, and has had a measure of success. He has given the individual householder cheaper electric light than was given by private-owned corporations,—

This creature had to admit the advantage that the people of Ontario have sustained through the operation of Sir Adam Beck's system.

—but he has made collective householders pay through their teeth, and has piled up an enormous capital obligation for Ontario, and is still going strong. This fourth year of war, when the Finance Minister has vetoed new capital outlay except with his special permission; when every man in Canada is entreated to save his pence to win the war; when we are compelled to go to Washington to borrow an occasional fifty million dollars in order to pay our way; when all these claims and others, such as income and business taxes, pensions for soldiers, hospital and patriotic funds, are confronting us, this German-Canadian with the manners of a Uhlan on the rampage, is granted, on a silver platter, if you please, $9,000,000 to $10,000,000 "government" funds, for one year's expenditure of "capital account" which expenditure of Government funds is directed towards the destruction of companies that had developed industrial Ontario many years before Adam Beck's father left his home in Prussia.

What a contemptible statement!

The people of Ontario, even during four years of war, are blind to the fact that the entire Hydro Electric policy is German-made. Adam Beck can't help it, he was born that way but it is surprising that British people in ultra-British Ontario would allow themselves to be seduced into a dishonourable cause. It has been charged that the Financial Times is prejudiced; that we represent vested interests and that we cannot see the good man is doing to the loyal householder who saves a cent a day on the pantry light bill. Frankly. The Financial Times is prejudiced; and The Financial Times has no apologies to make. We are prejudiced against the Turks for their Armenian atrocities and against the Germans for destroying the Belgians who refused to be bribed with a promise of "cheaper light". We have no use for the tribe! And we regret to see the Germans' disregard for the pledged word enter into the spirit of those Ontario people whose one defense of Adam Beck is, "He gave us cheaper light." A mess, a dirty mess of pottage!

It is distasteful to deal in personalities as above, but the entire ramifications of the Hydro Electric Group are peculiarly personal. The head of that concern has resorted to trickery and generally to methods not tolerated in the established relationship between men. In a word, he has not played the game, "the End" in his doctrine "had justified the Means," and that is a gospel proclaimed from the housetops in Germany by the blood relations of Sir Adam Beck. It is not British, and it is not Canadian to repudiate one's word, even in business affairs. This man has devised these unprincipled policies, and he and his dupes must take the consequences.

I read that article to illustrate the depths to which the creatures who are maintained by vested interests will descend to blacken the character of a great public servant and to prejudice the people of Canada against a man who has spent the best years of his life in bettering the conditions of the province of which he is so proud. The name of Adam Beck will stand in this country for much that is good, for the real progress of the country, and for service to the people of Canada, long after the creature who wrote this article is forgotten. Much as I abhor, much as I loathe the German and all his works, I would sooner be Von Hindenburg himself, or the menial Hun who blackens his boots, than the miserable, traitorous interest-serving creature who wrote that article.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have wearied the House—I have certainly wearied myself—more than I intended to do. I have endeavoured to speak with great frankness particularly on the railway question which I believe to be the paramount issue in Canada to-day, next to the war. I believe that even members of the Government perhaps fail to realize the importance of this issue, and it is because I have made a study of the railway question for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and have watched the development of our railways, and have realized what transportation means to our people, that I conceived it to be my duty, in all kindness and in all frankness, to state my views, based upon my observations, to the Government. They may not adopt them, but they are presented in the kindliest manner, and I have no doubt the Government will give these views their attention. We must realize that at present the members of the Government are absorbed in war questions and other issues, and are, perhaps, unable to give the attention it deserves to a matter of such vast importance.

The real importance of the issue and the necessity for prompt action is my excuse for having dwelt on this subject so fully and dealt with it so exhaustively. I could discuss this subject until daylight, but, perhaps, I shall have an opportunity when the Railway Estimates come up of speaking further with regard to it.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) for the words of commendation which he addressed to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He made a good deal of capital out of the assertion that some company had bought one thousand square miles of land for $16,000. I do not know whether it was the provincial or the Dominion Government, but whichever it was, the fault was not that of the purchaser, but that of the government which sold the property.

The hon. gentleman spoke also of the large amount of money which is being made by the big interests. It would seem from the proposals brought down by the Acting Finance Minister yesterday that no matter how large the profits of these interests may be, the Government will get a big slice of them. A few years ago, when Roosevelt was President of the United States, he undertook to make an investigation of all the large interests throughout the country with a view to breaking up monopolies and trusts. This work proceeded for some years, with what result? They had to give up the idea of breaking up trusts and monopolies because capital was withdrawing itself from industry and labour would be the sufferer from any action taken. I hope to see the day when capital and labour shall be united in this country under such a co-operative system as is working so well in many of the industries of the United States.

As a plain business man I wish to suggest a few plain things that I think the Government should do. We have now been in war for four years, and during that period I have not seen such retrenchment as I think there should be. Representatives of the people should administer the affairs of this country as a board of directors administers the affairs of a company. The difference is that a company gets its money from the sale of stocks and bonds, and is watched by the shareholders, whereas we are administering the affairs of a whole nation and the ownership is in the people of Canada. We have no right, therefore, to consider ourselves masters of the situation; we are only servants.

In the country in which I live some men have been working on the international boundary line under a Boundary Commission which was established some ten years ago. It was deemed necessary that the monuments should be repaired or rebuilt, as the wooden cores in some of them had rotted and they had fallen down. For several years this work proceeded; the men said that their work was topographical, latitudinal, altitudinal, longitudinal, or some other term of that nature. But the people wanted to know what all this was about. The men engaged in this work were setting a bad example as representatives of the public service. They would lie around their tent until ten o'clock in the morning; if they lived among the farmers they would not get up until ten and would ask special meals in the afternoons. This is not a good example to set among the hard-working, labouring people of the country. This work has been going on every summer along the international boundary. Gangs of rugged men came in with motor trucks, went over the hills and put up tripods and towers in various places without consulting the owners of the land. Customs officers and immigration inspectors were suspicious of what was going on; indeed, one of the men engaged in this work himself said to me: "I will keep them guessing." The local papers took up the cry: "Are these men German spies?" I own a large section of land in that district—and taxes are pretty heavy, I assure you. One of these men said to me: "Well, we have run over your land pretty generally; of course, I should have asked your permission." I said: "Never mind, I understand that the Government have permission to do what they choose." I asked him what this work was for, and he said, "This is a triangular survey." I submit that in these times of war we should not concern ourselves with what latitude or longitude we are living in or what is the altitude of a certain district. Next year the Government will proceed to do hydrographic work; they will measure the depth of all the streams, ponds and lakes. Will that help us out any? I do not think so. We should account for every dollar that is spent in this country, and every man in the employ of the Government should do an honest day's work. We are spending money needlessly. As I have said, it was suspected that these tripods and towers were being built by German spies. After these people had been coming and going for some time and had left the place, the boys congregated on the heights and destroyed the works which the men had put up. One of them had been put up on an eminence 650 feet above the lake, and one Sunday the boys had a picnic and pulled it down.

A company that undertakes to make money with the people's money has to be administered honestly and carefully. Look at our banks; if you do not put a stamp on your note, it is charged to your account.

and you have overdrafts of from $3 to $15 at the end of each month. The Government should conserve every cent it is entrusted with. At a time when the private and public debt of Canada has reached $2,500,000,000, such stupendous expenditure should not be made by the Government, particularly in these appalling times of war. We have many things to do with our money. I believe that we should have national currency and national banks. We should provide national currency for the great transportation companies. The banking system should be such that a farmer could walk into a bank with his head straight on his shoulders and demand twenty-five or fifty per cent of the value of his ownerships or the equity of his lands, just the same as a business man can hypothecate his stocks and bonds. Moreover, we should have conservation of our resources, our forests, fisheries, mines and lands, because only in that way can we pay the interest on our vast debt.

I believe, not only in the conservation of all those things, but in the conservation of humanity, which is a thousand times more important. Our doctors and nurses bear testimony to that, as also do our insane asylums and hospitals. We have with us to-day things that are of very great importance without spending money on things that are of no use whatever. We are suspicious of the present Government because, in 1908 at Halifax, the leader of the present Government proclaimed a policy. Did he fulfil it in 1911? No, he did not. He there proclaimed a platform of retrenchment in the administration of this country, of doing away with the patronage system, and he promised other good measures. In 1911, did the Conservative party win the election upon that platform? Did they, during the six years of their administration, practise one thing that they promised? No. To-day we have a right to be suspicious of the present Government although it is called Liberal-Conservative or Union Government. I do not wish to be critical of the Government to-night, but I desire to give a warning against foolish and profligate expenditure of public money. I hope we have no such dominating influence in the present Government as there was in the last. The former Government was a government over which even the leader of the present Government and the past had no control. There was there a dominating influence that was, to say the least, vicious, bad and dishonest. As a plain business man, who knows something about business and who knows that every cent should be accounted for, I say that we should have here a system of accountability in regard to the Civil Service. We know there are, throughout the whole country, four or five times more civil servants than there should be. If you talk with one of them, he will say: If they should dismiss one-half of the staff of the office in which I work and give the rest a ten per cent increase in salary—he wants a little more salary—we shall do all the work.

The Government are spending money right and left throughout the country. I do not wish to go into Brome county, but just at Highwater they paid $5,500 for a house to be used as a customs house, which could have been built for $3,000. It was built on a clay hill, and it will have to be held there with guy ropes to keep it from falling down the hill. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) should have looked after these things rather than myself. A brand new building could be erected for $3,000, and I speak having knowledge of erecting buildings and of the price of building material, and I know that these are times of high prices. I believe the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) is right. Probably the reason I stand in the House to-night may be from the very fact of what he uttered in Sherbrooke a little more than a year ago, and if one-quarter of what he said then is true, it is abominable. I do not want to thrash this House for its past work, but we have a right to be suspicious because there may be in the present Government dominating influences that make the Minister of Public Works not able to do as he sees fit.

The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) were both brought up under the influence of our grand old chieftain, the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has stood for forty years without a blemish. The Exchequer Court has never had to be resorted to in his long career. There never was such prosperity in the history of Canada as there was from 1896 to 1911. We heard a speaker on the opposite side state to-night that a hundred years ago there was the same population on the north as on the south side of the international boundary. Why is there this difference now? It is because the United States was made a cheap country to live in, and this was an expensive country to live in. The best immigration agency in the world is to make a country a cheap country to live in, and you cannot make a country

a cheap country to live in until every part of the business is done honourably, fairly and squarely, so that all commodities can be bought without a great taxation upon the people. We know that Englishmen who have come out from the old land and who have settled, some in Canada and others in the United States, when they meet again, ask one another: Where did you get your shoes, your ties, your hats, your suit, and what did you pay for them? Those boys, John and Tom, do not meet together very long before Tom goes over to the American side. Seven years ago tens of thousands of our young men were in the Canadian Northwest. My two sons went there and endeavoured to work out destinies for themselves. They invested all their money, but just before the war broke out, times had changed. Tens of thousands of those young men went over to the American side, because they had bought land, and they could not pay the taxes; they could not live. We need not lay the responsibility for all this on war conditions. The tide had begun to turn before the war broke out.

I am not here to-night to criticize the Government, but we are suspicious of your doings, and I am telling you to-night that in the county in which I have fought, I had as my opponent one of the ablest campaigners in the Dominion. It is pretty hard to hit a man when he is down; it is pretty hard to hit a man when he agrees with you, and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) has almost agreed with us that things are going wrong on the opposite side of the House, and, for the last six weeks in this House we have seen that hon. members sitting on the back benches are suspicious of what is going on over there. I could talk along those lines further, but let us warn hon. members opposite that they must watch and do right or in the coming session they will be handled without mercy and without gloves. We have a united party on this side. We have men who can express their opinions. We believe in democracy and in the principle of Canada for Canadians. It would seem that some of the speakers in this House and the press of the country consider that the whole onus of this great European war must depend upon Canada; that Canada must render up her all and her future and not have sufficient left to keep herself together. I have a son in France at the front. I have as much interest in the winning of this war as has any hon. member on the opposite side, and I want Canada's resources to go to support my boy, because it seemed like the last long farewell when he went. We differ, however, as to method. I believe that conscription was a wrong thing and a failure. We should have used the money of this country in bonuses to recruit men here. In the American rebellion the authorities, by paying large sums, hired men to go to the front. That was even after the draft had been in force for several years. I am pleased to say here to-night that everyone of us on this side of the House is in favour of winning the war and takes as much interest in it as any hon. member opposite.

In regard to the railway situation, why did my hon. friends opposite not keep Mr Gutelius in Canada? I am not sure whether Mr. Gutelius resigned just before or after the present Government came into power, but why did he resign to leave this country? It was simply because a manufacturer down in Nova Scotia said: We are going to have our way; you cannot have yours.

Mr. Gutelius believed in the survival of the fittest; the other man believed in the patronage system. The result is that Mr. Gutelius is now in the United States, while our railroads are being run in a way that will lead to their everlasting financial ruin. We should keep such men as Mr. Gutelius when we find them in any branch of the public service. It was Lincoln who said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time;" and I think we have heard some hon. gentlemen on the back benches opposite express themselves to that effect; they will be an element to be dealt with. Robbers, thieves and dishonest men are allowed to go abroad in this Dominion, fleecing unsuspecting people in the rural districts. They are allowed to go among our people and sell whatever they like. This House should immediately pass a law similar to the "blue sky" laws on the other side of the international boundary. Just a short time ago I had the experience of trying to recover some notes and cheques for poor people in the rural sections who had been fleeced by one of the most nefarious characters in this country. He came from Colorado and had been in St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary for thirteen days when the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) had him released, as the man

told me himself. As soon as he got out he fleeced the people of this country to the extent of $200,000 by putting false names on cheques and notes, and now he is back in St. Vincent de Paul for five years, and I hope to God he never gets a day short of it. So there is something else for the Government to do besides spending money foolishly.

Not long ago the Borden Government bought the Ross rifle factory, which was turning out a rifle that was a life saver for the Germans and death for our boys. Soldiers from the front have told me that they have pulled and pulled and the rifle would not go off, and the Germans came up smiling and then our boys had to use the other end of the gun on them. We have it from good authority in England that Great Britain could make all the Lee Enfields and small guns required for the Canadian forces, but nevertheless the Borden Government went ahead and bought this obsolete factory—I do not know for just what price, but they fooled away many millions of dollars. Why did they not wait until the war was over and buy it as junk—because it is only junk. I have a thousand such charges which I could make to-night, but I will not inflict them on the House, because it is no use. I am sorry none of the Cabinet ministers are here, but what can we do? We can only sit here and let them make the laws of this country by Orders in Council. It is the grand Cabinet of twenty-one or twenty-three members, I do not know which, who are doing the business of this country. I do hope that this country will not lose its democracy. I have every sympathy with the Government in this terrible war. I have no particular fault with the Budget except that the Government have taxed the breakfast table, and taxed nearly everybody in this land, but perhaps it will have a salutory effect on the people of Canada, who, when they have to dig down into their pockets, will take an interest in the proceedings of this House.

On motion of Mr. James McIsaac (Kings, P.E.I.), the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, the House adjourned at 12.42 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, May 2, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

PRINCE RUPERT JOURNAL.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Did the Prince Rupert Journal receive a cheque from the Government, dated September 4, 1917, for $117? If so, on what account?
2. If for advertising, what advertising was done, what was the name or names of papers which published same, and on what date or dates?
3. If for printing, what printing was done, on what date or dates, and where?
4. Were any cheques issued to the Prince Rupert Journal by the Government from January 1, 1917, to the end of the year?
5. If so, on what account in each case?
6. Have any cheques been issued to O. H. Nelson, Prince Rupert, since January 1, 1917, from any Department of the Government?
7. If so, for what reason, and amount in each case?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Interior: Yes. Advertising coal mining regulations, 3 months to 30th June, 1917.

2. Interior: Advertising in the Prince Rupert Journal, 3 months ended 30th June, 1917.

3. Interior: Not for printing.

4. Interior: Yes. Naval Service: Three. Public Works: Yes, cheque for $110.60 on 25th January, 1917. Finance: July 30, 1917, cheque for $16. Marine: Cheque for $9, dated February 9, 1917.

5. Interior: January 22, 1917, advertising coal mining regulations, 6 months, to 31st December, 1916, $234; April 2, 1917, advertising coal mining regulations, 3 months to 31st March 1917, $117; September 4, 1917, advertising coal mining regulations, 3 months, to 30th June, 1917, $117. Naval Service: Cheques issued January 24, 1917, for $37.10 on account of advertising under dates May 11 and May 13, 1912, and June 6, 1912; cheque issued February 1, 1917, for $12.90 on account of advertising under date of December 1, 1911; cheque issued July 11, 1917, for $3.40 on account of advertising under date November 19, 1914. Public Works: Advertising, Victoria harbour breakwater, $21.60; Victoria harbour breakwater, $4.80; Massett wharf, $13.40; Refuge Bay wharf, $13.60; Sand Spit Point wharf, $20.40; Digby Island, doctor's residence, $13.20; Prince Rupert departmental building, $19.20; Prince Rupert public building, $4.40. Total, $110.60. Finance: For advertising debenture stock. Marine: For advertising

respecting persons supplying provisions or goods to stewards of Dominion vessels.

6. Information in reference to this question is given in the Auditor General's Report, 1917, volume II, pages T-54, 55, 56.

7. Answered by No. 6.

CANADA FOOD BOARD.

Mr. CURRIE:

1. Under what authority was the Canada Food Board established?

2. Has this Board the right to impose taxation on the public without the consent or authority of Parliament?

3. Under the British North America Act, has the Dominion Government the right to issue licenses for trading, or collect fees for the same?

4. Has there been a decision of the Privy Council on this question and did that Court give the sole right to license, to Provincial Governments?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to question No. 1, the Canada Food Board was established under the War Measures Act, 1914. The remaining questions seem to ask for a legal opinion upon the interpretation of Statutes, and it is not usual to give such opinions in answer to questions.

ONTARIO MINING TAX ACT.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has any application been made to the Government for the disallowance of the Ontario Statute, 7 George V, Chapter 7, assented to 12th April, 1917, which amended the Ontario Mining Tax Act, or as to any portion of the same relating to (1) the taxation of nickel, or nickel-copper mines, or (2) the ascertaining of the profits of nickel or nickel-copper mines?

2. If so, by whom, on whose behalf, and when, was such application made, and was the same made orally or in writing?

3. What action, if any, was taken by the Government in regard to the matters referred to?

4. Has any application or representation been made to the Government from any source, either (a) in Canada, or (b) in the United States with regard to the sum of approximately $1,366,000 that was recovered for the use of the Province of Ontario from the International Nickel Company, or the Canadian Copper Company (instead of the $80,000 that had been previously received by the province in question for two years' mining taxes), looking to the refund of any portion of the moneys so recovered, or any action being taken by the Dominion Government?

5. If so, by whom, and upon what grounds?

6. What action has been taken, or does the Government intend to take in respect thereto?.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. The Canadian Copper Company, dated 28th November, 1917. By written petition supported by oral argument.

3. It was determined not to exercise the power of disallowance.

4. No.

5 and 6. Answered by No. 4.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—EXPENDITURES.

Mr. PROULX:

Referring to the return showing the total amount expended up to the date of the said return in connection with the enforcement of the Military Service Act—

How much has it cost per man to secure each soldier enrolled under the said Act?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

The total expenditure to date incurred in connection with the Military Service Act is $1,803,581.61. This total expenditure includes the expenditures incurred in connection with the publicity campaign, the Dominion police, printing, subsistence and travelling expenses of men ordered to report for duty, and travelling expenses of men ordered to report for medical examination.

The registration of Class I men under the Military Service Act is, to date, 397,671. Therefore the total cost per registrant is $4.54.

There have been 39,760 Class I men actually placed on service to date, but to estimate the cost of securing these men, by the simple process of dividing the total number of men now on service into the total expenditure in connection with the enforcement of the Military Service Act to date, would not give a true estimate of the cost of drafting such men, for the reason that the greater percentage of the expenditure shown above has been spent in organization, the results of which are only now bearing fruit. One may safely say that every man drafted in future will materially reduce the cost of securing a recruit. It may therefore be plainly seen that at the present time it is impossible to estimate the cost of securing a recruit under the Military Service Act.

WAR INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Is the Government aware that the Insurance companies charge an extra premium on insurance policies issued to enlisted men before such enlistment?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to pay the difference between the regular and the extra premium? If not, why?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. The Government is aware that on life insurance policies now being issued, and on such policies issued since the outbreak of war, extra premiums have as a rule been demanded in respect of military service. Policies in force at the outbreak of war

have as a rule been continued without extra premium.

2. It is not the intention of the Government to pay the difference between the regular and the extra premium, for reasons which were fully explained to the House at the last session of Parliament. The discussion on this point will be found on pages 4019 and 4020 of Hansard for 1917.

CHAMPLAIN MARKET SITE.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. What area of ground and water frontage has been purchased by the Government for the Transcontinental Railway, between Sillery and the Champlain Market at Quebec?

2. What have these properties cost, and what use is intended to be made of them?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Transcontinental railway purchased all water frontage between Sillery and Champlain market at Quebec; 81.74 acres of land along said front.

2. (a) $1,039,377.02, which includes amount paid to the city of Quebec for Champlain market site.

3. These properties were acquired for right of way and station purposes of the National Transcontinental railway. They are available for future developments, docks and yards and wharves, in connection with the railway.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY QUEBEC SHOPS.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to put into operation the workshops of the Transcontinental Railway in the City of Quebec, so as to carry out the agreement entered into between the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, acting for the Government, and the Corporation of the city of Quebec, dated August, 1910?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, whenever required.

NORTHWEST GRAIN TRADE.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps to put a stop to the diversion of the grain trade of the Canadian Northwest, two-thirds of which is now being shipped at United States sea ports, and to give this trade to Canadian ports?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is necessary, under war conditions and in view of the submarine peril, to utilize from time to time all Atlantic ports on this continent.

HALIFAX RECONSTRUCTION WORK.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government been informed that mechanics have been hired to go to Halifax in connection with reconstruction work, with the understanding that their return fare would be paid provided they remain at work during a period of three months?

2. If so, is the Government aware that in spite of that promise, travelling expenses have been kept back from the wages of mechanics, even from those who have been at work for more than three months?

3. Has the Government been informed that after a lapse of more than one month after notification given by Colonel R. S. Low, manager of reconstruction works in the Finance Department, a certain number of mechanics have not yet received the balance of their wages?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to order these men to be paid what they are entitled to and to be reimbursed with the moneys retained?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS: 1. No.
2, 3 and 4. Answered by answer to No. 1.

DOMINION-WIDE PROHIBITION.

*Mr. CANNON:

1. Prior to or during the General Election which took place on the 17th of December last, did the President of the Council have an interview or interviews with Mr. Samuel Carter, M.P.P., for South Wellington, regarding the question of temperance or Dominion-wide prohibition?

2. If so, did the President of the Council represent the Government at the said interview or interviews, and had he authority to act for the Government?

3. Was any understanding or agreement arrived at between the President of the Council and the said Mr. Samuel Carter at the said interview or interviews?

4. If so, did the President of the Council request the said Mr. Samuel Carter, or was it arranged at the said interview or interviews between the said President of the Council and the said Mr. Samuel Carter, that the said Mr. Samuel Carter should consult W. A. Warburton, General Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association and Chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, and the Reverend T. A. Moore, of the Methodist Church, with a view to lining up the Temperance and Moral Reform and religious denominations in Ontario in support of the Union Government, on the secret pledge or intimation that if the Union Government was returned, Canada would be made bone-dry, or that some other drastic measure would be taken in connection with Temperance?

5. In consequence of such request or arrangement, is the Government aware that the said Mr. Samuel Carter consulted Messrs. Warburton and Moore and that the said Messrs. Warburton and Moore associated other workers in the Temperance, Moral Reform, and religious denominations to line up the Temperance and Social and Moral Reform Associations, as well as the Protestant Churches, for the Union Government?

6. Did the said Mr. Samuel Carter report to the President of the Council the result of any negotiations which he had with the said W. A. Warburton and the said Rev. T. A. Moore, or either of them, to further the line of action which he had been authorized to take by the President of the Council, or which the President of the Council knew he was to engage in?

7. Was the President of the Council aware of the advertisements published by the Citizens' Committee and by the Unionist Party Publicity Committee in the Canadian Baptist, of the 13th

of December, 1917, and the Presbyterian Review, of the same date, and other Protestant religious papers of the same date?

8. Did W. A. Warburton, or any one connected with the Citizens' Publicity Committee, or the Unionist Party Publicity Committee, submit such advertisements to the President of the Council or to his private secretary?

9. If the foregoing was not the understanding or agreement arrived at between the President of the Council and the said Mr. Samuel Carter and others, what arrangement was made between the President of the Council and Mr. Samuel Carter, or with Mr. Samuel Carter and others, at the interviews which the said President of the Council had in connection with the secret assurance regarding the position that he and the Union Government would take on the Temperance question?

10. Did the President of the Council assure the said Mr. Samuel Carter at one of the interviews above referred to that if the Union Government did not carry out the views of the President of the Council and Mr. Samuel Carter in respect to prohibition, that the President of the Council would withdraw from the Cabinet?

11. Was it arranged or suggested by the President of the Council or by the said Mr. Carter at any of the interviews between the President of the Council and Mr. Carter, that the arrangement with regard to Temperance was to be kept secret, and that the issue to be presented by W. A. Warburton and others associated with him should be the policy outlined in the advertisements above-mentioned, namely, that Conscription was the only issue?

12. Did the President of the Council subsequently learn from the said Mr. Samuel Carter of the result of his conference with Messrs. W. A. Warburton, Moore, and others, that they were willing to accept the secret assurance and take the necessary steps to line up the Temperance, Moral, Social and religious denominations and their supporters and adherents in support of the Union Government?

13. In the agreements or assurances given by the President of the Council to Mr. Samuel Carter, did the President of the Council have the authority of the Government to enter into the same on behalf of the Government?

14. Was any other arrangement or assurance entered into between the President of the Council and Mr. Carter, or with Mr. Carter and Messrs. Warburton, Moore, and others, or any of them, respecting any other measure of moral or social reform?

15. Is the Mr. Samuel Carter above referred to the gentleman named by the Government authorities or the Minister of Militia to take the registration for the Georgian Bay District of the man-power of that district?

16. If Mr. Carter is the same gentleman above referred to, was he named by the President of the Council for such position, and what recommendations were given before such appointment was made?

17. Did any of the recommendations to the Government for the appointment of Mr. Samuel Carter urge that he should be rewarded on account of the efforts which he had put forward in connection with the secret campaign for temperance at the last election?

18. Was Mr. Samuel Carter appointed by the Government to the position of Registrar by reason of the activities which he showed on behalf of the Union Government during the last election?

19. Was Mr. J. M. Godfrey at any time prior to or during the election in conference with the President of the Council and Mr. Samuel Carter regarding the line of campaign to be adopted in the Province of Ontario?

20. Is the Mr. J. M. Godfrey appointed as Registrar for the District of Toronto to take the manhood power, the same Mr. J. M. Godfrey who acted as Chairman for the promotion of a Union Government at the meeting in the Arena, Toronto?

21. If the said J. M. Godfrey is the gentleman who acted as Chairman of the Arena Conference in Toronto in connection with the advocacy of the formation of Union Government, was he appointed to his present position on the recommendation of the President of the Council, and was the appointment given to him as a reward for the support of the Union Government at the last election?

22. Did the said Mr. J. M. Godfrey and the said Mr. Samuel Carter while actively supporting Union Government at the election in December last, publicly endorse the policy advocated by the Union Government of abolishing Party Patronage?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1 to 6 and 9 to 14 inclusive. Shortly after the Union Government was formed, the Prime Minister brought the question of Prohibition to the attention of his colleagues and submitted to them copies of a memorial which had been received during the summer of 1917 regarding the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor in Canada. The Prime Minister advised that he had informed the committee which had presented the memorial, that the matter would be submitted to the members of the Union Government, when formed, for their consideration. After prolonged and most careful consideration of the whole matter in all its aspects, the Government reached the conclusion already announced, and embodied in several Orders in Council passed under the War Measures Act.

The action taken by the Government was not the result of any conference, agreement or compact with any party or parties relating to the election or any matters connected therewith, but was taken by the Government solely from the standpoint of the public interest.

7 and 8. No.

15. Yes.

16. No. Mr. Carter only accepted the position as a matter of public duty and on the understanding that he was not to receive any personal compensation for his work.

17, 18 and 19. No.

20. The Government is not aware of any meeting such as is referred to. The Government is advised that a Win-the-War Convention was held in the Arena in the city of Toronto in the summer of 1917 and that Mr. J. M. Godfrey was chairman of the convention.

21. No. Mr. Godfrey only accepted the position as a matter of public duty and on the understanding that he was not to receive any personal compensation for his work.

22. The Government has no information.

NEW BRUNSWICK AND P. E. I. RAILWAY.

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. On what date was the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, running between Sackville and Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick, acquired by the Government?
2. What was the purchase price?
3. How much, if any, was paid on account?
4. What is the reason why the balance of the purchase money has not been paid?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. As and from the first day of August, 1914.

2. $270,000.00.

3. Paid on the principal, $180,000.00; paid interest, $18,552.32. Total, $198,552.32.

4. Owing to the inability of the company, in view of certain outstanding bonds, to give clear title to the property.

MR. E. BEAUFORT.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Was one E. Beaufort employed on the staff and in the office of the Chief Press Censor for Canada?
2. If so, by whom was he recommended for such employment, and what were his duties on the said staff and in the said office?
3. Did he act as German translator and Assistant in the said office, and if so, for what length of time?
4. While the said Beaufort was employed by the Chief Press Censor for Canada were his services placed at the disposal of the Post Office Department, and did he go to Halifax to perform work there?
5. If so, what was the nature of his work at Halifax and how long did he remain there?
6. By reason of Beaufort's conduct did events transpire that caused him to be placed under surveillance?
7. Were certain letters or other documents written by the said Beaufort intercepted and handed over to the Chief Press Censor, and did such letters or documents disclose an attempted liaison with the person to whom they were addressed?
8. In consequence of the said surveillance and of the disclousures contained in the said letters or other documents was the said Beaufort dismissed from the Government service?
9. If so, was he subjected to any other penalty or punishment by the Government?
10. Since his dismissal from the Government service has the said Beaufort represented The Christian Science Monitor in the Press Gallery of the House of Commons of Canada?
11. If so, on what credentials or authority did the said Beaufort secure admission in the first instance to the Parliamentary Press Gallery, and does he still represent The Christian Science Monitor therein?
12. Have any of the articles written by the said Beaufort and sent by him to The Christian Science Monitor at Boston, been censored? If not, why not?
13. Has the Chief Censor for Canada any reason for believing that the said Beaufort has desisted from the practices that led to his dismissal from the Government Service? If so, on what is such reason based?
14. Will the intercepted letters on other documents written by Beaufort and handed over to the Chief Press Censor for Canada be land on the table of the House, or placed at the disposal of a Special Committee of the House should one be appointed to inquire into and report upon Beaufort's conduct as a member of the Chief Censor's Staff and of the Parliamentary Press Gallery?
15. How much was paid the said Beaufort while in the Government employ?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: Respecting questions 1, 2, 3 and 15, Mr. Beaufort was employed on the Chief Press Censor's staff from July, 1916, to June 30, 1917. He was recommended by the Chief Press Censor. He did work as German translator and was paid $4 a day. In regard to other questions, Mr. Beaufort was not under surveillance and was not dismissed. His services were no longer necessary as the work he was engaged in had considerably decreased. The Government is not aware of the circumstances connected with Mr. Beaufort's subsequent employment. All articles from the Press Gallery are treated alike. As to further matters alluded to, the files and documents of the Chief Press Censor's office are necessarily secret and confidential, and it is not in the public interest to disclose them.

NET DEBT PER CAPITA.

*Mr. ETHIER:

1. What was the net debt per capita on the 30th March, 1911?
2. What was the net debt per capita on the 30th March last, 1918?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Approximately $47.18.
2. Approximately $133.30.

NEWSPRINT INQUIRY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Was there a sub-committee of the Privy Council appointed to deal with the regulations, orders or interim report of the Commissioner conducting the newsprint inquiry?
2. If so, did such sub-committee consist of Messrs. Rowell, Reid, Calder and Maclean?
3. Did such sub-committee deal with any regulations, orders or report proposed or made by the said Commissioner? If so, what action was taken?
4. At the time the said sub-committee dealt with such proposed regulations, orders or interim report, did Honourable N. W. Rowell have any financial interest in the Toronto Globe or the Toronto Star?

5. Was Honourable N. W. Rowell a director of the Toronto Globe? If so, is he still a director, and if not, when did he cease to be a member of the Board of Directors?

6. Did the said Honourable N. W. Rowell prohibit in writing the said Commissioner from investigating the affairs of any newspaper or newspapers in Canada? If so, will a copy of the said prohibition or instruction be brought down in the House?

7. Is the said sub-committee of the Privy Council, or the said Honourable N. W. Rowell, still exercising any supervision or control over the conduct of the said Commissioner conducting the said inquiries?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. Yes, but Messrs. Carvell and Doherty were also associated with that sub-committee.

3. The sub-committee considered the regulations, orders and report alluded to and reported to Council. Any necessary action was taken by Council and not by the sub-committee.

4. No.

5. Mr. Rowell was a director of the Toronto Globe about five years ago. He resigned his position as director at the time that he undertook the leadership of the Liberal party in the provincial legislature and he has not been a director since. He has no personal or financial interest in either the Toronto Globe or the Toronto Star.

6. Mr. Rowell took no such step except in so far as he may have communicated to the Commissioner the opinion of Council with regard to the scope of the investigation, and this he did in the discharge of his duty as President of the Council.

7. The sub-committee alluded to is still acting, when necessary, within the scope of its duties.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES FOR ROYAL FLYING CORPS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it a fact that at the different camps of the Royal Flying Corps situated in the Province of Ontario, and particularly at Queen's Park, there are no church parades held to enable members of the different religious denominations to perform their religious duties? If so, why?

2. Is it a fact that at the above mentioned camps of the Royal Flying Corps, there is no Chaplain, specially assigned to attend to the religious welfare of the men now undergoing training? If so, why?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The camps of the Royal Flying Corps situated in the province of Ontario and elsewhere on this continent are under the direction of the British authorities, and not under the direction of the Government of Canada. It has been represented to this Government that there should be greater opportunity for the members of the Royal Flying Corps in camps in this Dominion to attend religious services, and this matter has been taken up in correspondence with the officers in charge of the camps.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

What municipalities have been authorized by the Minister of Finance to issue debentures on the market, since the Order in Council enacted in this respect?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What amount was paid the Toronto Globe and the Toronto Star respectively, from January 1, 1917, to April 1, 1918, for all service between the said dates?

2. Was any contract of any kind made with either of the said newspapers between the dates mentioned for advertising, publicity, or news editorial and feature service?

3. If so, by whom was said contract or contracts made, and what are the particulars thereof?

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What numbers of commissioned officers of each of the ranks of Major-General, Brigadier-General, Colonel, Lieut.-Colonel, Major, Captain and Lieutenant, and what number of warrant officers have been sent across seas from Canada, since war was declared, who have not been in actual service outside of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland?

2. How many have returned to Canada?

3. How many are still in the United Kingdom?

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. How many military officers have been employed in the enforcement of the Military Service Act up to March 31, 1918, in each province?

2. How many civilians in each province?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Have tenders been recently submitted to the Department of Militia and Defence or to the War Purchasing Commission for a supply of Smoked Wiltshire Bacon, at Toronto, Kingston and London?

2. If so, who are the tenderers, and what are their prices in each case?

3. To whom has the contract been awarded in each case, and at what price?

MILITARY SERVICE.

TEMPORARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO FARMERS FOR SEEDING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The Minister of Militia and Defence stated the other day that the young men would not be taken from the farms until after those in the cities and towns had been called to report, but as a matter of fact young men

on the farm are being called to report right along. Is any provision being made whereby these young men will be allowed to return to the farm temporarily until the men in the cities and towns have been called out?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think I stated clearly the other day that a request had been sent to the Registrars under the Military Service Act, in sending out notices to the young men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two inclusive to report, to first give notice to the young men living in urban centres. I understand that in some cases instructions have not been carried out to the letter, as there has been diffiuclty in ascertaining just who are and who are not farmers. I asked the Military Service Council to send another wire out to-day urging that our request be conformed with as far as possible. We are now endeavouring to arrive at some means whereby young men of this age who are in the midst of seeding operations, after reporting—it is necessary to report because otherwise the machinery would be complicated—shall be allowed to return to their farms for a couple of weeks to complete their seeding, and I hope arrangements to this end will be completed to-night.

Mr. P. MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): In the northern part of New Brunswick the seeding season lasts until the 15th or 20th of June. In the case of farmers in that section of the country two weeks' leave of absence would be altogether too short, and I would ask the minister to extend their leave.

Major-General MEWBURN: We are giving every consideration to the conditions existing in every province of the Dominion, and if it is possible to carry out that suggestion we shall endeavour to do it. But it depends entirely upon the urgency of the call for men.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the provision which has always been usual in war time been made, that the only son of a widow and the sole support of a family shall not be taken at all, whether or not they are on the farm?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that matter was dealt with in the statement which the Minister of Militia and Defence made on Tuesday. I understand that his statement embodies all that can be said on that subject at the present time.

[Mr. Edwards.]

THE RETURNS OF THE LAST GENERAL ELECTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): It has been the custom to give the returns of a general election in printed form. Will that be done this year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand the report has already been printed. A statement of the results of the last general election was prepared in printed form and placed at the disposal of hon. members about two weeks ago, I think. Perhaps what my hon. friend has in mind was a return in somewhat different form.

Mr. DEVLIN: I mean a return similar to the one printed after the twelfth general election giving the votes by polling divisions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The report is in course of preparation and will be issued in due course.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will there be a separate column in the report for the women voters?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I could not answer that without ascertaining what steps the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is taking, but it seems to me that any such proposal would be attended with a great deal of difficulty.

THE NEW TOBACCO TAX.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent, O.): Would the Acting Minister of Finance say whether the 5 per cent tax on Canadian-grown tobacco will apply to all qualities of tobacco? The reason I ask is that in many seasons we have early frosts in different parts of Ontario which damage the crop, and the tobacco has to be sold at five or seven cents a pound. Would the tax be applied in such a case?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The regulations will provide that in the event of the destruction of tobacco from any cause there will be a remission of the duty.

CORRECTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (North Winnipeg): I wish to correct some figures I gave yesterday in reference to direct taxation. As I pointed out yesterday, the Department of Trade and Commerce have not accurate

figures of the assessment of this country; they put the figures at five billions. I have no means of verifying this figure, nor has the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In the case of Winnipeg and Montreal, for example—we can take their assessment figures as about right—one mill on the dollar of direct taxation would produce one million dollars from these two cities. The full assessment of Canada does not differ fifty times over. The figures are only approximate, but I wanted to correct that point, as direct taxation, I feel, is a matter of urgent importance.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

ALLEGED UNLAWFUL DETENTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made inquiry with regard to an item which appeared in a newspaper, the Ottawa Journal, I believe, to the effect that the father of two young men, who were defaulters under the Military Service Act, had been arrested and was being held as a hostage. I have caused inquiry to be made, and the statement, as might have been expected, turns out to be entirely unfounded. The facts are that a man named W. Humphke, who had two sons liable to service under the Military Service Act, was arrested by the municipal chief of police and carried to Pembroke for having in his possession deer skins out of season under the provincial law and was held pending trial at Pembroke. The two young men who were defaulters, whether in their own minds they connected the arrest in any way with their default or not, did subsequently come forward and surrender themselves. There was no connection whatever between the two matters.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

ALLEGED CONFISCATION OF EXEMPTION PAPERS.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Prevost) asked a question with regard to the report of an incident which was said to have transpired in the town of Terrebonne. It was said that a young man had been accosted by the police, that his exemption papers had been taken from him because, it was said, they were not in proper order, that he was detained, and only discharged in the evening after communication with the registrar. Another alleged ground of complaint apparently was that there were too many police officers in Terrebonne. I have caused inquiry to be made, and it is reported to me that the facts are that the inspector in Montreal endeavours, wherever it is possible, to get the co-operation of the local chief of police. For some reason that was not procurable at Terrebonne, and, in consequence, the inspector having received information that there were a certain number of defaulters in and around that place, made the necessary arrangements to investigate. In connection with the case of the man named as having had his papers taken from him, it was reported that his papers were not in order, and in order to prevent the man losing any time from his work, a constable took his papers, telephoned the registrar during the course of the afternoon and returned them to the man when he came along after his work.

ENLISTMENT IN ROYAL FLYING CORPS AT QUEBEC.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I have been asked by the president of the committee of the Royal Flying Corps at Quebec City to communicate to the House the following information:

> It may be of interest to the country at large to know that applications for Royal Flying Corps are pouring into my office from Quebec and rural districts; all well educated young men and belonging to good families.
>
> (Sgd) Adelard Tourgeon.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

ALLEGED IMPRISONMENT OF RETURNED SOLDIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Major-General MEWBURN: Mr. Speaker, I might be permitted to reply to a question asked by the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to a report in a paper a few days ago that a returned soldier had been placed under arrest and held in the jail at the Soo. I made inquiries regarding that matter and I have a report to show that this man was really not a soldier; that he never had anything to do with the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but that he was for some time employed as a Soo canal guard. Subsequently to that he got drunk, created a disturbance, was arrested by the civil police, was fined, but preferred to stay in jail rather than pay his fine. He was not a soldier at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where did he get the liquor?

MEDICAL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: The following cable appears in the Montreal Gazette of to-day:

Dr. Bruce of Toronto to visit United States.

An important British commission will shortly visit the United States. It is composed of three prominent surgeons who will attend the National Medical Association at Chicago, and other gatherings. It is understood that Dr. Bruce, of Toronto, now with the Imperial Medical Service in France, will be a member of the commission and represent the body with which he is serving at the front.

I would like to ask the Government if, in view of the scandalous condition in which the medical service is reported to be in England, it is the intention to continue Dr. Bruce in charge of the medical service, or to reinstate him.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If he is going to the United States he could not very well be in England.

Sir SAM HUGHES: You might stop him.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In so far as the Canadian Medical Service in Great Britain is concerned, I have no information whatever that would justify the reflection that has been cast upon it by my hon. friend. My information is absolutely contrary to the opinion which he has just expressed.

ROYAL FLYING CORPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand that more than fifty per cent of the members of the Royal Flying Corps are young Canadians. In view of that fact are any steps being taken whereby our men may be constituted a separate body from the Royal Flying Corps, whereby the Canadians would be able to form squadrons of their own, and whereby Canadian officers who have given very excellent service might be recognized by being promoted to some of the senior positions? There are one or two subordinate positions given them but that is about all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will take into consideration the inquiry that the hon. gentleman has made and answer him on another day. He will recognize the difficulties which seem to stand in the way of organizing the Canadian flying men in a distinctive unit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I knew all the difficulties and I had them removed.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am bound to say that such information never reached me. If my hon. friend will give us a suggestion as to how the difficulties may be removed, we should be very happy to consider his proposal. The difficulties which arose seemed to be pretty serious, but this is not the time to enter upon a discussion of the matter. It is possible that something might be done along the line which the hon. gentleman suggests, but I am not prepared to say to-day whether it is possible or not.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I want to ask the right hon. gentleman—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member cannot pursue the matter further.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Just a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to have a discussion—

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is no discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to have a discussion on the Orders of the Day.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the information. I am well aware of it. However, I may ask a question. May I recall—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask the right hon. gentleman if he proposes—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot recall anything at this stage.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, then, I will ask the question: Does the Prime Minister not remember the fact that he took his information from the wrong source rather than from the right source in connection with these matters in days gone by?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have always endeavoured to take it from the best source available.

THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means (resumed from May 1).

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House for the first time, I crave that indulgence which is always so readily granted to a new member when he makes his maiden

speech. The questions now before the House are so important and so far-reaching that those of us who are unaccustomed to parliamentary debate are encouraged to take the opportunity to express our opinions with a feeling of less timidity than we would otherwise entertain. It is not my intention, in fact it would be extremely presumptuous of me as a new member, to discuss the questions now before us at very great length, but permit me to say that in my humble judgment the Acting Minister of Finance deserves to be highly congratulated on the excellent Budget Speech which he delivered—the most comprehensive and most important Budget Speech ever delivered in the Parliament of Canada, and under the most momentuous circumstances that ever faced a finance minister of this country in presenting the annual financial statement. The new taxation imposed involves a number of new departures and is in many respects drastic, but, Sir, under the existing circumstances there is not a member of the House, there is not a loyal Canadian, who will not cheerfully accept the impositions called for and endeavour to meet them so far as he is able.

The assembling of Parliament annually for the granting of supplies is a basic feature of our system of responsible government, and the procuring of ways and means wherewith to administer the public business imposes upon those charged with the affairs of government a serious and onerous obligation. If that is true in normal times, it is far more so at a time like the present when such serious conditions confront us. The result of the financial operations of the year, as disclosed by the Acting Minister of Finance, seems to me to be quite satisfactory; that is to say, all the ordinary or civil expenditure of the country has been provided for, and there is available the sum of $55,000,000 to be devoted towards paying off the debt created by the war. In the debate which has so far taken place upon the Budget, as well as in the discussions which have occurred on other occasions since the opening of Parliament, two questions have been deemed by hon. members opposite to be of primary importance in dealing with the serious situation which the war has created: One consists of a demand for the removal of the duties on agricultural implements, and the other is founded on the cry that if men are taken from the farm food production will seriously suffer. With regard to the first, I cannot pretend to any expert knowledge as to the merits or demerits of the subject, and, therefore, I will not venture to discuss it. But I understand, and I have heard the statement made repeatedly here, that it has been agreed that all matters of this kind should remain in abeyance until the war is over. So far as regards the denuding the farm of labour is concerned, all will admit that it is a serious proposition, but it must be remembered that a far more serious proposition is waiting to be disposed of: The Hun is at the gate, the very existence of our Empire is trembling in the balance, civilization and liberty are in jeopardy, and the call is for men, more men, and still more men. I admit that serious inconvenience, and even hardship, will be caused to many by the taking of able-bodied men from the farm, but, Sir, this is a time when all our people are called upon to make some sacrifice, and I do not apprehend that the consequences to farm operations, as a result of conscripting our manhood, will be as serious as some would like to make us believe. Even after all our young men of military age have been called to the colours, we know there will be a certain percentage who cannot conform to the physical standard required by the Military Service Act, and such persons will be available for work on the farm. Again, there are a great many men employed in non-essential industries in our large cities, and these I think could also be commandeered to some extent to do farm work. The objection has been raised by the practical farmers, "Oh, such men do not know how to do farm work." Even so, Mr. Speaker, we must endure the inconveniences and hardships involved, and solve the problem as best we can. The great problem that faces us, and which we must do our best to solve, is to do our utmost to send men overseas to beat back the invaders.

Sir, we know, and it is a matter of record, that, at the special session of Parliament held in 1914, regardless of political parties or affiliations, Parliament and people were unanimous in declaring that they were behind those men, to the last man and the last dollar, who first went forth to do battle for Canada in the allied armies. Those sons of Canada who have distinguished themselves as brave soldiers, in numerous battles—Courcelette, Vimy Ridge, and other scenes of carnage—were assured when they went to fight for Canada's cause that Canadians to a man would stand behind them; and those forty thousand brave sons of Canada who made the supreme sacrifice for their country, and are

now sleeping in Flanders fields, died with the conviction that their death would be avenged, because they were told when they left home that Canada was behind them to the last man and the last dollar. Our friends on the opposite side appear to question or to demur as to whether they should enter into the matter of supplying men or of doing what is necessary, or at least of doing so with enthusiasm and spontaneity, for they say: "The Government did not do this and that thing as it should have been done; the Government have made mistakes; therefore why should we show any enthusiasm in rallying to their support now?" Let us see: suppose we admit that the Government has made mistakes. Is there any Government that has not made mistakes? Has the British Government not made many mistakes in this war, as it has made in some other wars? The wonder to my mind is that Canada in this titanic undertaking has made so few mistakes. Canada had no knowledge, at least very little practical knowledge, of warfare. She knew little of recruiting men and making soldiers of them, or equipping and sending them to the scene of battle. She was engaged in peaceful pursuits, developing her great natural resources, when the war broke out. But, Sir, in face of all that, Canada did a marvellous thing when, within the space of a few weeks, she sent a flotilla of transports across the Atlantic carrying 33,000 trained Canadian soldiers who, but a few short weeks or months before, were all civilians. That is something for which Canada should get credit and of which she might well be proud. It is true that she has received encomiums. The United States, which had not then entered the war, that great nation, our last and greatest ally, of one hundred million people, say: We take off our hat, we bow to Canada for her extraordinary achievements in this war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McISAAC: Canada became a name to conjure with in Great Britain, in France, and on the continent of Europe in consideration of what she has done, and of what she is still doing, towards upholding her place, her dignity and her prestige in this struggle.

There is something else that Canada has done in consequence of the war which has brought her before the world in, I might say, an envious light. She has become a great financial country. Before the war, when Canada needed money, she went abroad to borrow it. But the time came when it was very difficult, indeed next to impossible, for Canada to obtain money from other countries. She then turned to her own people, and you know, Mr. Speaker, the record of the loans that have been placed in Canada, the generous, enthusiastic, and overwhelming response Canadians have made by pouring their money and treasure into the coffers of the country for the purpose of carrying on the war. In this respect Canada has established herself among the nations in an important light, of which a few brief years ago we scarcely had any conception. Having done so much, it is our duty to continue in well-doing. When the Minister of Finance comes down to Parliament and asks for almost a billion dollars, there is no murmuring; every one is satisfied that this money must and shall be raised, and that that portion of it which it is necessary to raise by borrowing, apart from taxation, can be furnished by our people when the loans are issued, as has been done before. In view of all these things, we have reason to be proud of our country, and it is our duty to continue to make sacrifices even greater than those we have so far been called upon to make. The one thing necessary is to win the war. For, Mr. Speaker, should we fail, should the Hun break through, what would be the good to us of our farms, or our money, or anything else we possess and cherish most dearly? The iron hoof of the invader's war horse would despoil our country; we would become serfs; civilization would be wiped from the face of our land, and freedom and constitutional liberty would be trampled under foot. God forbid that there should be any reason for believing that this will take place—but the possibility exists. Under these circumstances, Sir, is any sacrifice too great to be made by an honest, honourable and patriotic people? I have all along been convinced that a great many of us in Canada have not taken the war with sufficient seriousness. Look at the conditions across the Atlantic, in England, Scotland, France, Belgium. No able-bodied men are found there; farming operations are carried on by women, old men and young boys. Yet we murmur if we are subjected to some inconvenience; if we are not allowed to carry on our farming and our fishing operations just as we have been doing all along. The venerable member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) who addressed the House the other night, desires that the fishermen shall be allowed to carry on their business until the 1st of September, when they will be will-

ing to enlist. In order that such a course should be of benefit to Canada, the hon. gentleman should have a conference with the Kaiser and ask him to restrain his forces until that time. That is the way these extreme proposals present themselves to me. However, I am satisfied that the men will be procured and that not such great inconvenience will be suffered by the farmers and fishermen as hon. gentlemen are disposed to conjure up. In any event, the winning of the war is the one and only grand and paramount object which we ought to have constantly before us.

Having said so much about the immediate question involved in the motion before you, Sir, I may be permitted to discuss a question which peculiarly affects the province from which I come. I refer to communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Doubtless some of the older members of the House have often heard the complaint of members from Prince Edward Island; as a matter of fact, when the Island members made their statement regarding their disabilities in the matter of winter communication, the press used to say that it had been "Prince Edward Island day" in the House of Commons. Sir, I shall not inflict any wail or complaint upon you, but I wish to give a brief history of the winter navigation of the straits between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. To many members of the House the subject may not be of particular interest, but it is my duty to those whom I represent to raise my voice here with regard to the disabilities of Prince Edward Island, in the matter of railway facilities and winter communication.

It is a misfortune, perhaps, to live on an island. The people are necessarily shut off from other lands by water, and in northern latitudes, where the water congeals in winter, it is a serious problem to be on an island. We are isolated, and, if I may play upon the word, we are and have been ice-olated during the winter. But if we have been isolated, and if we have been ice-olated, I think it cannot be said that we are insulated; that we come here with insular ideas, or are not sufficiently broad-minded and magnanimous to meet the views of our friends from the other provinces. It is said that people born on an island sometimes have insular ideas, but I shall endeavour to show that I am not one of them, and that if there is anything like that in my make-up, it is something over which I have no control and for which I cannot properly be held responsible.

On account of our being in this isolated condition, the crossing of the straits of Northumberland during winter has been a very serious, difficult and hazardous undertaking. During all the days before Confederation, this was our condition. Some gentlemen here to-day may have gone through the experience of crossing the Straits in winter, the crossing being made in ice boats to which the passengers were, in a sense, harnessed with straps over their shoulders. They paid their fares and worked their passages, too. Of course, under these conditions passenger traffic between the Island and the mainland during the winter was not extensive; no one left during the winter season unless it was absolutely necessary for him to do so.

4 p.m.

The first meeting to bring about the confederation of the provinces was held in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, which may justly be called the cradle of Confederation. Curiously enough, when Confederation was consummated in 1867, Prince Edward Island did not join the union because she thought that the terms offered were not such as would meet her necessities, the crux of the difficulty being the winter navigation of the straits. In 1873, however, when she thought the matter had been so arranged that there would be no further difficulty, Prince Edward Island, under what is known as the "better terms," became a province of the Dominion. In order that we may have a fair understanding of one of the conditions which induced Prince Edward Island to become a member of the Confederation and which was cited in the bond, I quote these words from the Imperial Order in Council under which Prince Edward Island came into the Dominion of Canada:

> Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

That was the condition that the people of Prince Edward Island desired the most. Prince Edward Island became a member of the Dominion of Canada in 1873. About three and a half years later, the first attempt was made to implement the above promise by putting the steamer Northern Light on the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The Northern

Light, which was a fairly good ship with a wooden hull, commenced plying between Georgetown and Pictou on the 25th December, 1876. In that winter she managed to make thirty or thirty-five round trips between the island and the mainland, and for twelve years this was the only steamer, making anywhere from twenty-five to sixty round trips each winter. After the Northern Light had served for those twelve years, the Government of Canada supplied the steel steamer Stanley for service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The Stanley was a splendid ship, well proportioned in regard to size and power. She was not a large ship; the horsepower of her engines was not very great, but she did good service. To show what an excellent ship the Stanley has been, after thirty years' service she is at the present time doing service for the Government of Canada. Just recently she was commissioned to go to the Magdalen Islands to take the first relief to those people after the winter. She has, as a matter of fact, been there during the winter, and she has been going around in the ice relieving other ships that have become ice-bound. On the 3rd day of January, 1900, the steamship Minto, which came out from the old country in the previous autumn, was put into the service in conjunction with the Stanley. She was a more powerful steamer than the Stanley, but it is a matter of doubt whether or not she did very much better service than the Stanley. Those two boats were doing pretty fair service. The Minto continued in the service until 1915. Later on the Earl Grey, a splendid ship, was commissioned for the service, and she started in the winter of 1909. The Earl Grey, which was a large ship, had very powerful engines, but I have been told more than once—I am not positive as to this—that her hull was not strong enough for her engine-power, and as a result she was unable to give as good service as she would had her hull been able to stand the full power of the machinery.

At this stage, before I proceed any further about the steamers, I wish to say this: As I said in the beginning, I am not here to complain as to the service which was done during those years by these steamers to keep up communication with the mainland in the winter time. I am simply giving a brief history of the service, and I am willing to give thanks where thanks are due. I am willing that those who did the service should receive due consideration and thanks therefor. While the steamers were doing fairly well there was in the minds of the people of Prince Edward Island all through those years an idea that those steamers were not giving such service as they considered would be carrying out, practically and fairly, the terms of Confederation. There was always that idea of instability, of lack of finality, that this was not the best service that could be had, and that some other means should be taken to bring about a better service. There grew up an idea that a tunnel could be constructed under the straits of Northumberland, a distance of nine miles, and that by that means the people of Prince Edward Island would have no difficulty, during the winter, in keeping in constant communication with the mainland. The agitation for the tunnel went on for a number of years, and assumed very considerable proportions. That shows the people down there were not satisfied, and that some better means of communication must be provided before the terms on which Prince Edward Island entered Confederation could be regarded as having been satisfactorily carried out. At different times the leading statesmen of Canada have had occasion to visit Prince Edward Island, generally in the summer, but sometimes in the winter. These distinguished visitors who came in the winter time were subjected to all the hardships and inconvenience entailed in crossing the Strait of Northumberland by an iceboat. I might add that there was hardly a winter when the iceboats had not to be used for a month or two, as the steamers could not get through the ice. Very often the people would be without mail for several days, until the iceboats were brought into requisition. In 1891 the present leader of the Opposition in this House visited Prince Edward Island in the winter season, and I believe he was subjected to the hardship and inconvenience of crossing Northumberland Strait by an iceboat. The matter was brought to his attention at all events, and on his return he wrote a letter to the editor of the Charlottetown Guardian, dated February 19, 1891, as follows:

> Dear Sir: I have your favour of the 2nd of February. I hardly thought that an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the Island of Prince Edward with the mainland should be required. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and the necessities involved by the Island entering into confederation must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first thing to be done is to have an accurate

survey and estimates. I am only sorry that it was not done long ago.

Yours very truly,
Wilfrid Laurier.

So in 1891 he was strongly in favour of a tunnel if at all practicable. A few years afterwards the right hon. gentleman took the power reins in Canada. What representations were made to him thereafter regarding a tunnel I do not know, but I am informed, or misinformed, that he has never done anything towards building the tunnel except writing the letter I have just read. Let me tell what happened to those winter steamers. The largest of them all, the Earl Grey, was sold to the Russian Government in 1914, and in 1915 the Minto was also sold to that Government. There must be a tiny bit of regret in our souls when we reflect that these steamers, which have done such fine service in our part of the country, are now being used perhaps by the Bolsheviki or even by the Germans. I should like to read a despatch in a paper that has just been placed in my hands about the steamer Stanley. The ice seems to have a spite against the Stanley and never wants to let her get through. The despatch is as follows:

Halifax, N.S., May 2.—The Naval Department here has despatched a tug to the assistance of the Dominion Government steamer Stanley, before reported in distress at a point twenty-five miles off East Point, P.E.I., while en route from Louisburg, C.B., with mails for the Magdalen Islands. The first message from the Stanley stated that her rudder had been carried away. Last night the Marine and Fisheries Department had a wireless from her saying that temporary repairs had been made to the rudder, but that it was impossible for her to get through the ice floes.

I now turn to another phase of this question. In the year 1911 the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government visited Prince Edward Island. The question of winter communication between the Island and the mainland was brought before him and he made this statement (it may not be word for word, but it is substantially what he said):

I am willing to admit that in this beautiful and fertile province you have been labouring under serious handicaps ever since your entry into Confederation on account of your want of proper communication. I am so seriously impressed with this fact and the knowledge that although some serious attempts have been made to abate this condition, I may tell you that if elected to power I shall use every practical means either by tunnel, which has been much advocated, car ferry or some such mode best known to the scientists of to-day, to implement the terms of Confederation which thus far have been in abeyance.

This was the statement made in 1911. This was not a mere empty promise but it was a promise that had behind it earnestness, sincerity and the determination to fulfil it should the promiser be placed in a position where he would be able to do it. I want to tell you how that promise was carried out. A car ferry, the latest and greatest accomplishment of marine architecture and engineering, as far as icebreakers are concerned, was built for the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland and came to Canada in the summer of 1915. It was placed in commission between the Island and the mainland in the winter of 1916. It was not placed where it is now plying for the reason that there were no terminals where the steamer could have docked. It plied between Charlottetown or Georgetown and Pictou, performing good service. It did not give its ideal service plying between these ports because the car ferry is a steamer on which there are two lines of rails that can accommodate six cars each. The ferry is capable of carrying twelve Intercolonial railway freight cars across the strait of Northumberland every time it makes a trip.

The cost of the car ferry was $670,000. In addition to supplying the steamer, terminals were arranged for, one on the Prince Edward Island side which now, most appropriately, bears the name of Port Borden, and one on the New Brunswick side at Cape Tormentine. These terminals cost $2,205,000. The car ferry and the terminals at present in operation cost $2,875,000. That, Sir, is the way in which the right hon. Prime Minister carried out his promise to Prince Edward Island.

But, that is not all. In order that the car ferry may be effective, that it may do the work which it was intended to do, it is necessary that the narrow gauge Prince Edward Island railway shall be standardized and become of the same gauge as the Intercolonial railway on the mainland, so that cars taking their departure from any part of Prince Edward Island may go through without transfer of freight to all portions of North America. The intention was to broaden the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway, but, like many other projects of great importance contemplated by the Government, it became necessary, in consequence of the war, and the enormous expenditure involved in carrying it on, that the completion of this portion of the connection between Prince Edward Island and

the mainland should wait until times are better and money will be easier to obtain.

During the past winter, for the first time, the car ferry plied between Port Borden and Cape Tormentine, and the success that has attended its operations during a winter of unprecedented severity has revolutionized the ideas of the people of the island regarding their connection with the mainland. They now feel for the first time that they are a part of Canada, that they are not isolated as they had been in past years. Here is the proof. There was not a day during the winter that the car ferry could not cross in these heavy ice flows, and on some days it made two or three round trips. It is able to make the passage in fifty minutes under favourable circumstances, and at no time was it more than three hours in making the crossing. There was not a day upon which it might not have crossed, although there were a few days when it did not cross, because there were no trains on either side and consequently nothing to cross for.

What we desire now is to have the Prince Edward Island railway standardized. We would like to see this work commenced as soon as possible, but no one realizes more fully than the people of Prince Edward Island that this is not a time when we should ask for extra appropriations when so much of our money is required to carry on the war. The standardization of the Prince Edward Island railway could be regarded in the light of a war measure. Prince Edward Island is an agricultural province, and it is extremely productive—in fact, we have really no idea of the extent of its productivity—but if facilities are afforded for the transportation of the island's products it is capable of increasing its agricultural production at least a hundredfold. If that be true, Sir, and if we can contribute that much more towards feeding the soldiers than we are now doing, would it not be sufficient ground for the Government undertaking the work of standardization without much delay? It is for the Government to say when that work shall begin, but the people of the island would like to see it started forthwith. If that were done the output of Prince Edward Island's products would be augmented to such an extent that it would be by no means a losing speculation for the Government.

Let me give further reasons why, in our opinion, it would be wise for the Government to undertake this work now. The operation of the narrow gauge car at present used costs about as much as the operation of the great car used on the Intercolonial railway, so that the improvement suggested would effect a saving there. Economies could also be brought about by a change in the system of handling produce. At present all freight shipped from Prince Edward Island goes to Port Borden, where it is transferred from narrow gauge to broad gauge cars, and then the cars are run on to the ferry and carried to the mainland. The cost of transferring freight in this way is from four to five thousand dollars a month. Now, taking the annual cost as $50,000 or $60,000, that amount capitalized would be equal to about $1,000,000, or, in other words, it would represent about one-half the cost of standardizing the road, as far as I am able to learn, in order to handle the increased volume of freight. Last year, owing to want of transportation, there were two million bushels of potatoes that could not be carried away from Prince Edward Island. More than that, the numerous steamships carrying freight from the island to other points—for example, to Newfoundland, Montreal, Boston and Halifax—have all, or nearly all, been eliminated owing to the abnormal conditions brought about by the war. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, almost any kind of vessel that is available is quickly picked up now for war transportation purposes, with the result that Prince Edward Island shipments are confined to the one route via Port Borden.

Another point arises in connection with the shipment of coal. In our province there are no coal mines, and coal has to be imported from Nova Scotia and other places. The volume of coal requiring to be transported by the car ferry, in addition to all the other products to which I have referred, represents something like forty thousand tons. There is this further point to be borne in mind: It is expected that Prince Edward Island, as a result of the campaign in favour of increased production, will this year have seeded some seventy-five thousand acres more. The product of that area, representing probably fifty-six thousand tons, will also need to be transported. All this great volume of freight, representing a total of something like 247,846 tons—calculating from the figures of last year's exports and taking into consideration the freight that was held up and could not be forwarded—will have to go by the car ferry during the present year. The present export facilities will therefore not be adequate, and when they involve a transfer it means delay and an increased outlay of money.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, I am not wearying the House, but even at the risk of doing so, I must present the case for my province. I am talking on behalf of those who sent me here and who expect me to do my duty, and it is in the humble endeavour to discharge that duty that I am making my plea to the House this afternoon.

In addition to the expenditures to which I have already referred it will cost, to begin with, probably four or five hundred thousand dollars to put the narrow-gauge railway as it now exists, into a condition for handling business this summer. Again, there is the further expense of transferring the freight, and handling the additional freight that will need transportation. These figures will indicate to you the extraordinary disadvantage from which Prince Edward Island is suffering at the present time; and in my opinion the improvements desired with the elimination of these extra costs would not involve such a large grant from the Federal exchequer as it would if none of these subsidiary conditions prevailed.

There are other items that might be introduced to swell present expenses. There are, for example, the claims against the Government which may be brought any day arising out of the loss of potatoes and other perishable goods owing to the failure of the narrow-gauge railway to move them from the Island. Adding all the items together, I estimate $936,409 as the amount which the Government stands called upon to pay under present conditions.

There are other reasons why the people of Prince Edward should have the railway gauge broadened and its standardization commenced. They are reasons which will be beneficial to the Dominion, and to Prince Edward Island especially. During the past winter, it cost $67,000 to fight the snowstorms blocking the road, which had to be shovelled out. Every one acquainted with railways will understand that with a broad gauge and more powerful engines the snow blockade could be better handled and its inconvenience reduced to a minimum at a much smaller cost.

There is the movement of certain perishable products also to be considered. In addition to being a great agricultural province, the richest and most abundant fisheries abound on our coast. The fresh fish industry would secure the best results from the quickest possible transportation to the markets on the mainland. If the beautiful fish that we catch on the coast of Prince Edward Island could be shipped from there in the morning and brought into Montreal, for instance, the next morning, fresh from the sea, would that not be something worth working for? Prince Edward Island would benefit by it, and certainly other parts of Canada would not lose by it. There are other perishable products which should get to the markets in the shortest possible time and in the best possible condition. We have no hope that this ever can be done until we have the gauge standardized. Standardization will come some time; we have got so far ahead now, and the conditions that I have laid down seem to me to be of sufficient force to be some inducement to the Government to take up the work at as early a date as possible. Altogether, apart from the sentimental question, there is no longer any doubt in Prince Edward Island about the feasibility of practical daily communication, winter and summer, between the island and the mainland. The problem involved in the winter navigation of the straits is solved, and we feel that, at least, we have taken the first and greatest stride forward towards being really part of Canada. We no longer feel ourselves isolated. We only wish the completing of the railroad standardization to make our railroad situation as that of any other part of Canada, and to enable us to ship our products from any part of the Island to any part of North America without breaking bulk, and that any passenger boarding a train on the Island will not be obliged to leave his car until he reaches his destination. These are reasons which appeal to us, and I wish I was sufficiently persuasive to convince the Government that now is the time to standardize the Prince Edward Island railway. If I could convince them, I feel sure that within a short time the work would be commenced.

I do not know that I shall trespass upon your patience any further, Mr. Speaker, unless to thank you very sincerely for the generous hearing that has been accorded to me, upon these matters so dear to the hearts of the people of Prince Edward Island, the first time that I have risen in Parliament to address you.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) who has just taken his seat will pardon me if I do not follow him very much in the speech which he has just made. If I had any criticism to make of his speech, it would be that he was lacking, like some of us, in terminal facilities, in knowing where to stop. The

great difficulty of the hon. member was where to begin. He began away too far back; if he had begun at the end of the railroad, as he should have begun, he would have been through with his business long ago. But, of course, when the hon. gentleman makes his next speech he will know better where to begin, and he will be shorter and more to the point. He will learn, of course, that if he desires to tell us that the sun is in the heavens, that the sea has its boundaries, and that they will not trespass them; that there is light and darkness—he can tell us these things without going back to Genesis and saying that the Lord created the heavens and the earth in a certain set number of days. Some of these things could have been taken for granted, and it would have shortened his time a good deal. However, there is great latitude to be given to men who speak for the first time in the House of Commons, and I rather congratulate my good friend on the way in which he presented his case.

Before I forget it, there is something else in connection with his speech which seems to be coming to us from that side of the House a great many times and from a great many members. It is this somewhat secretive agreement that was entered into some months ago evidently when the Union Government was formed. It was first mentioned in this House some three or four weeks ago by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who made the open statement that there was such an agreement. There was no denial of it, except that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) was in his seat and I noticed that he ominously shook his head, which I took to be a disagreement with the hon. member's statement. However, the country had the advantage of hearing the statement of the hon. member for Brantford, but they did not see the Minister of Agriculture shake his head. So the statement of the hon. member goes uncontradicted. Last night we heard a revival of that statement by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) who told us again that there is such an agreement, and from his remarks we would gather that he is a party to it himself. To-day, the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaac), has once more stated that there is such an agreement. There are people in this country who would regard an agreement of that kind as unconstitutional and unparliamentary.

In dealing with public questions, representatives of the people in this House are supposed to be free agents, to be governed by the facts put before them, and it is at variance with the principles of proper representation that members should come into the House like sheep going to market, their legs tied and their heads in a bag, and do exactly what they are told. If they venture for a moment to differ from the course laid down for them, this agreement is pointed out to them. Some day an hon. gentleman on this side may move that this agreement be brought down—for, of course, we have every reason to believe that it is actually in existence. It will be interesting to learn when it was made and who are the parties to it.

I realize that any criticism we make of the Budget and of the Government should be sane, serious and well-founded, and that nothing be said that savours of a desire to impede the progress of the Government in the steps which it is taking to deal with the serious question now confronting the country. I think I may safely say that no criticism of an unfair kind has been made from this side of the House. I congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance upon the mechanical part of his speech—as to its style, construction and delivery—and, so far as it is consistent with the position I take, I congratulate him also upon his success in presenting to the House a very difficult and a very bad case. The hon. gentleman has disappointed some of his friends outside of the House by the ability he has shown in dealing with this very important matter. The Journal-Press, the special organ of the Prime Minister in this city, has, of course, a monopoly of the brains of this country and of the foresight and thought of the city of Ottawa. It is said that the editor of that great journal is in close touch with the Prime Minister, by whom he is guided in the more intricate and difficult questions with which he has to deal. Picking up this newspaper two or three weeks ago, I noticed that in an outburst of wisdom the Journal-Press had declared that surely the Prime Minister would not entrust such a very serious task as the delivery of the Budget speech to the incapable hands of the member for Halifax. For the sake of Nova Scotia and of auld lang syne, I am glad that the Acting Finance Minister has acquitted himself in such a way as to demand that the Journal-Press apologize and take back its gratuitous opinion of his capacity. We assure the hon. gentleman that whatever his friends over there may think of him, we on this side

5 p.m.

still have a lingering regard for him and hold a good opinion of his ability to deal with such important matters as have been dealt with in the Budget. Of course, in the minds of evilly-disposed persons there is a doubt as to the paternity of this speech. It is said that the speech was born in the United States of Canadian parents; that the hurried visit of the Prime Minister to New York recently was for the purpose of smuggling this infant into Canada and handing it over to the hon. gentleman who has presented it for christening to the House. Personally, I do not believe that. In any case, I give the Minister of Finance credit at least for not having written that part of it which refers to his own excellence and to all the wonderful things that he has accomplished.

Having said that much about the style and character of the Budget speech, a conscientious and God-fearing man like myself cannot say anything further in praise of it. The ridiculous suggestion is made that we have a surplus. That fallacy, that heresy, has been running through the speeches of the Minister of Finance ever since the war broke out. We always had a surplus in one part of the account and a deficit of some millions in another. The Acting Minister of Finance should not have been induced to incorporate in the Budget speech the statement that we had a surplus. To say that we had a surplus on ordinary expenditure might be tolerated. If since the war began we had continued the same revenue, the same taxation, the same sources of income that we had when the war broke out; if we had dealt only with ordinary expenditures and had something to the good, we might reasonably and with a fair degree of consistency say that we had a surplus on ordinary expenditure. But such is not the case. Immediately on the outbreak of war we levied war taxes. We levied business taxes, and we are getting money from stamps and from many other things which the minister mentioned in his Budget Speech. From the Business Profits War Tax the minister told us we are getting $21,271,283; from banks, $836,-724.28; from insurance companies, $385,-127.68; from trust and loan companies, $267,917.68; from inland revenue from railways, steamships, telegraph and cable companies, stamps, etc., $2,229,922.81; making a total, according to the speech of the minister, of $24,990,975.45. Besides those taxes which the minister has specified, there was the flat 7½ per cent extra duty which was placed upon the whole trade of every kind and description of the country. Possibly the minister could not tell us exactly what that amounts to, but it would probably amount to somewhere around $25,000,000. I am only guessing at the amount. At all events we have a specific tax of something like $50,000,000 or more, which we have collected from the people of this country as a special war tax. The minister has taken that $50,000,000 of special war tax, and he has applied it, with the rest of the revenue, to the ordinary business of the country, and then when he adds it all up, he does not put one cent of it to the credit of the war until he finds a surplus, and then he says: We have a surplus. It is perfectly clear to the most ordinary person that this is not a fair nor an honest way of stating the account. When we have gone after the people for special taxes for war purposes, they should be credited to the war, and if you are going to deal with special accounts, they should be kept evenly balanced, having the one fairly meet the demands of the other. When the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in the past told us that we had surpluses, and when the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to-day tells us that we have a surplus of $55,000,000, they are absolutely stating a case which is not fair, and which is not, so to speak, putting their cards on the table, and showing the people of this country exactly how the account stands. That is not dealing with us fairly, and we should have the account presented and stated just as it is, so as to let the Canadian people know exactly what they have to deal with. We, as representatives of the Canadian people, are willing to put everything we have into the pot in connection with war conditions, but on the other hand we have a perfect right, and it is the inalienable right of every taxpayer of this country, to know where every dollar goes and what is done with the moneys of the people. In the early stages of the war I remember well the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) making one of his eloquent speeches in this House, telling us that he, as a member of the Government, would begrudge the mis-spending of the moneys of the people for anything other than the purposes of the war. At that time, we expected that those words meant something, and that great care would be exercised in the expenditure of the moneys of the people in accordance with the true reason for which those extraordinary taxes were being collected. We are given part of the account, but we are not given all. It does not follow that, because our very hearts are set upon war

duties, and because every nerve is strained to do our full duty in the war, we must be lax about other phases of our duty as representatives of the people, nor that the people of this country can be lax about the other branches of their business. If there ever was a time when proper care should be taken to safeguard every influence and opportunity for good and for the accumulation of wealth in this country, that time is the present. No advantage should be taken of the temper of the people and their feelings about expenditures, because in this time of war the people may not be as critical about expenditure as they otherwise would be. The closest attention should be given to expenditures, and we should know where every dollar goes.

This year there is a new departure in connection with some of the Estimates, and large amounts of money, that must come from the pockets of the people of this country for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the country, are not being put into the Estimates at all in accordance with the old conditions. That is not right; that is not proper. If I should criticise the Government along those lines, I do so in accordance with my right as a representative of the people in this House. What is the good of sending men to this House unless they have a free hand and an open voice to place before you, Sir, and this country, what they regard as proper criticism and direction of the Government who, after all, are but directors of the big concern of the people of Canada to carry on, in the best way, what they regard the will of the people to be? That is the position, and that is the way in which the business of the House should be conducted. I complain, I find fault with and I criticise the Government, and I bring that criticism as squarely as I can before the people, that the Government have no business to endeavour to get money in the thousands of dollars, much less in the millions, and possibly the hundreds of millions, without putting that expenditure before the House and having the members pass it with the ordinary conditions attached to it as to how it shall be spent. That has not been done with the millions of dollars which we shall require for the purchasing of rolling stock and the operation of Government railways in this country. Why has that not been done? Is it because the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), or the Government has no confidence in the people? Is it because they are afraid that hon. gentlemen in this House are not big enough and broad enough and have not business ability enough to give them the money if it is properly required? And, are they afraid that we shall not place sufficient confidence in them to allow them to spend this money in the good old way? At all events we are, I am told, to pass an Act of Parliament by which we shall have nothing to say as to how this money is to be spent. That should not occur, and free agents in this House, whether they sit on the Government side or this side, should have something to say in the matter. We in this country are to-day in a condition when the people will not stand for monopoly of that kind, whether that monopoly is exercised by the Government under Orders in Council, or by concerns who have with the Government a pull which they should not have and which will perhaps induce and compel the Government to do things which they otherwise would not do. I submit that the temper of the Canadian people will not stand for that, and possibly we have stood too long for imposition of that kind. As far as expenditure of railway money is concerned, it is not in the Estimates at all, and if my hon. friend took the moneys he will require out of this $55,000,000 alleged surplus, the whole amount would be wiped out and there would not be even a shadow of a surplus left. In order to show a surplus, he leaves this expenditure out of sight altogether; but he deceives nobody.

We had a lecturing address from the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) last night, and I have not been able to tell exactly on which side he is. He reminded me of the fellow who was perhaps a little under the weather and who asked, when out walking, "Which is the other side of the street?" A man told him "There is the other side of the street over there." The man went over, and when he got across asked another man, "Is this the other side of the street?" "No," said the man, "the other side of the street is over there." "Well," said he, "that man over there told me this was the other side of the street." The hon. member for Springfield, I think, is somewhat in that position; it is difficult for him to find which is the other side of the street. However, he wanted to criticise us and criticise the leader of the Opposition. Of course he had to criticise the railway policy of the present Administration; had a right to do that, and a very excellent field for criticism. I will not weary the House by going very far into these railway criticisms, but somewhat in answer to the

hon. member for Springfield, I must remind him that he has been in public life for a great many years. I have not the honour of his acquaintance, but I know he has been in this House before. He knows the history of the railway policies of the different parties in this country; how in 1903 the policy of my distinguished leader, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was launched in this country for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and launched in no hole-in-the-corner way, but in the most open manner possible. Before a sod was turned or a dollar expended on that magnificent enterprise the people of this country were appealed to, and their verdict was given on the Government's policy in connection with that great enterprise. It is well known that in 1904 the battle royal from the Atlantic to the Pacific was between the railway policy of the then leader of the Opposition, now the Premier of this country, and the railway policy of the Laurier Government, and the verdict of the people was overwhelmingly in favour of my right hon. leader. Whatever else there may have been a division on there was practically not a dissenting voice on that policy from coast to coast. So that, as far as the railway policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is concerned and the course his Government took in connection with the railways of this country, he had the full sanction and approval of the people of this country. Again in 1908, after four years' work on the road, the people of Canada had the opportunity of passing judgment upon the railway policy of my right hon. leader again, and he was triumphantly returned to power. So satisfied were the people of Canada with his railway policy that during the campaign of 1908 the leader of the Opposition had really nothing to say about the railways at all. It was accepted by both parties that the proper course had been taken for the opening and development of this great country, of which we are all so proud and whose resources are so immense; it was this policy alone, within proper bounds, that was necessary to full discharge of the duty of any Government that might have been in power at the time. The difficulty is that new men have taken the wheel and are trying to work out the destinies of this country. Conditions which were all right in the hands of a master like the Premier of that day have become burdensome and too heavy to carry in the hands of people who do not understand the art of government as he did when he had control of the affairs of this country. The rod of empire has fallen into hands which are not capable of wielding it in his masterful way, and the mole has become a mountain and the grasshopper a load. The new men are unable to carry these matters along, and the result is that the financial conditions in connection with the railways are such that the Government of the day, if I am to judge from their actions, will not dare to bring before the House the real state of affairs in connection with railway matters. I would remind the hon. member for Springfield and the members generally who are supporting the Government that shortly after the Borden Government came into power in 1911 the Minister of Finance made his first speech in February of the following year. He was then, of course, fresh from his financing, fresh from the critical training which he had had as a financier, and anxious to discover any weak spots that could be found in the financial conditions of the country. There was a good deal of criticism then by newspapers supporting the Government of the railways the Government had on their hands at that time. If conditions were very bad, if there was anything that was dangerous to the finances of this country, or that might have a bad effect on the credit of this country I am sure the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) could very well have been entrusted with bringing that difficulty and weakness to the notice of Parliament and the country. Any person who wishes to see what he stated on that occasion can look up his speech. Of the financing of the country generally he spoke in glowing terms; he was delighted to find the country in such a prosperous condition, and glad that after every obligation had been properly met by the outgoing Government, that Government was able to hand over to him the sum of $40,000,000 to meet any fresh obligations that might arise; you will find that in his speech. He also said that while there was some criticism in connection with Grand Trunk Pacific, he was glad to be able to say that instead of that road being a burden or a debt on this country, it was a magnificent asset to the Canadian people.

That is the position as far as railway matters in this country were concerned at the time the Government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), whom I am pleased to follow, passed over the reins of power to hon. gentlemen opposite. If there is anything wrong, if things are not what they were at the time they took charge, it is their lookout. It is for them to see that

better, and more capable men are put in charge of the management, if necessary, and that the affairs of the country shall be looked after in a more efficient way in the future.

My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. McIsaac), touched on local matters in his own province and if I very briefly touch upon a local matter in my own province, I am sure, that you, Mr. Speaker, will pardon me. I fully realize that the minds of the Canadian people are now directed to the one great purpose of winning this war and maintaining the standing of our country. Nevertheless, we have only the one Parliament to deal with the war and with other matters as well. Consequently, when members are speaking in this House, they may be excused if once in a while they digress a little or talk along other lines.

It is conceded, Mr. Speaker, that the production of food, and an abundance of supplies produced in this country for the support of our armies, is of equal importance to the furnishing of men at the front. Of course, the supplying of wheat, fish, and the other necessaries of life, has not the romantic appeal that there is in the boys' donning khaki and going to the front. There is not the same aspiration, the same pride about it, but at the same time, we must keep our feet on the ground all the time and realize that if the boy with the khaki and the gun and the yeoman's spirit that took him to the front is to do credit to himself, and if he is to withstand the hardships that are facing him, he must be looked after, cared for and well fed. Wheat, pork, potatoes, do not grow on the tree tops but they must be produced by the industry of the men and women on whom that responsibility falls. There must be conditions kept up in this country that will give our people an opportunity to provide these things which are so essential to our success in the war.

While touching on the questions of railways, I want to very briefly bring to the notice of the Government that in the province of Nova Scotia we have the most magnificent fishing grounds in any part of the world. I do not know very much about the fishing grounds of New Brunswick but I believe that from the State of Maine, along the coasts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and clear down to Labrador, particularly the Nova Scotia part of it, we have magnificent grounds. There is no food that you can put before any human being better than the fish that is obtainable off our coasts. Our people, in catching that fish and placing it upon the market, are handicapped, not as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. McIsaac) said the people of that province were by a narrow gauge railway. The difficulty is no railway at all. We have three hundred or four hundred miles of coast in Cape Breton, the most magnificent fishing territory anywhere to be found, where they have no railways and no proper facilities for getting this splendid food product for the market. I wish to say to the Government that, whether as a war measure or as a matter of business, they could not do anything better for the Canadian people than to open up these territories and put these magnificent fishing grounds in touch with the outside world so that every man and woman in Canada, at least from Manitoba east to the coast, would be able to get a cheap and abundant supply of fish. Without facilities it is impossible to do it.

While upon the railway question, I wish to touch upon the necessities of my own constituency of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and to speak for the other parts of the island as well. All around Cape Breton South, Richmond and Inverness there are the same magnificent fisheries, the same opportunities, and the same necessity for railway transportation. I hope the day is not far distant when the Government will implement the resolution accepted from me by the Borden Government in which it was stated that the time had arrived that we ought to build railways, or extend the Intercolonial, into all the non-railway counties of Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces generally. That resolution was accepted in this House two or three years ago but I am sorry that it has not been implemented in any way. Since the Government has accepted the proposition I have not bothered them with any further resolution. But it is a matter of record in this House and I trust that the condition which existed under the Laurier Administration will be restored before very long and that the moneys which were voted under the Laurier Administration will be put to use in order to bring about this much needed advancement and improvement in that part of the old province of Nova Scotia.

I appeal to hon. members from other parts of Canada for their support in this matter. We are spending money gladly in opening up avenues to the wheat fields of the West. That is a proper thing to do because the farmers of the West cannot cultivate the land and produce crops without railway connection. If that is proper

and necessary, is it not good business for the western men and the Ontario men to see to it that proper facilities are provided in other parts so that they may get the other foods which are necessary for use with what they produce upon the farm? There is a broad, national principle underlying what we are asking for. I am sure that I am not asking for anything that is not in accordance with those national ideas and broad principles which should actuate all when dealing with matters of this kind.

The hon. the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), told us the other day something about the Victory Loan. I am proud to know that the Victory Loan was such a success. The success of the Victory Loan proves to us what can be done with proper organization and the application of business methods. The machinery for carrying out the Victory Loan was well and properly organized; consequently, it was a success from the point of view of getting the money. But I wish to tell the Acting Minister of Finance and the Government that they cannot take to themselves very much credit for this money being in the country. If there is wealth in Canada, if the Canadian people are well off and generally have bank accounts, it is not by reason of any measures or any policy adopted by the present Government, or by the administration that came into power in 1911. The wealth of this country, the wealth that is in the possession of the people was accumulated during the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and its acquisition was made possible during the fifteen years that administration was in office. History is repeating itself. We have somewhat of a reversal of conditions as they prevailed in the days of the early Egyptians; in Egypt the fat years came first, and the lean years afterwards. Or perhaps it is not a reversal after all, for the fifteen years during which that distinguished statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was in power were years of plenty, were years of clean, honest and progressive administration, so that the people of Canada had an opportunity of accumulating wealth and having that wealth when called upon by the Government for Victory Loans, they answered the call. I want hon. gentlemen opposite, when they felicitate themselves upon having obtained this money, not to forget where it came from, or who created the conditions in Canada that enabled the people to save that money.

There is another application I wish to make of the success of the organization in connection with the raising of the Victory Loan. I submit, Sir, that if the same organization, the same energy and the same lack of selfishness in arousing this country and developing a sentiment for voluntary military service had prevailed in connection with our efforts at recruiting, we would not have had the difficulties here that have been experienced, but we could have secured by voluntary and willing effort all the men we desired. The difficulty was —and I am not going to dwell very much upon the subject—that from the beginning of the war our friends on the other side of the House, and particularly the Government of that day, were simply running the machinery along party lines on the war question to the same extent as they did in connection with anything else which they handled. There was party advantage, they felt, to be gained by the exclusion of certain sections of this country, and by not giving the people of those sections the opportunity of participating in the war as other parts of the country were participating, and contributing their wealth and their men. I have not as yet heard read in the House a letter which was sent by my hon. leader to the Prime Minister very shortly after the opening of the war, and, in view of the assertion that the leader of the Opposition did not do as much for the war as he should have done, I deem it necessary, for the information of the new members more especially, to read that letter. Early in the history of the war Sir Wilfrid Laurier wrote in these terms to the Prime Minister:

> Dear Sir Robert Borden,
>
> There is every probability that the war will be of long duration, and I understand that the Government is already contemplating the organization of a second contingent.
>
> May I suggest that as our population is composed of various ethnical elements, it may be well to recognize the fact, and to allow the formation of these units out of those several elements. The War Office—

That is the War Office in London.

> —at all times has taken advantage of the force of race sentiments in the formation of the army. At all times it has recruited purely Scotch regiments, as well as purely Irish regiments, and we understand that Lord Kitchener has just authorized recruiting an exclusively Welsh force.
>
> The aim I have in view is in reference to the formation of a French-Canadian regiment. You are probably aware that a movement is on foot in Montreal and Quebec for the purpose of raising such a regiment. There is every reason to believe that if the formation of a French-Canadian unit were authorized there would be a generous response.
>
> I offer these observations with the sole object of helping in the cause which we have all so

much at heart. If you think well of my suggestion I will be happy to assist in any way that may be deemed advisable, and I will hold myself ready to meet at your convenience for a mutual exchange of views, both as to the object itself and the best means of attainment.

Yours sincerely,

Wilfrid Laurier.

That offer was submitted to the Prime Minister in the early stages of the war. Why was not advantage taken of it? Was anything done by the Prime Minister to implement that offer? I am sorry to say nothing at all. The manner in which attempts were made to organize recruiting in Quebec has already been discussed several times, and the subject is not new, and what occurred is well known. If it was the intention of the Government to create dissension in Quebec and make recruiting a failure—and it was said that such was their intention—they could not have gone about it in a better way than they did. In most of the Canadian provinces our young men speak the English language, and they suffer no disadvantage from being trained by English instructors. But it is otherwise in the province of Quebec, where in large sections the population speak French exclusively. Not only the old people but the young folks use French entirely, and when it was a case of obtaining recruits it was but natural to look for instructors who could make plain to these young men the requirements of the drill in their own tongue. Had there been a proper organization in connection with recruiting in the province of Quebec, men who could speak the French language, and who were in sympathy with the French people and understood their ways and their peculiarities, would have been placed at the head of that recruiting and in charge of the training of French Canadians.

What has happened? You would say at once: Surely they did that. Nothing of the kind. They sent men there to do recruiting, at least for the first two or three years, who did not know a word of French, and who were not of the same religion as those to whom they were sent. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we get closer to men who are of our own language and religion than we do to those who are not. I do not say that in a sectional way, or as finding fault with any man's language or religion; but these things are natural to us. As far as Quebec is concerned, men were sent there who were not in sympathy with the people on one or other of these very important phases of character, and the result was an absolute and a huge failure in recruiting. That failure has been taken hold of by some men who wanted to start a sectarian fire in politics and use it to win the election. I submit that if we had been playing politics and sectarianism with the Victory Loan the same result and the same failure would have followed that followed in Quebec recruiting when elements were introduced that were calculated to produce failure. I make these explanations on these statements to show that the Government of this country who were in charge of the war did not always have the singleness of mind and heart which they wish other people to have to-day, and that they always and at all times had something else in view different to the winning of the war. There was no stage of the proceedings when they did not have the primary idea of politics and the winning of the election which was really a very heavy factor in whatever course they took in connection with these matters.

Having said that much on this question, I propose to give a little attention to some matters which came before the House, particularly last night, regarding the political situation and the policy of the different parties so far as the trade of this country is concerned. Let me assure you, Sir, that I do not propose to go very lengthily into these things, or to take up too much time. But it is well that we should always, whether we are Liberals or Conservatives, have a proper understanding of the faith and doctrine of our party and the principles for which we stand. If we lose that, if we have not the proper chart and compass upon what we stand for, and what we believe our party to stand for, we lose the full force and effect of the service which a party is supposed to render in the Government of a country. For, after all, partyism is an institution in this country; we have two parties, Liberals and Conservatives, and whether the Government is good or bad, whether the system is good or bad, it is still the system, and I must submit as my own opinion that, so far, it is the best system of governing that we have yet found. If we are going to have clean administration and proper checks one on the other, we must have a Government party and an Opposition party, and I wish to remind hon. gentlemen of the fact that in any province in this, or any, country, where there is an admixture of parties, and a forgetting of the responsibilities, rights and privileges of parties, there has been corruption and a falling off in proper

administration, much to the loss of the people. For that reason, if we are to recognize party government, we should have the best possible party government, and each party should take pride in its doctrines, ideas and traditions. Belonging, as I do, to the Liberal party, I am proud of its traditions and history, and I wish to keep it as much as possible unsullied from anything that might tarnish it, or stain the names of the great men who have been in the past and are to-day its leaders, or which would interfere in any way with the doctrines which we have always espoused as a party. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) last night endeavoured to mix things up and to lead the House and the country to understand that the Liberal party was not true to its principles and to its professions as set forth in the platform of 1893, three years before the Liberal party took over the Government of this country in 1896.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (resuming): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was approaching the subject of the 1893 platform of the Liberal party with a view to dealing with it in the light of the observations made yesterday by the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). The hon. gentleman wished the House to believe that the Liberal party went to the country in 1896 under false pretences and obtained power on a policy which they did not carry out when they were entrusted by the people with the government of the country. I propose to show, Sir, that the Liberal party in every way carried out the platform laid down at that time. The member for Springfield said last night that the present leader of the Opposition stated in 1893 and at other times that if the Liberal party were put in power we would have free trade in Canada as they had it in England. It is not true to ascribe to the right hon. gentleman any such statement; it is misleading to say that the platform of the Liberal party at that time contained such a plank, which was not afterwards lived up to. Nothing more clearly shows that the policy of the Liberal party was not the old National Policy than the attitude of the Conservative leaders towards the Liberal party when that policy was put in force. If any man in Canadian public life could recognize the National Policy, it was Sir Charles Tupper. He professed to be the author of that policy, to have cradled it in its infancy, to have brought it into full development and fruition. Of whatever glory came to the Conservative party by reason of the National Policy, Sir Charles Tupper was always willing to take ninety-nine and one-half per cent. When he made his first speech as leader of the Opposition in 1896, having become familiar with the policy of the Laurier Government, he declared that he had heard in the highways and byways as he went along the streets the sorrowful wail of the great industries from ocean to ocean that had been wrecked and smashed and sent to ruin by the policy of the Liberal party. That was the view Sir Charles Tupper took of the policy of the Laurier Government. If the Fielding tariff and the Laurier administration and policy were the same as the old National Policy, why was it necesssary for Mr. Borden, now Sir Robert Borden, who was leading the Opposition in 1903, to move the following resolution:

> That this House, regarding the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy for such adequate protection of its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian markets for Canadians.

This was some years after the adoption of the tariff under the administration of Laurier, and if it had been the same old tariff I am sure that the then leader of the Opposition would not have found fault with it; would not have criticised it in this way; would not have said that a policy of adequate protection should be adopted.

Three or four years, if not more, after the Laurier administration came into power and the platform of the Liberal party had been carried forward as the policy of the Government, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), speaking, I think, in Toronto with regard to the sufficiency of the protection under the Laurier administration—his remarks are reported in the Mail and Empire—said:

> So long as we import into this country $1,500,000 of agricultural implements in less than a year, every one of which might be made by the artisans and labourers of this country and import that amount from the United States, a market from which our products are shut out by an almost prohibitive tariff; so long as our binder twine is largely made for us in that country; so long as $11,000,000 manufactured iron and steel are brought in from the United States whilst in Canada the great natural vaults are bursting with iron and coal, Canadian brawn and intelligence is chafing to unlock them and set these riches and resources loose; so long as our pulp and

paper resources are sacrificed in another market and we import millions of dollars' worth of their manufactured products; so long as the lead smelters of the United States grow rich whilst they put one and a half per cent duty upon lead in ore and 2 1-8 per cent upon lead in bullion; so long as those things are unredressed, there is reason for the existence of the Liberal-Conservative party.

That is the view which Sir George Foster, Sir Robert Borden and Sir Charles Tupper took of the difference between the policy of the Liberal party and the policy which they advocated when they were in power, their policy being better known and understood as the National Policy. It is only fair to the House and to the Liberal party at this stage of our history that I should again remind the House of what the policy of the Liberal party was in 1893. These are the ten planks of the famous platform of the Convention of 1893:

1. That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service; that the highest interest of Canada demands a removal of this obstruction to our country's progress by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade and hasten the return of prosperity to our people; that to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient Government; that it should be so adjusted as to make free or bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote free trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

2. That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtain a fair and liberal reciprocity, including a well considered list of manufactured articles.

3. That the Convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys.

4. That we cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the control of the annual expenditures of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the public, under the Governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the Government of the country.

5. That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure and into all charges of misconduct in office against ministers of the Crown.

6. That in the opinion of this Convention the sale of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only and not to speculators upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

7. The repeal of the Franchise Act, that we should revert to the provincial franchises.

8. To make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that the conformation of the electoral division, county boundaries, should be observed, so that in no case no parts of different counties could be put in one electoral division.

As regards the ninth plank, I am not sure that these are the exact words, but this is the substance of it:

9. That the policy in regard to appointments to the Senate of Canada should be revised and brought forward in conformity to certain public opinion.

10. That, whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

In moving that resolution, the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made the following observations, which form a small section of the speech that he delivered to the Convention on that occasion:

I say the policy should be a policy of free trade such as they have in England—

That is, he says, it should be.

—That, I am sorry to say that the circumstances of the country cannot admit at present of that policy in its entirety, but I speak to you from this day forward that it should be the goal to which we aspire. I propose to you from this day forward, although we cannot adopt the policy itself, to adopt the principle which regulates it; that is to say, that though it should be your misfortune for many years to come to have to raise the revenue by customs duties, those duties should be levied only so far as is necessary to carry on the business of the Government. Nothing is more difficult—that is one of the evils of protection—than to wipe away protection because under it interests have been established, which every man who has at heart the interest of all classes must take into consideration. It is always easy to increase the tariff because by doing so you increase the private fortunes of certain individuals, but whenever you decrease the tariff it has always to be done with careful consideration, and I am sure that when the Liberals are in power they will not be in different to this primary truth.

I have quoted the particular part of the speech which dealt with the character of that policy. It was clearly laid down at the time that, although the goal of the Liberal party was to be free trade, it could not be accomplished at one bound, but that the Liberal party hoped to go forward from step to step and to adopt freer and freer trade from time to time as that could be accomplished without any deterrent to or interference with vested interests in this country. I need not tell hon. members, who are familiar with the progress of the country the rapid strides that were made under the administration of the right hon. gentleman and how this country

prospered under that policy and under the management of it by himself and the wise men whom he gathered around him to compose his government. It is unnecessary to point out how, under his administration and under his policy, population rapidly flowed into this country.

The great West, which is of course the great hope of this country, has developed and expanded so that villages have become towns and towns cities, and those vast territories which were practically unorganized at the time the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took office were flourishing provinces before he left power, and rapidly coming into a position where they could vie with the older provinces of the Dominion. Those were the conditions brought about by the policy of the Liberal party, and that is the policy which we want to keep to the fore all the time. We have no thought of departing from the policy which we followed when in power. When we return to power again we hope to bring happiness, prosperity and honest administration to this country, and we shall not be called upon to depart from that good old basic old rock of the constitution of the party, on which we have built for so long, and built so well.

The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) hinted last night that he did not know where the Liberal party was; he did not know whether there were any of that party still alive. He need only look across the floor to see a very sturdy section of them left, and if he will go to the country to-morrow, stripping his platform of this cry about the war, the cry by which the people have been falsely and improperly divided, if he will appeal to the country on a clean, straight administration and the best policy for the people in peace times, he will find out where the people are, and whether there is any of the Liberal party left.

Referring once more to the development of this country under the regime of my right hon. leader up to his going out of power in 1911, what is the testimony and what are the declarations not only of his friends but of his political opponents as to what he achieved in the glorious period during which he had charge of the affairs of this country? When we declared for reciprocity in 1911, what was the slogan of the then leader of the Opposition? From the Atlantic to the Pacific his appeal was: The policy which has been in force for the last fifteen years has brought this country to such a high mark of success, the country is in such a magnificent state of prosperity that it would be folly and a sin to interfere with present conditions. Let well enough alone; Sir Wilfrid Laurier with his immigration policy, his tariff policy, his expenditures of the revenues of this country, and everything that goes to the making up of a successful administration and a growing country, has done well; we have no fault to find; let us stand by the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and leave well enough alone. That was the appeal made on every hustings by the then leader of the Opposition. He did not recognize that it was well enough; it was very good, and a magnificent departure from the conditions he found when he took office. Then the country was bankrupt. There was not enough revenue collected to meet the ordinary expenditure. One province was flying at the throat of another, and there were dissensions and dissatisfaction between men of different religious creeds. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power, and brought this country into the harmonious and happy condition it was in in 1911.

We have a magnificent territory, extending from ocean to ocean. Our resources are just as good as those of the United States and we have a territory that is wide and comprehensive, and capable of receiving and looking after something like one hundred millions of people, but to-day we have only got seven millions, what was the vision of that great statesman? Am I to sit here, he asked, with a territory around me capable of making homes for one hundred or one hundred and fifty million people and be satisfied with only seven million people? Is it not my duty as the responsible head of this Government to provide such means as will make Canada a happy and contented country, an inviting country for people to live in? And he started out to make Canada a place where there would be open markets, where the man who was settled on the land would have right at his door a ready market for whatever he raised. Although the English market was very good, it was three thousand miles away, and you had to send your goods by rail to a steamer, and then by steamer across the Atlantic, and then perhaps by rail for a further distance. The English market was good, but it was not natural and proper to ship to that market when we had right by our side some one hundred and ten million of people, speaking our own language, and requiring the things we produced. Would it not have been better and more reasonable to sell our products to them, where we could get the

best price, than to send them to the English market three thousand miles away? Was not that the proper course for the Government to take? That was the policy which Sir Wilfrid Laurier placed before the people at that time with a view to making Canada an inviting place for the millions of people for whom we had room, and who would no doubt have come to this country if reciprocity had been accepted. But there were people in this country whose interests were being interfered with. As was said by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) the other night, there was a Diana of the Ephesians in this country; the profits and trade of certain people were likely to be interfered with if the national barriers against trade between Canada and the United States were broken down. There was enough force brought to bear on that occasion to defeat us, not squarely and honestly, but through raising the cry of disloyalty and traitorism. The flag was waved and the question was asked, "Under which flag will you live? It is well enough to have trade, but we must stand by the flag." But those days have gone by, and now everybody who has any proper conception of national development can see that that would have been the best course for this country to pursue. Friends of the Government and the Government themselves, one after the other, are forsaking the props and pillars that supported them at that time, and everything that we advocated in connection with the trade relations between the two countries is about to be adopted; at least they are making a show of doing it, whether they mean it or not. It is pretty hard to know sometimes whether they are going or coming, because they try to make every circumstance suit their whims and caprices. At one time they put Ontario against Manitoba, and at another some other province against another section of the country, just as it suits them for the time being. We have evidence enough of that. On 3rd December last, a certain policy was good enough for them, but now it has been changed for the time being; there is now a new fiddle and a new tune, but they will find out that the people of this country will not change the tune as rapidly as the Government think they can do in matters of the gravest consequence with which they have to deal.

I have outlined the course which my right hon. leader has followed since he laid down his broad platform in 1898, and the policy upon which he came into power in 1896 under which he administered the affairs of this country so grandly and magnificently up to 1911 and upon which, in its advanced state, he gloriously went out of power in that year.

I said in the early part of my remarks that it was important for every man, if he belonged to a party, to do what he could to keep that party clean, strong and devoted to the best interests of the country. Let me remind the House that although we had fifteen years of office, although we had handled millions of money in dealing with every kind of public enterprise, service and work in the country, we went out of office in 1911 and every possible investigation was thrown after to discover where we had done anything wrong. It is the proud boast that we can make to-day that although every department of Government was rifled from one corner to the other, not only with such men as they could employ in that work in Ottawa but with men brought from the Old Country to investigate the books of the department in the effort to find some scandal, no scandal was found. It was not shown that one fifty cent piece was misappropriated in the fifteen years when we were in power. I do not like scandal-mongering and I am not a scandal-monger but I wish to remind the hon. gentleman of the conditions under which they went out of power in 1896 and ask them to compare the conditions of those days with the conditions under which we handed over the reins of Government when it was our duty to do so in conformity with the views of the people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he remembers a man by the name of Miller whom we had to lock up in the Carleton County jail because he would not tell us who had received the money which he had paid out to obtain Government contracts and that part which the hon. gentleman opposite took in backing him up in defying the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: In what way did I back him up in defying the House? I will take no insinuations from the hon. gentleman. I will tell the hon. gentleman that I never exchanged one English word with a man named Miller; I never saw him. I do not know who he is and if the hon. gentleman thinks I shielded him in any way he is absolutely and entirely mistaken. If he has any such insinuations to make, let him make them like a gentleman. He has either said too little or too much.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I spoke about members of the Opposition defending Miller and backing him up in defying the House when we were trying to make him say to whom he paid the money.

Mr. McKENZIE: Absolutely incorrect. I defy the hon. gentleman to put his finger upon anything that will go to show that any member of the Opposition did anything to shield, protect or shelter that gentleman. That shows the straits to which these gentlemen are put, that shows their lack of information, that shows that they have nothing to talk about except this miserable, picayune Miller business. That happened years and years after we went out of power. That is the only thing they can talk about. The hon. member for South Oxford is the lone pelican on the housetop who has anything to say here to-night and that is all he has to say. The whole Dominion of Canada will have to accept my statement now that there was nothing wrong except that the hon. member for South Oxford says that there was a man by the name of Miller who paid some trifle as a travelling agent for something we knew nothing about and had nothing to do with.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. gentleman asked us to point out a single instance and I merely referred to a single instance.

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly; I was talking about the departmental conduct of the Government and this man never had anything to do with any department of the Government. He was never in the employ of the Government. He had never handled a dollar of the public moneys, and he never was a servant of any minister of the Crown during the fifteen years that we were in power. Now, Sir, I still defy the hon. gentleman or any other member of his party to point out a single instance of corrupt administration in any department of the Government with which we had anything to do. I did not desire to say anything offensive at all, but I was simply reminding the hon. gentleman and his friends of the conditions under which they went out of power in 1896 and in 1873. They no doubt remember these things.

I wish to deal further with the attitude of the Liberal party on the trade question not only while we were in power but after we went out of power. We have the same attitude to-day that we have always had. We have not one policy for one province and a different policy for another province. We have not one policy to-day and a new one to-morrow. The right hon. gentleman, whom I have the proud distinction of following, was always strong on that policy which suited the great West. He was always anxious to promote the development of that country because it is in the interest of us all that it should be developed. The older provinces are full of resources and they are only beginning to realize what is in store for them. Nevertheless, our wider and greater expansion must come from the great provinces of the West and for that reason it is of the highest importance that whichever party is in power, whoever undertakes to lead the thought of the people and to shape the policies of the country, whoever may be at the head of affairs, should support that policy that can consistently be supported by every province from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That is the kind of policy that we must have and that is the policy which has always been, and which is now, advocated by the leader of the Opposition. I am going to bring to your notice, Sir, the attitude which has been taken by the leaders of the Liberal party since we have come into Opposition in so far as trade matters are concerned. The Liberal party, on various occasions in the House of Commons and outside of it, announced itself in favour of the removal of duties on foods of various kinds and in particular on January 26, 1913, Sir Wilfrid Laurier addressed the Liberal Club Federation of Ontario at Hamilton and announced a policy of free food, free from customs duties. These are the words Sir Wilfrid used at that time:

> The policy I give you at this moment, the policy I believe every patriot in Canada ought to support and the policy I believe it to be the duty of a Government to immediately inaugurate is a policy of absolutely free food—free from custom duties.

This general statement has been followed up by specific motions in the House of Commons demanding that certain foods shall be placed upon the free list. On January 28, 1914, Dr. Neely, M.P. for Humboldt moved:

> That the House regrets that, in the gracious speech with which your Royal Highness has met Parliament, the said speech gives no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps to secure free access to the markets of the United States for the wheat and wheat products of Canada, by removing the duty on wheat and wheat products coming into Canada from the United States.

The Conservative members of the House voted against this motion, the Liberals voted for it. On April 23rd, 1914, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved:

> That this House is of the opinion that in view of the prevailing economic conditions of

the country it is advisable to place wheat, wheat products, and agricultural implements on the free list; and that without doing injustice to any class, steps should be taken to alleviate the high cost of living by considerate removal of taxation.

The Conservative members of the House voted against that motion, the Liberals voted for it. On April 28th, 1914, Mr. Loggie, an hon. gentleman representing a New Brunswick county, moved:

That tariff item No. 83 be amended by adding thereto the following words:—

Provided, however, that potatoes, dry, dessicated or otherwise prepared, being the growth and production of the United States, shall be admitted free of duty when, and as soon as, the United States removes the embargo regulations now existing against like articles, the growth and production of Canada.

For that motion the Liberals members of the House voted, the Conservatives voted against it.

On February 23rd, 1916, Mr. J. G. Turriff, M.P., for Assiniboia, moved:

That in the opinion of this House, in order to secure to the farmers and people of Canada the advantages of the American market for wheat products and potatoes, steps should be taken at once to put these articles on the free list in the Canadian tariff.

The Conservative majority in the House solidly voted against the motion, the Liberals voted for it.

Now, Sir, that is the course that was followed by us as far as those resolutions are concerned.

Again, on the 16th of March, 1915, Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved as follows:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved;

That this House is ready to provide for the exigencies of the present situation, and to vote all necessary ways and means to that end, but it regrets that in the measure under consideration duties are imposed which may be oppressive on the people, whilst yielding little or no revenue; and that the said measure is particularly objectionable in the fact that instead of favouring, it is placing extra barriers against Great Britain's trade with Canada, at a moment when the Mother Country is under a war strain unparalleled in history.

The Liberals voted for that resolution, the Conservatives voted against it.

On the 23rd of May, 1917, less than a year ago, the Hon. Mr. Oliver, member for Edmonton, moved the following resolution:

In the opinion of this House it would be in the public interest if the Customs Tariff Act were so amended as to provide;

1. That wheat, wheat flour and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list;

2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and sawmill machinery, and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers, be added to the free list;

3. That staple goods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and food therefor, be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.

4. That substantial reductions be made in the general tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.

5. That the British preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

This resolution was moved on May 23, 1917, by Hon. Frank Oliver, ex-Minister of the Interior, and seconded by no less a personage than the present Minister of Public Works. That, Sir, was the attitude taken at that time, and all the time, by the Liberal party in this House, and I have enumerated these resolutions so as to put the matter in concise form. I have done it so that everybody would know what our attitude has been throughout, and that we put ourselves on record, not upon the hustings, not where we might say one thing in one place and another thing in another place; in the House of Commons where everybody has an opportunity of seeing at all times the position we have taken.

Now, Sir, I come to another resolution of great importance to this country, and of particular importance to our friends from the West. As I said before, when we are talking on the question of development, when we are talking on the question of trade with the United States, and when we are talking on the question of free wheat, free farming implements, and free admission of all that enters into the proper and economical conducting of the farms of the West, we expect the western men to be particularly interested in what is taking place, in what we are saying, and in the purposes of political parties in this country. Everybody remembers the famous convention at Winnipeg last August. At that time the attitude of the Liberal party on the war was put in such clear-cut and concise language in the resolution that was adopted at that convention, that I wish to adopt it as far as I can as the attitude of the Liberal party, not only in the Western Provinces but in the other provinces of Canada where Liberalism is understood and acted upon according to its real meaning. The resolution in question was put to the convention, no doubt after discussion, and adopted, and it so well expresses my own views with respect to the war, that I wish to adopt it as my own and put it on record. It was moved by Dr. Neely, and seconded by Lieutenant C. B. Reilly, both of them returned soldiers.

In this war for the defence of democratic civilization against military despotism, the conditions call for the putting forth by each allied belligerent of its full power as the only assurance of victory. In times of peril the entire resources of the country, moral and material, man-power and wealth, are justly disposable by the state for the preservation of its national liberty. The imperative duty of the Canadian people in regard to the war is its continued vigorous prosecution.

(1.) By conferring with the British Government for the purpose of definitely ascertaining the scope and character of all the services that can best be rendered by Canada in the conduct of the war.

(2.) By the maintenance in unimpaired strength at the front, of our fighting forces, and the taking all steps necessary to secure the required reinforcements for this purpose.

(3.) By organizing the production of our other contributions to the war, such as food, munitions and other war necessities upon lines of the greatest efficiency.

(4.) By the complete extinction of profiteering in all business having to do with munitions and the necessaries of life, if necessary, by the nationalization of these industries or by an adaptation of the British system of controlled establishments;

(5.) By the recovery for the public treasury of undue profits obtained since the beginning of the war by the exploitation of the necessities of the people or the urgent requirements of the state;

(6.) By the application of a combined system of sharply graduated taxation upon incomes and assessed profits which shall insure that every citizen shall bear his or her full share of the war burdens, according to his or her means.

(7) By thoroughly organizing the nation and carrying out this program by whatever means may be necessary for its accomplishment.

Then comes another resolution by Mr. Roderick McKenzie, of the Manitoba Grain Growers, seconded by Mr. D. W. Warner. I will not detain you, Mr. Speaker, by reading it, because it is word for word the Oliver resolution, which I read a moment ago. Exactly the same things are asked for to be put on the free list by the Government. I come now to another resolution, and the last resolution I am going to read, and it contains the opinion of the convention as to the conduct of the Government then in power, and which is practically in power still. It was moved by Premier Sifton, of Alberta—I do not know whether that is the Mr. Sifton who is now in the Government—and seconded by Mr. Laidlaw, of British Columbia. I call the attention of the Government particularly to that convention's estimate of it, and to the estimate which the hon. gentleman who moved that resolution had of it at that time:

This Convention of the Liberals of the four Western Provinces of the Dominion assembled for the purpose of assisting in the solution of the many serious problems facing Canada at the present crisis feels compelled to place on record its most severe disapproval of the war administration of the Borden Government.

War is essentially the business and concern of the entire nation and not of any section, class or political party. It can be waged to the greatest advantage only when behind its prosecution all classes of its people are enlisted in the same passionate determination to defend the right, and triumph over the forces of despotism and unrighteousness.

Any attempt to arrogate to one section of the people or one political party a monopoly of its prosecution and the prestige of the conduct of the national struggle for freedom and existence can be characterized as only base and unworthy in the highest degree

Because the Borden Government has sought from the outset to make our national life and death struggle the prerogative of one political party, to the exclusion of one half of the Canadian people, and an instrument for selfish, political advantage rather than the triumph of national ideals; and because it has exhibited gross incompetency and inefficiency in the face of national peril; because it has substituted partisan selfishness for honour and fair dealing, because discussion has overcome leadership in its councils and weakness and vacillation have taken the place of firmness of resolution, courage and efficiency in execution we condemn it as no longer entitled to the confidence of the Canadian people.

That, Sir, is the resolution passed by the convention, and which was sponsored for by the hon. member (Mr. Sifton), who, I believe, is Minister of Customs in this Administration. What happened? Evidently the Prime Minister believed this statement. He believed, evidently, that he was not capable, with the outfit he had then, of running the Government, and he began to cast about as to what he should do. He saw that the Hon. Mr. Sifton, then Premier of Alberta, was rather a courageous gentleman, and thought it would be a good thing to have him out of the way somewhere; so he got somehow in touch with him, and I imagine that I can hear the mellifluous voice of the Prime Minister breaking forth in song to our friend, Mr. Sifton, and saying:

Come under my plaidie, the night's gone to fa';
Come in from the cold and the drift of the snaw;
Come under my plaidie and sit down beside me,
There is room, my dear Arthur, believe me, for twa.

That, Sir, is what happened. The Prime Minister can smell trouble, because his olfactory nerve has been cultivated strongly to trouble ever since he became Premier, and he could see what was coming from the West, and he thought he would steal their thunder by bringing these men under his plaidie, and in they came, and there they are for better or for worse—we hope not for worse. That is some history in connection with the stand of the Liberal party and

the position they took, not only on the trade of the country, but on the war as well.

I am coming, Mr. Speaker, in sight of the end of my speech. But there is one matter that I am rather called upon to bring to the notice of the House, and with which I must try to deal as briefly as possible. I said in the early stages of my speech that it was of the highest importance for the Canadian people that we should have a clean-cut Administration and a Government that would be free from all trammels and influences, and which would administer the affairs of the country in the interests of the poor as well as the rich. It has been brought to my notice, and to the notice of every person in the country, that undue profits have been made in connection with the war by gentlemen who are supposed to be too close for comfort—that is, comfort to the poor men of this country—to the Government. It is my purpose to-night to bring before the House and the country some of the performances of these gentlemen so that the Government may take notice of them, and it is never too late to do good. It may be late to start it now to cut off those gentlemen who are parasites and leeches on the life blood of this country, but it is better to do it now than to let it continue. I have particular reference to the William Davies Co., or, in words more commonly understood, to the operations of that distinguished gentleman, Sir Joseph Flavelle, Baronet. I propose to call the attention of the House to the works of that gentleman and his company, and to the way that they have been grinding the faces of the poor and sucking the life blood out of the country generally, in the hope that something will be done to get rid of influences of that kind, and to let us breathe freely and understand, and hope that we understand, that everything is done openly and above board, that we are getting a dollar's worth for every dollar that we spend in this country, and that the poor man is not paying too much for the pittance that he can afford to accumulate for his little family, and that it will not be cut down, filched and stolen, so to speak, by men who are making their millions improperly at the cost and to the disadvantage of our poor people. I wish to pay a little attention to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) in connection with these things. He is a gentleman of wonderful activity. Nothing escapes him; when he finds out that trouble exists, he gets after it right away. The difficulty is that some things may not be brought to his notice. I wish to quote a letter which was read in the House yesterday as evidence of the eternal vigilance of the Minister of Labour. The moment he scents trouble anywhere he puts his sword upon his thigh, strides boldly forward, and, caring not who is in his way, breaks down every barrier and smashes to pieces anything that may interfere with the regulations of his department. In this letter, written on December 13th, 1916, he gives evidence of having discovered a combine in the city of St. Thomas—and his ardour was not as strong then as it is now. A dreadful combine was in process of formation in that city. Three men engaged in the cobbling business were concerned; they had no capital, but one of them had a couple of lasts and an awl which was used jointly by the three, one lending it to the other as occasion required. Here is what the minister says about this combine:

> I am advised that a few days ago yourself and several others entered into an agreement to raise the price of shoe repairing in the city of Chatham from the 8th instant.
>
> I am enclosing you a copy of an Order in Council recently passed, whereby you will see that if any such agreement was made you have laid yourself liable to prosecution under that Order. It prohibits the entry into any such agreement.

This awful combine, this incubus upon the body politic, was discovered in the home city of the Minister of Labour; but he went after it promptly, and no doubt the awl and the lasts and the cobblers and everything else at once disappeared in smoke, and the place that knew them once shall know them no more for ever. But the difficulty in connection with Sir Joseph Flavelle and other big guns who are making millions is that the minister does not hear anything about them, and it is my duty as a member of this House to bring certain facts to the minister's notice. Besides cobblers who are wicked enough to enter into combinations to the detriment of the body politic, other holy men in this land, while lifting false hands up in prayer, have other hands, the real ones, in the pockets of the people. At all events, this information has come to me, and when I have given that information to the minister my duty ends and his and that of the Government begins.

I have here an editorial from the Toronto Saturday Night, a well-conducted paper of very high standing, not only in Toronto, and Ontario generally, but throughout the whole Dominion. That it is owned and managed by men of public spirit is evidenced by the fact that at a certain inquiry

that was being held in Toronto, Saturday Night, at their own expense, paid a very capable lawyer to attend as representative of the public to see that the interests of the people were safeguarded. This is what that paper says:

Those in high places in Ottawa Government circles continue to air their disapproval at the manner in which the affairs of the Imperial Munitions Board are being conducted. For one thing they allege that the policy of "you scratch my back and I will scratch yours," which is said to prevail among the "elect," is getting on their nerves.

As it now stands, Sir Joseph Flavelle's tight little family party are spending yearly over three times the amount enjoyed by the entire Federal Government, and as the money expended by the Board is, in the last analysis, Canadian money, Ottawa public men think they are entitled to a little more light. For instance, it is alleged that enormous contracts for various war materials are being let without calling for tenders, or taking the usual precaution to ascertain whether or not the best is being obtained for the money available.

On the other hand, steel men are up in arms over the manner in which shell inspections are being carried on. They charge that ignorant and unskilled men are being utilized as inspectors with the result that rejections of shells at the steel plants have reached a point where manufacturers are alarmed. And furthermore, some of these shell makers state that if the system of inspection is not changed they will be obliged to cease manufacture.

Ottawa also quarrels with the fact that there has been altogether too much hole-and-corner business in the manner in which the affairs of the Imperial Munitions Board are being conducted. In this connection the contract between the Imperial Munitions Board, the British Munitions Company and the Northern Electric Company is a case in point. It will be remembered that at the time the Shell Contracts Commission was in session at Ottawa before Sir William Meredith, Mr. Hellmuth examined Sir Joseph Flavelle. Sir Joseph, in his testimony in respect to fuses and the loading of the same, made the following explanation in respect to a loading plant located at Montreal, and known as the British Munitions Board, Ltd.: "Some business friends of Mr. Gordon agreed, as their contribution toward helping in the situation, that they would lend their business energy and judgment without charge . . . and we formed—

Notice the word "we."

We formed a small company known as the British Munitions Board, all the stock owned by the Imperial Board, and the Northern Electric lent the services of their Mr. Hathaway. . "

So far so good. It is to be noted, however, in the contract between the Imperial Munitions Board and the British Munitions Board, that in spite of the statement made by Sir Joseph Flavelle to the effect that these men were lending their business energy and judgment "without charge" the Imperial Munitions Board paid the British Munitions Company, known in the indenture as "the contractor," a five per cent commission upon all amounts expended by the said contractor in the purchase of land and in the erection and equipment of the buildings and in the operation of plant, all necessary funds for the work in hand being furnished by the Imperial Munitions Board.

Still another indenture serves to show where this money, this five per cent eventually went. Paragraph two of this second document, which is a contract between the British Munitions Company, the Northern Electric Company and the Imperial Munitions Board, is illuminating in this connection. It reads as follows:

"In consideration of the services rendered by the party of the second part (Northern Electric Company) to the party of the first part, (British Munitions Company, Limited), under the provisions hereof, the party of the first part (British Munitions Company, Limited) undertakes to pay to the party of the second part (Northern Electric Company, Limited) five per cent of the gross amount of all expenditures made by the party of the first part (British Munitions Company, Limited), in the conduct of its business, including the cost of land, buildings, plant, machinery, equipment, insurance, salaries, wages, cost of explosives, and all disbursements generally made by the party of the first part (British Munitions Company, Limited) from the date hereof until the completion of its contract with the party of the third part (Imperial Munitions Board) for the assembling and loading of time fuses."

Another interesting point in these documents is the fact that the plant was to have sufficient capacity to load, assemble and ship at least fifteen thousand fuses daily: The statement that all expenditures made by the Northern Electric Company from the funds of the Imperial Munitions Board are subject to this five per cent profit, including, it will be noted, the weekly wage bill, the cost of materials, etc., as well as the original expenditure for land, buildings, machinery, etc., is also interesting in view of Sir Joseph Flavelle's original statement to the effect that these gentlemen were lending their "business energy and judgment without charge."

We have no quarrel with the gentlemen of the Northern Electric over any sum which they are able to draw down monthly by reason of this contract. Five per cent on gross operating expenditure in a plant of this magnitude looks like a good thing, but perhaps we are mistaken. What we do quarrel with is the fact that Sir Joseph Flavelle did not make a frank statement of the facts.

The Government should know, and possibly they do know that Sir Joseph Flavelle, as chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, makes a contract with himself as a member of the British Munitions Board. He says, "We formed a company." I have, of course, no personal knowledge of these things, but this is the evidence which he gave upon oath before the Commission here last year:

Q. Who is head of the plant?

A. Some business friends of Mr. Gordon agreed, as their contribution towards helping in the situation, that they would lend their business energy and judgment without charge, the leader in the movement being Mr. Sise of the Northern Electric Company, and we formed a small company, known as the British Munitions Board, owning all the stock by the Imperial Board, and the Northern Electric Company lent the services of their Mr. Hathaway, an expert, and by reason of our relations with

the American Locomotive Company and the arrangement which Mr. Gordon was able to make, they gave him complete access to their loading plant at Providence so that we could learn from their mistakes and their errors if possible.

That is quoted from the sworn evidence as taken before the judges. There Sir Joseph Flavelle says: "We formed a company". And I think we have a right to suppose that he was a member of this company himself, and that, as the chairman of the other board, he made an agreement with himself. I suppose, of course, that may technically be all right, but he makes the statement that he himself and others are lending their business abilities and experience to the Government and to the country for nothing. We find, however, right on top of that, a written agreement, a copy of which I hold in my hand, and by which he agrees as one of the company to get 5 per cent on every dollar that is expended. That agreement is made by:

Imperial Munitions Board, represented by J. W. Flavelle, its chairman, hereinafter called "the Board," and British Munitions Company, Limited, an incorporated company, having its head office in the city of Montreal, hereinafter called "the contractor."

That is the agreement in which it is stipulated that 5 per cent of all the expenditure that is made by the Imperial Munitions Board, of which Sir Joseph Flavelle is the head and chairman—and no doubt millions were expended in this work—will go to this friendly company organized by himself, the members of which were doing nothing except out of the goodness of their hearts, giving all their time and energy and business experience to the country, but of course, as a matter of no concern, just as a sort of a side show to keep the matter lawful were getting a five per cent rake-off on the millions that Sir Joseph Flavelle himself was pouring into the hands of that concern. That is something that the people of this country do not like, and something about which we should have information, because, after all, those millions, according to the statement given to us by the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) the other day, are our moneys. It is the money of Canada that is being expended in that way, and for the present at all events, paying for those munitions, and at best we have to bear a fair share. It was given out, at the very outset of the war, that we are paying our share of every part of the expense in connection with this business, and whether we pay it all or in part now, or whether Sir Joseph Flavelle is appointed by the Imperial Government or not, we have power enough in this country, and this Government has no doubt its Minister of Militia Overseas closely enough in touch with the management on the other side of the Atlantic, to see that no connivance of this kind is permitted to go on; that no person is allowed to receive rake-offs, and that there are no holes and drops and chutes through which money will go where it has no business to go and where the soldiers of this country will not get full value for the money that is expended on these things. It is time that steps should be taken to inquire fully into these things. The people of this country are sick and tired of this great plutocrat, Sir Joseph Flavelle. Is there anybody on earth that can do anything but Sir Joseph Flavelle and his boys, or his young men, as I believe he calls them? Is it necessary that any man who has entrée to the Government, any man who receives the badge of capacity and ability and is entrusted with the spending of money, should have to receive the earmark of this hon. gentleman before he is entrusted to do anything? It is a weakness in the Government and the country that any man, even if he be as worthy as some people profess that this gentleman is, to think that nobody can do anything right but Sir Joseph Flavelle, Baronet.

I think the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) knows me well enough to believe that I would not say anything to hurt him nor anything to injure a hair on his head —although he has not any more than I have myself; but I must, as a public man in a small way, tell him, as a public man who fills a great space in this country as a minister, that I, at all events, am not satisfied with the vigour and vigilance that he is showing in bringing to time and to the ringbolt men who have been playing with the moneys of the people of this country and putting too much of it into their pockets, for which money the people have received no value. I must say to the minister that it looks bad to see him plugging after these poor little cobblers and putting them out of existence with one blow of his sword, while he says nothing at all to Sir Joseph Flavelle with all his satellites and companies, and companies within companies, and the banks that are in the pool with him. To all that great outfit, which in one second of time takes in more money than three cobblers will make in a century, he says nothing at all. When an officer of my hon.

friend's department undertook to be what the minister regarded as officious, he simply called him off and said: "This far shalt thou go and no further. There are certain things you can meddle with, Mr. O'Connor—cobblers and such cattle as that—but when it comes to bringing Sir Joseph Flavelle or any of that holy crowd to task, it is a different matter. You will keep your hands off him, leave him to me. I will touch him with a velvet hand. I know where I stand, and where the Government of which I am a member stands, so far as Sir Joseph Flavelle is concerned. Knowest thou not, Mr. O'Connor, that Sir Joseph Flavelle is the political godfather of the Minister of Finance, and would you dare to put your unholy and unconsecrated hands on a man of that kind?"

Those are the things which I complain about, and I think the Minister of Labour should explain to the country why he is so vigilant and active in going after the small things when the big things are left to go as they please. The case of Sir Joseph Flavelle was before a commission more than once. Mr. O'Connor made a report which was practically an indictment against him. He complained about it bitterly and was granted another court. Now I appeal to the ordinary common sense of this House. I think they will admit that when a man is tried in Canada, whether it is in a country place or in a city, whatever the jury find, if it is a criminal case, that is usually the end of it. There is no machinery in this country, so far as I know, by which a man can go before a judge and say: "I am not satisfied with this trial. I want to go before another jury, so dismiss this jury and give me another one." But that was done in the case of Sir Joseph Flavelle, and some people have been cruel enough to suggest that Sir Joseph had a considerable say in selecting the judge who tried him at Toronto. That may not be the case, but if he had anything to say in that matter, he was very unfortunate in his selection, because that judge also found him guilty and said that there was "profiteering beyond all reason, which should not be for one moment tolerated in this country." What does Mr. O'Connor say? As I have touched upon this matter, I may as well complete the job. I will briefly quote from Mr. O'Connor's report, which was filed in the Department of Labour some time in July last, I believe. On pages 3 and 4 of that report, Mr. O'Connor says:

> A few of the cold storage companies, however, have attained such dimensions, and have so centralized the business in certain lines that as respects particular commodities particular companies are able to exercise a practical monopoly especially of export business.....Out of the total quantity of 151,000,000 pounds of bacon handled, sold and exported in Canada during 1916 no less than 140,259,202 pounds were handled by these two companies, or ninety-three per cent of the total. Of this quantity the William Davies Company handled about sixty-four per cent, and Matthews-Blackwell Limited about twenty-nine per cent.

Further on he says:

> With regard to bacon we find one company selling 97 millions of the total 1916 cold storage sales of 151 million pounds at a margin of 5.05 cents per pound.

I am not going to follow that further. The charge is that Sir Joseph Flavelle was making a profit of 5·05 cents on every pound of bacon that he was handling. It was also charged, and was brought out in the investigation, that Sir Joseph Flavelle was using his position as head of the Imperial Munitions Board to get transportation for his goods across to the other side, when the ordinary man could not get his goods across at all.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think my hon. friend is misrepresenting the facts, unintentionally, no doubt. If he will examine the report carefully he will see that 5 cents is the margin, not the profit. The profit was considerably less than one cent.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will adopt the language of the minister and say it was a margin. The company took umbrage at Mr. O'Connor's report that they had even a margin of 5·05 cents, and immediately asked for another court. What did that court find? It did not find that they made a profit of 5 cents, but a great deal more than 5 cents. The company would not give Mr. O'Connor the necessary information to ascertain the difference between gross and net profits, so Mr. O'Connor figured it out from the overhead expenses of other companies and reached the conclusion put forth in his report. He found there was a margin of 5·05 cents. But what is that compared with what was found by the court that was appointed to whitewash Sir Joseph Flavelle, in the expectation that it would find that Mr. O'Connor was absolutely wrong and that there was no such margin. I have in my hand the report signed by Mr. Henderson, Mr. Brodie and Mr. Clarkson, the three gentlemen who were appointed to review the investigation of Mr. O'Connor and to report. It is only necessary for me to read the first section of their finding, as all I am concerned about is: Did they find that the profit was greater or less than 5·05

cent, as represented by Mr. O'Connor. Let me point out that Mr. O'Connor finds that on the turn-over, that is, in the handling of that particular quantity, there was a gross profit of the amount he mentions, but as I understand it, that does not include plant and overhead expenses generally, such as the land upon which the building stands and the machinery used in a business of this kind. I do not understand that Mr. OConnor figures on that at all. I think he simply deals with buying the goods and the turning over of them without any reference to the value of the stores, land, horses, engines or stock that the man might own. But what do Mr. Henderson and his commission find? They find that there is not only 5 per cent on the turnover but that the profits made by the companies during the war, were excessively high and yielded an extraordinary return on the capital investment. They say that in the year 1916 the trading profits of the Davies Company—that is Sir Joseph Flavelle—equalled eighty per cent on the company's investment in packing houses, plants, retail stores and everything else in connection with the business. Eighty per cent upon land, upon buildings, upon horses, upon engines, upon every conceivable thing they had in connection with the business. That is the finding of Mr. Henderson. It is plain, simple, clear and easy to be understood.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there was no ground or justification given before the commission, of which Mr. Henderson was the head, for the appeal from the findings of Mr. O'Connor. I wish to bring this matter to the notice of the minister and to tell him in the most particular way that the people of this country think it was only because of the pull that this man, Sir Joseph Flavelle, and those who were associated with him in making these huge fortunes, have with the minister and the Government generally that has influenced them, and that it is only this hydraulic pressure that has lifted this man O'Connor out of office and thrown him on the street. That is the belief of this country and I submit that there is some fair ground for it. From the day that he found fault with this man, Sir Joseph Flavelle, to this, in so far as the office of the Minister of Labour is concerned, it appears that there was no continuing city for him any more and that he could no longer live in comfort there.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

But the manœuverings and dealings of this great concern did not end with making eighty per cent out of the poor people of this country by reason of the fact that Sir Joseph Flavelle had the inside track, by reason of the fact that Sir Joseph Flavelle, through his influence, or his friendship with this Government, managed to secure a contract with the Imperial Government which no other concern could get. He could lose nothing no matter how much he paid. He had a contract with the Imperial Government that he would get a certain percentage on his buying price whatever it might be. There are hon. gentlemen sitting in front of me who know something about buying and they know that if they can go through the country with the knowledge that, whatever they pay, they cannot lose any money, and that if another man has not such a contract he cannot compete with them at all. A man, if he expects to make a few dollars, or a few cents, on his bargain, must buy at a certain price because he knows what he has to sell for. Sir Joseph Flavelle was in the fortunate position that if he bought at ten cents he knew that he had a margin beyond that and if he bought at twelve cents his margin was the same. If the market went up by twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty per cent, he could not by any possibility lose. Together with that he had access to transports which enabled him to send his goods over to the other side and make profits on the turnover there through agencies to which he attached his machinery and he went on dealing and working and squeezing money out of the poor people of this country without any check or interference whatsoever. As one of the representatives of the people of this country, I maintain that there should be a check on conduct of this kind. The Government should have known what was going on in this business and this man should not have been permitted to make these extraordinary profits out of the life blood of the poor people of this country. This is a fair subject for comment and it should be brought to the notice of the Government and of the people. I do not think that I should apologize, or feel that I am imposing upon you, Sir, or upon hon. members, in bringing a matter of such vast importance to the notice of the only tribunal in the world with which we have anything to do that can remedy matters of this kind.

There is one thing more. Sir Joseph Flavelle was not satisfied with what he had done in connection with the investigation that took place, but, before I leave

that I venture to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a most extraordinary thing that although this man has been found guilty by Mr. O'Connor of extraordinary profiteering, and although Mr. O'Connor says that if this had been done while the Order in Council was in force, he would have regarded it as his duty and obligation to bring the matter to the notice of the Attorney General with a view to prosecution, no action was taken. If the minister discovered that this prosecution could be brought about by just making this Order in Council, which was produced with such a great flourish of trumpets, retroactive, by just changing the date from the twentieth to the first of the month, why did he allow this man, who was a criminal and who was robbing the people of this country, to escape punishment? If he were a cobbler he would have no show for his life, but this millionaire, this multimillionaire, a friend of this Government, the godfather of the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) and who has a lease evidently on everything that is powerful and strong about this Government, can do as he likes and smile at any person who may suggest that he is injuring the country and discrediting its Government. I make these somewhat extraordinary and strong charges in the hope that I may stir up the Minister of Labour a little bit and that he may get on his cobbler armour and go after the man who has millions and who has great strength in this country and that he will give the country to understand, the poor as well as the rich, that there is only one King, one Government, and one line of justice for every man whether he be rich or poor. It remains for the Government to satisfy the people that that is the way things should be done. If they leave this matter as it is now and let this man escape with his eighty per cent, his millions and hundreds of millions, this man who was enabled to make five millions in less than six months out of the life blood of this country, I do not think that it will be regarded as wholesome for the Government or for any person who may be supporting them particularly in this zone where this disclosure has been so keenly felt.

In the city of Winnipeg only the other day we had an investigation into the conduct of this same man and his agencies in that part of the country. Food of the most delicate character, food that is not easy to get, to the extent of thirty-five tons of chicken, I understand, was allowed to rot in a certain cold storage in Winnipeg. It was allowed to go to decay and had to be thrown out upon the dump rotten rather than sell it to the poor people of Canada at half a cent a pound less than the ordinary high price out of which these millions were being made as I have already stated. The Government appointed a Commission of Inquiry and this is what the commission says. But before I read its findings, let me say that it is sad to think that on a question of fact you cannot believe those people. You cannot believe Sir Joseph Flavelle, I am sorry to say, on a mere bald question of fact. He swears before Mr. Justice Meredith or Mr. Justice Duff, that certain work was being done for them for nothing, that it was being done absolutely free. We find his hand to an agreement according to which, in connection with identically the same work, he was getting five per cent on a million, or at least his company was getting five per cent on hundreds of millions of money. This man has spent a million dollars a day, the money of the Canadian people, three hundred millions of money a year, if not more, and a large slice of that was going through this company and somebody was getting five per cent. We would like to know how much it was.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Toronto Centre): Who owns the stock of the company that is getting five per cent commission? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that that stock was all owned by the Imperial Munitions Company which was giving the contract to the subsidiary company. So that if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct that five per cent profit would be something that would go back to the parent company who owned the stock in the subsidiary company.

Mr. McKENZIE: I must tell the hon. gentleman that when it comes to talking about Mackenzie & Mann's companies—

Mr. BRISTOL: But the hon. gentleman was making a statement and I merely asked him to explain it, I wish to understand him. If his statement is correct that one company owns all the stock in the other company then the five per cent is a question of bookkeeping, and neither Sir Joseph Flavelle nor anybody else is getting it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I can give the hon. gentleman an agreement with another company according to which this five per cent never comes back directly to the Munitions Board, never in the world. These agreements came into my possession as being

genuine, and I believe they are. The facts are not of my creation, and all I am saying is this: Sir Joseph Flavelle states that this company was getting nothing at all. He says: Those men are giving their time and energy and experience for nothing.

Mr. BRISTOL: That may be so.

Mr. McKENZIE: Well, they are incorporated into a board, and right on top of that there is an agreement by which these philanthropists, who are giving their time, energy, and experience for nothing, are to receive five per cent.

Mr. BRISTOL: No, the company is getting five per cent, and the other company owns the stock. The philanthropists are not getting it according to the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. McKENZIE: Very good, I say that they are getting it, and that is what they are after. That is why a paper like Saturday Night is making an investigation and letting daylight into this matter, to see that the people of this country are protected. If it can be shown that there is nothing wrong about this transaction, well and good. It is no business of mine, and if the transaction turns out to be honest and above board no person will be more pleased than myself. On the face of it, however, it looks as if this man was making a statement that does not square with the facts as they develop afterwards. If that is not so all right, but, as I understand it, his statements are not borne out.

As to a question of fact, I have here the report of an officer, I presume appointed either directly or indirectly by the Government, in which the finding appears that a certain transaction of the William Davies Packing Company in Winnipeg was far from proper, and that the statements made in connection with the conduct of their business there are far from the truth. Now, Sir, there is no use in going half way with this matter, and I must ask your indulgence while I read to you a report:

J. D. McGregor, Esq.,
Western Representative,
Canada Food Board,
Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir:

I received your letter dated March 14th, 1918, instructing me to hold an investigation into the cold storage business of the William Davies Co. of the city of Winnipeg, with particular reference to the destruction recently of a large amount of poultry at the city incinerator.

After careful consideration I beg to report as follows:

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Meetings of the Commission for taking evidence were held on the following dates: March 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st and 23rd, of 1918. On the morning of the 20th an inspection was made of the plant.

Mr. Isaac Pitblado, K.C., and Mr. A. E. Bowles, were counsel for the William Davies Co., and Mr. C. E. Finklestein for the Canada Food Board. They were present at all meetings.

All witnesses were duly sworn and evidence taken under oath.

I enclose herewith the transcript of the evidence taken before me, together with Exhibits filed.

In the following findings I refer to the pages of the evidence. I take it from your letter that while you wished me to deal with and recommend upon collateral matters arising therefrom yet you desired me to investigate and report upon the following two points in particular:

1. Was there any "hoarding" of food?

2. What was the cause of the deterioration of the poultry?

Mr. Karl Symonds, Manager of the plant of the William Davies Co. of Winnipeg, swore that the Head Office at Toronto knew nothing of his purchasing the poultry but he bought them "off my own bat" (Page 41). He did not at any time report having this quantity of poultry on hand to the Head Office, but he reported daily temperatures of the room in which they were held. He further swore that he gave instructions to his travellers to sell "regardless of cost" (Page 23). He swore "no price was set to Williams," one of his travellers (Page 23) that his instructions to sell "regardless of cost" were for the whole of the summer of 1917 (Page 33) that he never fixed the minimum price (page 104) that he instructed his travellers to meet all competition (Page 35). On being recalled the following day he again swore that he gave instructions to sell "regardless of cost" (Pages 103 and 105).

Now that is the evidence of the manager, now comes the evidence of the travellers to whom he refers:

Symonds' evidence was contradicted by the evidence of his own two travellers, Messrs. E. A. Williams and F. D. Cundell.

E. A. Williams swore Symonds did not instruct him to sell "regardless of cost" (Pages 261 and 266) swore that he, Williams, had an offer from John Campbell at the General Hospital at 19c and Williams phoned Symonds who instructed him not to sell at less than 20c (Page 262).

F. D. Cundell, also a traveller of the Davies Company, swore that Symonds did not instruct him to sell "regardless of cost" (Pages 271-272) was not told that he had to undersell and get rid of it (Page 271); had to sell according to set price (Page 277); could have sold if price had been reduced (Page 272).

In addition to the evidence of the manager, Mr. Symonds, and the two travellers of the Davies Company, several quite disinterested parties gave evidence before me to which I give the utmost weight and to which I now refer. Mr. T. J. Coyle, broker, swore that Symonds offered him 20,000 pounds of poultry August 22nd, 1917, at 20 cents per pound. He wired order to Gunn-Langlois, Montreal, but they would not accept at that price. He swore Montreal firm would have purchased if

price was reduced, and that if Symonds had had a standing order with him to sell regardless of cost he could have sold the poultry.

John Campbell, Steward of Winnipeg General Hospital, swore that Davies Company refused to sell at market price, in October, 1917. He swore that he offered 19c. to Williams, the Company's traveller quoted 20c. and says he got some fowl from Swifts and Gordon Ironsides at 19c. during the month of October, 1917. He swore that Williams told him there was no fowl for sale in December, 1917, and January, 1918.

John Guest, Manager meat department, T. Eaton Co., swore Eatons could have sold the poultry, says he would have purchased it in January, February and March, 1919, at 20c.

W. L. Haight, produce Manager, Gordon, Ironsides and Fares, swore he could have sold chicken in January, February and March, 1918.

James Gallagher, President Gallagher, Holman and LaFrance, swore he disposed of a carload in Montreal to William Clark in December, 1917, at 21c.

At this point I should state that the evidence submitted by the Winnipeg branch of the Davies Company was to the effect that the poultry in question, amounting to 70,000 pounds was put in cold storage in their Winnipeg plant during the months of October, November and December of 1916.

In March, 1918, about one year and five months later, 50,000 pounds still remained, and it was found that a large portion of it had deteriorated and 8,500 pounds was sent to the city incinerator for destruction. The W. Davies Company have been instructed and are rapidly disposing of all stock on hand that are fit for food at very reduced price and there will be about 1,500 and 2,000 pounds more to be destroyed out of the balance in storage.

A comparison of prices for storage poultry as shown in Gordon, Ironsides and Fares price list and Cundell's price list will show that the prices of Cundell, traveller for Wm. Davies Co., run slightly higher all through the year 1917 for both fowl and chicken.

The commissioner has added a table here which shows that the prices of the William Davies Company all through are higher than those of Gordon, Ironsides & Fares. In June, 1917, he says that Gordon, Ironsides & Fares quoted fowl 21 to 24 cents and chicken 23 to 26 cents, while the William Davies Company were quoting 22 to 25 cents for fowl and 25 to 27 cents for chicken, and right through to September they were charging more than other companies, and he recommends that the cold storage plant should not be permitted any longer to carry on business in that way, and he criticises severely the fact that this enormous quantity—perhaps not enormous, it is 35 tons or more of very excellent and delicate food needed in the country at that time of the year—was allowed to deteriorate and had to be thrown into the dump, and says that it should not be allowed to happen again.

In conclusion, I must say that this gentleman who is at the head of these great operations should not be allowed by the Government to go along any further having such power and control over these matters as he now has. Sir Joseph's power of spending is one million dollars a day, over three hundred millions a year, of the money of the people of Canada. His conduct in his own private business, his greedy profiteering, his defiance of public sentiment, his outraging of public opinion, do not make him a fit custodian and spender of this vast sum of the people's money, nor can the Government of Canada retain the confidence of the people when a thrice-convicted war profiteer and food hoarder is kept in the powerful position which he at present occupies. Surely the people have paid a sufficient price for the services of Sir Joseph Flavelle. He parades the fact that he works without salary, but he demanded as the price of his services not only a tribute to his bacon factory, not only a knighthood, the ordinary reward of public service, but a hereditary baronetcy, against the establishment of which in this democracy the people of Canada very properly rebel. The "pork barrel" in politics is an Americanism which is not required in Canada, and the time is long past due when this baronet with the conscience, which "has no qualm" should be retired from public life, and the Prime Minister of Canada should so intimate to the Imperial authorities, who, no doubt, would be only too glad of a reasonable excuse to conform.

A very small part of the operations of this concern has been in this way brought before the House, and particularly before the Government, and I trust such steps will be taken as will prevent any further profiteering at the expense of the good people of Canada. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is only necessary to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Labour and the Government to insure that such steps will be taken as will for ever put an end to any man having power to conduct his business in such a way as to unduly rob the poor people of the country of the food which should go to the sustenance of themselves and their children. It does not contribute at all to the high standing of the Government, or to the efficiency of our army and navy, or to anything that is being done in connection with militarism in this country, if it is for one moment believed that there are men who have backstairs and backdoor influences in connection with matters of this kind which operate to the disadvantage of the

ordinary, everyday, poor man in this country.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I was obliged to take so much time in presenting this case.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hear the hon. member for Brantford saying, "Hear, hear." I suppose that he is in full sympathy with those millionaires and men who make such extraordinary profits, and he does not feel very much in sympathy with me and other poor people to whom a dollar is a consideration. I can only hope that the hon. member will excuse me for living upon this planet and for having exercised my right of free speech as a member of this House in presenting these matters to a free Parliament.

Mr. D. L. REDMAN (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) on making the longest speech which we have heard during the course of this debate. I regard this as the more remarkable because when commencing his speech he gave some very weighty advice to the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaac) who preceded him. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that the fact that he read for two hours out of the three during which he addressed the House will take something from the length of his speech. However, I will say nothing further with regard to that.

I wish to congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance (Hon. A. K. Maclean) for the able manner in which he presented his Budget to the House and for the firm way in which he has grappled with the tremendous financial problems that confront the country. The record of the Finance Minister and of this Government in the financing of the country's affairs during the war, in the splendid loans which they have floated, in the well-placed taxation which they have effected, is one of which they may justly be proud. The people of Canada have reason to be proud of their splendid response to the call for subscriptions to war loans, of the manner in which ordinary business affairs of the country have been carried on, and of the wealth which has been produced throughout the land. We can look with satisfaction upon our financial position, and we can feel that no matter how long the struggle may last we shall be able to keep up in the collar; we shall be able to maintain the position we now occupy until that victory comes of which we are assured.

While our position is an excellent one, we should not lose sight of the fact that at the end of March of this year our national debt is approximately $1,200,000,000. What that debt will be when the war is over no one can say, but if the struggle continues one, two or more years, we can be certain that it will be substantially larger than it is now. We must remember also that in addition to our current expenditures and capital outlays, we have to make annual payments out of revenue by way of interest on our national debt, which to-day is estimated at approximately $50,000,000, and which will increase as our debt increases. Moreover, we have to meet annual payments by way of pensions, for which in the Estimates of this year some $15,000,000 are being asked. It is safe to predict that when the war ends the amount payable for pensions will exceed $50,000,000 a year.

We should have regard to two things in considering this Budget: first, the manner in which we shall raise funds during this and possibly the next year; second, the financial position in which our country will be placed at the termination of the war. To-day we have an opportunity of greatly influencing that post-war condition. In discussing this matter I wish to keep that second point more especially in view.

For many years it has been the policy of this country to rely upon customs revenues for the means to meet ordinary expenditures. I shall not make any comment upon the merits of that source of revenue, except that in time of war we must without question continue it. But our reliance upon this source of revenue should not blind our eyes to other possible means of raising money; in the circumstances existing to-day, it is desirable that every possible source of revenue should be carefully investigated and, if deemed advisable, taken advantage of by the Government.

The other great form of taxation is direct taxation, of which in England the most important factor is the income tax—and it should be the case in Canada. Income tax has existed in England since the year 1799, when it was put on by Mr. Pitt to raise moneys for the prosecution of the Napoleonic wars. Since that date, and more especially since the repeal of the Corn Laws, that tax has been the mainstay of each Chancellor of the British Exchequer, and in England to-day that tax, more than any other source of revenue, is enabling England to carry on the war and to pay as substantial an amount as 17 per cent of its war indebtedness. They can do that in England better than

we can do it here because they have been accustomed to income tax for one hundred years. It is proper that in Canada we should introduce new modes of taxation slowly; no important departure in the way of taxation should be made suddenly. Our people should be gradually educated to a new form of taxation, and only when they have accepted it can it be considered successful. What is the history of income tax in this country? The subject was discussed early last session. The Minister of Finance stated at first that an income tax would not be introduced—he pointed out various objections to it—but later, towards the end of the last Parliament, the income tax which is now on our statute book was brought in. The imposition of that tax was in itself a great step forward, and after six months we can feel that it has been favourably accepted by the people. They have looked into that tax; they have considered the rating under it, and viewing the matter in relation to the requirements of the country, they feel that it is a tax which they should be called upon to pay. That being the case, we should consider whether or not it is advisable to make any substantial increase in the rate payable under that tax. That brings us to the changes proposed in the tax as outlined by the Acting Minister of Finance. I agree with him in the lowering of the minimums of exemption in the case of unmarried men to $1,000 and of married men to $2,000, and the placing of the rate of 2 per cent on the amounts by which these minimums have been respectively reduced.

I feel that is only fair, and especially that those unmarried men, although not earning a great deal, should be called upon to pay some little part—I believe the tax amounts to about $10,—so that they will feel that they are citizens of this country; that they have responsibilities, and that they are taking their fair part in this war. The next important point in regard to this change in the tax is that it affects a very large number of people, and, as a consequence, a substantial revenue will be received. No one, I believe, can take exception to the exemption of $200 granted in the case of each child. A similar provision has for some time existed in the American and British Acts, and this provision will tend to make the Act a great deal more fair, and as an Act becomes more fair, so will it become more popular, and so will the people of Canada become more willing to pay it.

I cannot say that the surtax which is proposed to be imposed by the Government, has impressed me as have the other two items. I do not know for what reason this tax has been imposed in this manner. As I understand it, this surtax is a tax upon the super tax already imposed, and it varies in degree as the incomes become greater. I do not, however, think that this surtax is substantial. It commences with a tax of 5 per cent on the tax already assessed under the old Act, and a tax of 5 per cent on the former tax is, in my opinion, not substantial, and I cannot see that it makes any great difference in the Act.

Speaking of the classes who should be exempted, I put out in a more or less tentative manner this idea, that while possibly those who are serving in His Majesty's forces and navy should not be entirely exempted from the operation of this tax, some exemptions, greater than those ordinarily given, should be granted to them, because I think it is evident to every one that, in most cases, those who are overseas are not receiving as much as they were heretofore receiving, or as much as they would to-day be able to earn in this country. If by sending them overseas we have taken away a source of income from them, then to that extent they should be exempted from the operation of this tax.

Leaving, however, those points which are more or less smaller points in this subject, I come to the next change which has been proposed by the minister. That is the very heavily increasing taxation on incomes over $50,000. To this I can only most heartily agree and say that I personally would be willing to go considerably further in regard to those increases. There is another great class of incomes in which no change has been made. There are large incomes, underneath the sum of $50,000, per year which are not very heavily affected by the present tax. In order that I may present this matter definitely, I shall lay before the House a table showing what the tax on incomes between $5,000 and $50,000 would be if the rate were doubled. This will be in the case of a married man without children, premising that the exemption would be $2,000, and that the rate between $2,000 and $3,000 would be one-half of the normal tax. This is the table:

Income.	Tax.	Net Income.
$2,500	$ 20	$ 2,480
3,000	40	2,960
4,000	120	3,880
5,000	200	4,800
6,000	280	5,720
10,000	760	9,240
20,000	2,560	17,449

I have read these figures to the House because I think they will show that even in the lowest income, for example, that of $2,500, the payment would be only $20. I do not think that could be considered as being too heavy a drain upon the individual, nor one which he could not well afford to pay. As we get up into the higher amounts, for example, an income of $20,000, I do not think the sum of $2,560 would be a tax which that man could not, having regard to everything in this country, pay, and I think that the balance of $17,440 should be sufficient for him to maintain himself upon each year. The first point I want to make is that I feel that the rate under the income tax should generally be substantially increased, and that especially the higher incomes should be very substantially taxed. I believe, upon the figures which I have just given to the House, showing the effect with the rate doubled, it is apparent that each person should be able to afford the tax which he would have to pay and should have quite sufficient left to maintain himself in the degree of comfort to which he has been accustomed. If any further evidence should be required as to the possibility of a family having an income of $2,500 being able to afford a tax of $20 and to live on a net income of $2,480, I should like, for purposes of comparison, to draw the attention of the House to a large class of families living to-day in Canada. Every hon. member has met with them in his constituency. I refer to the families of soldiers overseas who are living on the moneys which the Government and the Patriotic Fund give to them. We all know the sort of life that some of those families have to lead. We know they have nothing but the bare necessities of life. I believe $15 is the amount of the assigned pay, $25 the amount of the separation allowance, where there are no children, and the amount donated by the Patriotic Fund varies. Think for a moment of the amount on which those families are living, and they comprise no inconsiderable proportion of the people of this country. Some 400,000 men have enlisted, and from that we can deduce the number of families in our country who are living on that scale. Personally, I believe the amounts payable to those families should be increased; but I am using this illustration to show the possibility of a family living on a less income than it now receives. I quite agree with the statement that a tax to be successful must be popular. I believe the people of Canada would accept a very substantial increase in the income tax, and the more readily because the strain of war is upon them. Our people are interested in the war more than in any other question which could possibly come before them, and for that reason I think they would not object to the payment of this additional tax. It may be urged that the cost of living is higher, but on the other hand money is freer and wages in a great many, if not the majority of cases, are higher.

Another reason why I think the tax should be increased now is that we are having what might be termed a period of prosperity to a certain extent caused by war conditions, and I think we should collect for the purposes of the war a substantial portion of the money that has been made by reason of the war. I am not advocating any very drastic tax. I do not think the figures I have given could be considered drastic. Another reason why I think we should increase this tax now is lest our people might get the idea that the tax will never be increased, that the present tax is fixed and furnishes a precedent. If the time is ripe, and I think it is, we should move up logically to the next step.

Referring to the collection of the income tax, the Minister of Finance last session stated that one great objection to such a tax in this country was the vastness of our territory, compared to our population, which made its collection difficult, but that objection is eliminated as regards the increased tax I am proposing, because we already have our collecting system established, and it would cost very little, if anything, more to collect a higher tax.

Let us consider what would be the result to the finances of this country if the present income tax were doubled or trebled, and if higher rates were assessed on the bigger incomes. The Acting Minister of Finance, in introducing this tax, estimated it would yield between seventeen and twenty million dollars, and I do not think any public statement has been made in reference to that estimate since. Taking that as our basis, and premising the doubling or trebling of the rate and increasing the assessment on higher incomes, we could hope to obtain in this way a sum between fifty and seventy-five million dollars. I believe this amount is required in this country to-day. It is true we are paying our current expenditure, and still have some surplus to apply on our post-war indebtedness. It is all a question of the extent to which we should go in the imposition of taxes, in the reduction of our

indebtedness, and in the amount of indebtedness we are justified in leaving to the future. I believe the amount realized from this tax, together with the surplus which we now appear to have from year to year, would enable us to reduce our war expenditure by at least one hundred million dollars a year, and I do not think we should set our ambitions at anything lower than that. England in the years 1916 and 1917 paid off 17 per cent of her war expenditure, and she did that almost entirely by direct taxation, for she has not, relatively speaking, any customs revenue. England has done that while she is fighting with her back to the wall, while she can hear the guns of the enemy thundering across the channel. In view of the great strain and financial demands upon them and their proximity to the war, it is astounding that the people of England have been able to pay off as much as 17 per cent of their war expenditure. The Americans are arranging to pay off 14 per cent, and while it is a matter for congratulation that we in Canada have paid off 11 per cent, I know of no reason why Canada should not do as well as England and the United States, and I feel that this is possibly the easiest and most proper way to raise the money required to retire annually such a substantial portion of our war indebtedness.

It may be said by some, that if we impose such a severe tax it would interfere with our war loans. I quite agree that the major portion of the money we require to carry on this war must be obtained by means of war loans, but I do not think the imposition of this tax would interfere with the success of the war loans. After all, while the sum is substantial in itself, it is not very great for each individual, nor is it very great in comparison with the amount which we may have to borrow. To take care of our war needs, the next loan may have to be for $400,000,000. I do not think the imposition of this tax would cause our people to subscribe less freely to the war loans, or decrease to any appreciable extent the funds which they would have to subscribe.

One thing at least is clear. By the imposition of this tax we should reach a class of our people who do not now subscribe to war loans, and who but for the imposition of some such tax as this will never contribute to this war. From one end of our country to the other there is scattered a class, small, it is true, who for different reasons are not contributing to our war loans, and this is the only manner in which they can be made to do their share.

I might suggest this further idea. If it is apparent to our people that their incomes will be substantially taxed for war purposes, and if we continue to make our war loans free from income tax I should imagine the imposition of this tax would incline people more and more to the purchase of war loan bonds. Whether we should issue our war loans free of income tax, is a very important question. In order to influence people gradually to buying loans subject to income tax, an option might be given to purchase bonds at par, if they want them free of income tax, or at something less than par if they are to be subject to the income tax. A gentleman suggested that to me in conversation to-day, and it is a possible mode of making the transition from loans free of income tax to loans subject to the tax. Personally, I do not think this tax would have any bad effect on the war loans, and I certainly think it should be imposed. I think that all we have to do is to grasp this question firmly and put it through. I believe that we will find that this tax will be popular, that our people will pay it without complaining and that they will rise to the necessities of the situation by purchasing war bonds as they did before.

Some people may object to the increase of this tax because they fear that our people, or their money to some extent, may emigrate to the United States. One can only estimate what the effect of a substantial increase in this tax may be in that regard. I can only say in the light I have been able to obtain with regard to the question that I do not believe that such a result as this will be brought about. Eventually our indebtedness must be paid. The United States are perhaps, in some regards, not in as good a condition as we are with reference to the financial side of our war operations. We are further on in the war than they are; we know where we are; we know how much we must provide, what we have to provide for and what our expenses are. On the other hand the United States are practically commencing. They do not know what their costs will be and they do not know exactly the form of taxation which it will be advisable for them to impose. So, I cannot see any great force in any comparison which might be made if we should raise the rates of taxation in this country higher than those which exist in the United States. While that may be true with regard to emigration to the United

States, unless we substantially decrease our national debt that may act as a great deterent to immigration into this country. We should endeavour to so reduce our national debt that after the war Canada can be looked to by the prospective immigrants as a country which, if it has not a proportionately less debt has no greater debt than other countries which may be offering inducements to immigrants. Having regard to our great need of immigration after the war, the problem of the amount of our national debt will be an important factor, and we should endeavour to grapple with that problem now as firmly as we can. When the war is completed we will require a large amount of money to develop the resources of the country, to carry on until they become more productive our railways to assist our returned soldiers and to promote those more or less co-operative enterprises which are creeping into our national life. We shall be very seriously handicapped if, at the end of the war, we have made no substantial progress in redeeming an appreciable part of our national debt.

I do not believe that the imposition of this tax will tend to discourage or disorganize business in any manner. It may be true that the business profits war tax—that is, the tax on business itself—if carried too far, might discourage initiative and enterprise among business men but it must be remembered that this income tax is not being levied on business itself, where perhaps some surplus is required for the purpose of new enterprises and expansion, but it is being levied on money that is free even from the control of business organizations. It is not being taken away from any particular business. It is being taken from the moneys of individual people throughout the country and I do not see that there is any great danger of discouraging initiative or enterprise or harming business in any way. This is perhaps the feature of greatest importance that we must consider in imposing any tax. I feel personally that there is no substantial reason why the rate of this tax should not be doubled or even trebled and why incomes in the higher amounts should not be even more heavily assessed than they appear to be in the Budget which has been brought down. I have not been able to discover any good reason why this should not be done and I feel personally very strongly that it should be done. I think that I have made out an economic case for increasing substantially the rate of this tax. There is another feature and that is that this tax would act in the nature of an equalizer in the matter of sacrifice in this country. A large proportion of our people were called upon to go overseas, to work for $1.10 a day, to endure hardships and to run the risk of losing their lives, many have lost them. At home their families are living on the bare necessities. These men are not able to take advantage of the economic prosperity here as many of us who remain at home have been able to. We are enjoying all the conditions which we would have enjoyed in peace time. In addition, we are enjoying even greater prosperity than ordinarily exists in peace time. I have been very closely in touch with a large portion of those who are serving overseas ever since the outbreak of the war, and I think I can indicate to the House what their feelings are. They have a right to express their feelings in regard to this matter, and they feel that while they are doing these things for us we should sacrifice something ourselves. We should sacrifice something out of the money we are making and which we can well afford to part with. It seems to me that when our fellow Canadians overseas are endeavouring to defend us against the German onslaught we might be called upon to protect and defend this country against any burden of excessive debt or any possibility of bankruptcy. Therefore, I believe this measure will be an equalizer or sacrifice, and I believe further that those of our people who remain at home and who have not been called upon as yet to make as great a sacrifice as have the soldiers, wish to do their fair share. This tax will not be unpopular. On the contrary, it will be popular. I believe that the people expressed themselves on that point at the last election, and that it was their intention, and their mandate to the Government to increase the taxation as well as to obtain the necessary men. For the reasons I have given, more especially for the economic reasons, I recommend that the question of substantial increases in the rates under the Income Tax Act, should receive the most careful consideration of this House.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, like every member of the House and many taxpayers outside, I was very much interested in the Budget speech as brought down by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance. I appreciate that at a time like this it is a very difficult matter to produce a Budget that will meet with the approval of every one. In this

time of stress and trouble in Canada it is particularly hard, but I believe that it is our duty, not only in connection with the Budget, but in connection with any legislation that may be brought down, to have but one thought in mind, and but one object in view: that is to enact such laws as will best assist our country and the Empire at the present time. Any criticism that I may have to offer will be absolutely with that object in view and animated by that spirit.

I feel that the Government are deserving of particular credit for their Order in Council permitting the introduction of tractors free. Anything that will tend to increase production in Canada at the present time will be of real assistance to the Allies and of real assistance to the country. I only regret that the Government do not see their way to going further and absolutely eliminating the duty on all farming implements. Personally I stand, always have stood, for a tariff for revenue purposes, but as has been well said by various hon. gentlemen, this is not the time for tariff discussion. It is rather a time when we should come to a decision to do what is best for the country; and surely no one can gainsay that what Canada needs now is greater production. If free tractors will make for greater production, surely free agricultural implements of all kinds will make for that result to an even greater extent, and I believe the Government should give this matter further consideration.

So far as the re-imposition of the Business Profits War Tax is concerned, I feel that the action of the Government will meet with the approval of the people at large. I do not agree with one hon. gentleman who said that perhaps the business interests will feel aggrieved. My own experience of the business men of Canada, during this war, is that they have been generous of their time, generous of their money, and even generous of their families, and I believe they will be the last to grumble with respect to any taxes which the Government require them to pay. But, Sir, should there be men among them who do not desire to pay over to the Government some of the profits they are receiving at the present time, it is fitting and proper that measures should be taken that will enable the Government to collect such profits.

I quite agree with what my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Redman) has said with reference to the Income Tax, and I think the proposition should receive the careful consideration of the Government. I believe that the men who are in a position to pay that tax should be required to pay, that the men who are in a position to carry the burden should be made to carry it; and the burden should be made as light as possible upon those who can least afford to pay it, that is, the working classes of Canada. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary that if it is not too late some action should be taken along that line.

In connection with the Income Tax, there is a matter which affects our own locality, to which I would be glad to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance, and it is this: Living on the border, as we do in the city of Windsor, there are many of our citizens who are employed across the river in the city of Detroit, and, vice versa, there are many citizens of Detroit who are employed in Windsor. To-day Canadians who cross from Windsor to work in Detroit are subjected to a tax of two and a half per cent on their wages, but there is no provision for such a tax on American workmen crossing to our side. I do not advocate imposing a tax on American workmen coming into Canada, because I realize that in many instances their wages are not very large and they could not perhaps afford to pay it, but I do believe there should be some reciprocal arrangement between the two countries that would free our people from the obligation of paying this tax. I do not know whether the minister has had the matter before him, but I hope that representations have been made to Washington that will enable us to bring about a settlement of this matter in a manner that will be satisfactory to our people.

There is another suggestion that I wish to offer to the minister. There may be reasons why it should not be accepted, but they do not occur to me at the moment, and that is in connection with the Business Profits War Tax and the Income Tax. It would seem to me advisable, if possible, that when statements are sent in by corporations or by individuals, they should be accompanied by a cheque for the amount which is owing the Government at that time. I know of some cases—and I have no doubt there are other members of the House who know of many cases—in so far as the Business Profits Tax is concerned, dating back to 1915 that have not been adjusted. This country is a heavy borrower, and if it is possible to adjust anything that may be wrong in this statement, it is just

as easy and just as feasible to adjust it with a cheque rather than to allow the matter to drift for two or three years with the amount that is due remaining uncollected. I believe if the Finance Minister will take that matter under advisement he will probably find it will enable him to come into the immediate possession of many millions of dollars that otherwise he might have to wait for until the matters in dispute have been adjusted. I give the suggestion to the hon. gentleman for what it is worth.

I am heartily in accord with the tax that has been placed upon the packers; after listening to the statement of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) tonight, I do not believe there is a man in the House who will say that he is not heartily in accord with the tax which has been placed upon those gentlemen. My thought in connection with this matter is this: I hope that the Government of this country will not realize a five cent piece from the excess profits so far as the packers are concerned; there should be some regulation of prices in the interest of the consumer, and if this is done there will be no excess profits. I know what I am talking about, because I live in a city and I am in touch with workingmen who are earning three to four dollars a day. It is difficult for them to get along as it is, and properly care for their families, bearing in mind the high prices exacted for food, clothing, shoes, rent and fuel, without paying profits either to the packers or to the Government. It does not make very much difference to the workingman with his three and a half or four dollars a day, whether the profits go to the packer or go to the Government. In the one instance he, perhaps, gets an indirect benefit, but that benefit is not very apparent to him when he draws his wages at the end of the week and settles his bills. Therefore, I believe that, if possible, legislation should be enacted with a view to regulating prices in the interest of the working classes. I do not know whether the Food Control Board can be utilized in this connection, certainly some effort should be made to regulate food prices so that the average worker may have the opportunity to live like a white man in this country of ours.

There is one tax that I do not agree with, but take great exception to, and that is the tax on tea. It does seem to me that the Government could have found some other method of raising three million dollars per annum than by taxing the poor man's table

I would suggest to the Finance Minister that he take a look at the Financial Times of Saturday, April 20, 1918, where he will notice an interesting statement. It shows that $500,000,000 constituted the three-year profits of ninety companies, and the paper in question gives a list of the companies. Some of them were food companies, some were steel companies, and all of them will bear inspection. It seems to me that many of these companies could well have contributed the $3,000,000 that is being exacted from the people of Canada by a ten-cent tax on tea. Now, the Financial Times is a very responsible paper; it speaks for "the interests" in this country, if any paper does, and it says this:

> Five Canadian steel companies: Dominion Steel Corporation, Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Lake Superior Corporation, Ontario Steel Products, and the Steel Company of Canada for 1917 report earnings aggregating $27,582,623, compared with $9,341,460 in 1915, being an increase of 196 per cent.

I have also before me the annual report of the Steel Company of Canada, which shows that in 1914 the profits for the year were $539,811, and in 1917, the net profits, after deducting charges for repairs, maintenance and improvements, and providing for war tax, amounted to $6,040,318. The figures which I have given might well be investigated by the Government, when perhaps the Acting Minister of Finance would find some other way of raising the $3,000,000 that he proposes to collect by a tax on tea. I have another suggestion to offer in connection with the $3,000,000, and that is that the Order in Council to control the packers should be made retroactive, thus enabling the Acting Finance Minister to go back after Sir Joseph Flavelle and his eighty per cent. If the Acting Finance Minister does that it will meet with the approval of the people, and the Government will stand high in the public estimation. Furthermore, by carrying out my suggestion they will be placing the burden where it properly belongs.

There is another matter that to my mind merits the attention of this House, a matter which concerns the whole of our people and yet seems to have passed unnoticed—I refer to the amalgamation of banks. We who have been reading the press know that very recently there have been two amalgamations. and we know that slowly, but surely, the number of chartered banks in this country is decreasing. During the past ten years the chartered banks have decreased from thirty-four to nineteen, and it will only be a matter of a short time until we probably

will have in this country three great banking systems, perhaps the Bank of Montreal, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and the Royal Bank. And these banks, with a couple dozen of directors, will control the finances of this country. I do not believe that that will be a good thing for Canada. Nor do I believe that any amalgamation of banks should occur at the present time, at least until the matter is brought before the Banking and Commerce Committee and this House. We are the representatives of the people; the banks are the trustees of the people. The people place their money in the banks, and they should be under Government regulations, as they are. I cannot see why the Acting Minister of Finance, or the Governor in Council, should have the power to permit the amalgamation of banks without having the matter discussed in the House. I can appreciate that under some conditions there might be necessity for immediate action to protect the depositors or shareholders, but I do not believe that under proper Government inspection there is even a remote contingency of that kind. I think the banks in this country are strong financially, and certainly the amalgamation that took place the other day between the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of British North America had no justification. We, representing the people, should have the opportunity of knowing why these amalgamations are being made and what their object is.

You know, Sir, that in the United States very recently—and I speak very deferentially of the United States, because I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite are giving it some thought these days and are treating the United States rather deferentially too—a law was enacted as against what they term interlocking directorates. We in Canada seem to be getting away from that, and we are interlocking the banks rather than the directorates. I think the time has reasonably come when the law should be changed. Perhaps it is almost sacriligeous to say a word against the Canadian banking system. We are told from early morning till late at night that it is the greatest system in the world, that it makes currency elastic, that it keeps up the credit of the country, that it is so superior that no other possible system should be thought of. I believe it is a good system so far as elasticity of currency is concerned. But, while it may be a better system than they have in the United States, the Americans seem to have worried along pretty well notwithstanding the fact that their system does not begin to compare with ours. From my knowledge of it, I have no hesitation in saying that they seem to be pretty well satisfied with it. It does something which this system of ours does not do; it encourages the growth of smaller communities and builds up small towns and cities. Under the system in vogue in Canada, the banks, outside of two or three great centres, are simply depositories. They obtain what deposits they can, which are transferred as speedily as possible to the head offices which use them for any purpose desired. It is a well known fact that money which should have been used for the development of Canadian manufacturing and other enterprises has gone into Mexico, the West Indies, South America and even into far-off Spain;—and to Germany also, as the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Joseph Read) informs me. There is a difference between this and the American banking system. Under the American system, if a man wants a credit he goes to the bank, and fifteen minutes afterwards he knows whether he is to get it or not. The personality of the borrower, not always the collateral that he takes with him, is the basis of the credit. A man's character, his business ability, his record in the community, are large considerations under the American banking system. What happens under our Canadian system? When a man outside a large centre wants money, he goes to the local manager of a bank and fills out two or three forms, which are forwarded to the inspector for the district. The inspector examines these carefully and turns them over to the second vice-president, second general manager, or somebody else, who, if the loan is large enough or of sufficient consequence, turns the matter over to the board of directors. If the directors do not want the money for some one close at home on the day in question, the man is liable to get it—but he is more liable not to get it. That is the difference between the United States system and ours. The great New England manufacturing centres have been built up by the American banking system. In banking, as in other businesses, one requires competition. It is a mistake to permit banks to amalgamate, and I submit that no further amalgamations should be permitted without good reason therefore being given on the floor of this House.

Since I have been in this House I have heard a great deal about what the Government have been doing; how very capable the administration has been; how glad the people ought to be because they have Union Government. May I say to hon. gentlemen

in all sincerity that the atmosphere of Ottawa is not necessarily the atmosphere of this whole Dominion. There are places in Canada to-day where ministers of this Government could go and not be met by a torchlight procession. Nine out of ten men who come to Ottawa to interview Cabinet ministers want something for themselves or for their friends, and very naturally they tell these hon. gentlemen that they are the annointed of Heaven; that they are the only Cabinet ministers that ever were, or ever will be; that this is the only Government that ever was or ever will be. Well, that is not the view which is taken by a great many of the people. The Government has been in office over four months, and I submit that they have not lived up to the advance notices of their press agents. I shall refer to two or three matters which will bear out what I say.

I supported the Government so far as the Military Service Act is concerned. No hon. gentleman can say seriously that the Government deserve credit for the manner in which they have administered that Act from its inception up to the present time. Hon. gentlemen have told the farmers one thing one day and changed their minds the next, to such an extent that men working on farms and engaged in various forms of production, thus assisting the men at the front, do not know whether to stay on the farms or not. The Government made a big mistake when they passed the Order in Council the other day with regard to military service. They would have been well advised had they accepted the amendment offered from this side of the House and adopted a different procedure with regard to the farmers. However, they changed their mind before the election and again after the election, and it is quite probable that they will change it again—it all depends on the number of deputations that come here. Throughout the country there is a feeling of unrest among the farmers, who have no confidence in what the Government does. The men who are exempted to-day do not know how soon their turn will come; do not know whether they are justified in spending money or in proceeding with their farm work. Their exemptions may terminate to-morrow or the next day, and consequently production is interfered with. On the whole, the Government have not administered the Military Service Act as they should have done. I supported them on the principle of military service and I therefore feel free to criticise them and to say that I am disappointed, as many of their followers must be.

Another matter about which I have heard a good deal of talk since I came here—some from the Acting Minister of Finance—is the Victory loan. I agree that it is a great credit to the people that they subscribed over $400,000,000 to the Victory loan; Canadians may always be relied upon to do their share at any spot in the road, whether in men, money or munitions—they have always done so. But the people's money should be economically and judiciously expended. In my opinion, the cost of floating the Victory loan and placing it before the people was excessive and extravagant to a degree that perhaps many hon. gentlemen do not appreciate. Approximately $400,000,000 were raised, and the acting minister says that the total cost will be in the neighbourhood of 1¼ per cent, or $5,000,000. That is too much money to pay for floating a loan of $400,000,000. It is true that a Toronto broker, interviewed by one of the Toronto papers, said that the cost was reasonable; that the ordinary rate was 3 per cent, and that the Government were to be congratulated on having handled the loan at such a low rate as 1¼ per cent. But to ask a broker his opinion of the commission paid on a loan is like asking a grocer whether his eggs are fresh—you get the same kind of an answer. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite will be interested in some figures with regard to the floating of loans in the United States, the country that they are now following so closely, whose example they are emulating so frequently, and whose precedent ought to have some weight with them. Last week in the city of Detroit subscriptions closed to the third Liberty Loan bond issue. I have in my hand a letter from John W. Staley, First Vice-President of the People's State Bank, Detroit, a responsible and respectable gentleman whom I know, who was Chairman of the Liberty Loan Campaign Committee for that district. He says:

> Acknowledging receipt of your telegram I beg to say that the United States Government has allowed no commission either to committees, salesmen or banks for handling the First, Second, or Third Liberty Loan bond issues. The Government has allowed a portion of the expense, which however, has been so small as to be of little importance. The allotment for expenses of our committee here for selling $52,000,000 bonds of the Third Liberty Loan is limited to $6,500.

In the city of Detroit the committee secured subscriptions to the Liberty Loan

amounting to $52,000,000, and the cost was only $6,500. On the basis of the cost of floating the Victory Loan subscriptions amounting to $52,000,000, if secured in Canada, would have cost this country $600,000. For our $400,000,000 we paid $5,000,000; on the same basis, every time the cost of floating loan in Detroit was one cent, the cost of floating loan in Canada was one dollar. I do not believe that the Americans can do anything we cannot do. I believe, under Government leadership, if the Acting Minister of Finance will go out to the pe ple of this country, he can get the same results that are being secured in the United States. I know that he can, in our section, get men who will be glad, voluntarily to give their time. The newspapers have been a big item in the expenditure. The Government, as returns show, have spent a tremendous amount of money in advertising. What has been the practice on the other side of the line? The largest papers over there have voluntarily given their columns without a cent of expense. I have before me a statement issued which shows that space worth $4,712,238 was donated to the United States Government by 270 newspapers, newspapers like the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Louisville Courier-Journal, without a dollar of expense. I should like the Acting Minister of Finance to go to those newspapers that are preaching sacrifice and tell them to practise what they preach. Let him point out to them what the newspapers in the United States are doing, and what the American people are willing to do for patriotic purposes, and let him ask them if they are less patriotic than the people of the United States. That is one way in which to save money for the people of Canada. If the Acting Minister of Finance is going to float a new loan, let the people of Canada feel that the money is to be spent decently and economically. Let me give an instance—I give this only for the purpose, I was almost going to say, of a warning to the Acting Minister of Finance out of my personal regard for him. I find, in the list of expenses in connection with Canada's Victory Loan of 1917, a Victory Loan film of Sir Thomas White costing $7,368.91. Sir Thomas White is a great man. There is no question about that. He is so great, he must live in the United States at the present time while acting as our Minister of Finance. Notwithstanding that fact, I would suggest to the acting minister that he do not emulate the Minister of Finance when the time comes. I appreciate the fact that nature has been kind to the acting minister; that he probably would do well in the "Movies," but $7,368.91 is too much to pay even for a moving picture of the Acting Minister of Finance. Let me tell the acting minister—and this is worth thinking about—that while the people of Canada were asked to pay $7,368.91 for a "movie" of Sir Thomas White, it cost the United States Government in the city of Detroit $6,500 to get $52,000,000 worth of bonds subscribed. That is what a government is for, and that is what hon. gentlemen opposite are in office for, namely, to protect the people, to look after their interest and to give them a square deal. They are not doing that if they allow money to be spent in this way. I mention that fact only to show my hon. friends opposite that in union government it is not absolutely all plain sailing. Here and there one hears a word almost of disapprobation. Here and there one hears just a whisper that perhaps those gentlemen are not all heaven-born administrators. Perhaps they are just as human as other governments have been and are, and probably it will not do a bit of harm to tell them that the people of this country are watching them; that they expect them to look after their affairs honestly. If they do that, the people are willing to support them, but not otherwise.

I have, perhaps, taken up more of the time of the House than I intended to do. I have not much more to say, but in conclusion I want to say this: I gave the Government support on the Military Service Bill. I did so honestly and conscientiously. I want to win the war, as every man in this country wants to win the war but if this Government are going to get the support of the people and if they are going to succeed, they must let the people feel that they are handling the affairs of the country as they should be handled, honestly and fairly. It is just as much the duty of the Acting Minister of Finance to handle and to pay out the moneys of the people of this country so that value will be obtained as it is to provide for taxation. A man is not necessarily a great financier just because he can get in money. It helps a great deal if he knows how to pay out money. I am not satisfied with the figures before me in connection with this Victory Loan that his predecessor knew how to pay out money. I hope the acting minister will look over the expenditures in connection with this loan before he goes on with his new loan; that he will find out

how the Victory Loan was arranged for, and that he will not do anything along the same lines, but will do something different. I do not believe that the Minister of Finance handled the Victory Loan in the proper manner. If the Government will go out to the people of the different cities and towns in this country, they will receive the support of all the business men, who will be glad to give their time for nothing so as to help this country in this great crisis.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I presume it is the wish of the House that the debate should be continued. I do not like to inflict myself upon the members at so late an hour as this; but if it is the wish of the House, I shall proceed, and my good frend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) may bear a part of the blame on account of his three and a half hour's speech.

The proposals of the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) were very well placed before the House, and with them I am in hearty accord. I am sorry I cannot agree with the criticisms of my hon. frend from North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) with regard to the duty on tea. No fitter tax could possibly be placed on anything in Canada that is not taxed than the tea and coffee tax. That is a tax that touches everybody—and so it should. The war is everybody's war, and those that cannot be reached through the Income Tax, which is only for those who have a considerable income, can be reached by such minor taxes as that, and I must entirely dissent from my hon. friend in taking exception to the taxing of tea and coffee, because those are natural products that are used by everybody and are very legitimate objects of taxation. Our hon. friends opposite are very fond of quoting free trade England, as to what should be taxed and what not. Even now the tax on tea in Canada is very much less than the tax on tea in free trade England, and the same is true in regard to coffee and cocoa. Therefore, my hon. frend, if he is a free trader, must say that the precedent is good when the acting minister has adopted a tax that has been in vogue in Great Britain for upwards of a quarter of a century, and which is bringing into them million of pounds sterling per annum. In my judgment, this tax should have been imposed three years ago. When the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) made his first Budget speech after the war started, I told him privately that he had missed the best opportunity of taxation I knew of, and that was tea. He told me it would be putting a great deal of money into the pockets of tea holders, but the Acting Minister of Finance has shown that there can be placed upon tea a tax which is not only prospective, but retroactive, and it will be collected on all the teas that are in store as well as on teas that are now to be stored. This is very commendable, and the acting minister has followed that policy with regard to some other matters mentioned in his tax list.

The new taxation is moderate and judicious and cannot reasonably be taken exception to by any of our citizens. Exception has been taken to it to a certain extent, but, I think, in a very limited way by our friends opposite who have spoken on the question up to the present. Taxation, in all its forms, is more or less objectionable, and no one likes to be taxed in any way that can possibly be avoided, but in war times such as these taxation is absolutely necessary in order that the coffers of the Government may be filled. The coffers of the Government have been fairly well filled during the past year, and the Acting Minister of Finance has been able to tell us we have a surplus over ordinary expenditure of about $55,000,000.

It is true my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) takes exception to that and says there is no surplus at all if the book-keeping is properly done. He says the acting minister is crediting all the taxes raised for war purposes in order to make a good showing. But in doing that he is only pursuing the policy that has been adopted by all Finance Ministers in the past, including the Finance Minister of the Government of which my hon. friend was a supporter for so many years. They all took this taxation and credited it as the Acting Minister of Finance has done on this occasion. There are those, I know, who think that the taxation should take care of pretty nearly all the cost of the war, but in my judgment that is not a well founded opinion. This is not a war of this generation alone. This war was not brought about by the men of Canada; we were forced into it, and in my judgment it is up to posterity as well as to the present generation to pay a share of the cost of this war, and future generations will recognize that in no uncertain way; they will admit that part of the burden borne by the Allied countries has justly been placed on them, and they will bear their fair share in the years to come. When the young men of this generation are going forth to fight—

and they are worth more than our money, when they are giving their life's blood in order that the future generation may be spared such a war—it is but a light thing to ask that posterity should help pay the cost of this war. I think the Finance Minister has been very wise in not attempting to pay all the cost of the war at the present time, and I know that here I am not in accord with two or three hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who spoke yesterday. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) stated that the people should pay the cost of the war practically as we went along; that is an impossibility, and it would be unwise for us to do it even if it were possible. This war is for future generations as well as for the present, and posterity should bear, and will be willing to bear, part of the burden that has been added to the public debt. We are giving our young men, who cannot be replaced. Capital can be replaced, either by borrowing or by production. Therefore, I say, this generation is making a sacrifice that the future generations will not be called upon to make. We believe the object is worth the price. We are fighting for the liberties of the world, fighting that right may prevail, and that iniquity wherever it is exalted shall be brought low. The utmost that we can do to win the war is what is required of us at the present time. Nothing else counts. That is the reason we have at the present time a Government that has been brought together with the object of winning the war. That brings me to a point my hon. friend from North Cape Breton made in his discursive speech of three hours and a half. He referred to me as the first man to say that there was an agreement entered into as to the formation of this Government. I was not in the House when he made that statement—I endeavoured to put in the three hours while he was speaking, but I could not put in all the time. Now I am not in possession of any private information that is not open to the hon. gentleman, or that has not been open to him as to any agreement or agreements that were made between the various parties composing the present Government. What I stated the other evening was what I believed to be the truth, and what is common knowledge not only to the members of this House who take any interest in current events but to all those who read the newspapers. The newspapers have said there was an agreement by which Union Government was brought about. Otherwise, the Union Government could not have been brought together. This Union Government, as I understand it, is composed of men from both sides of politics who were prepared to sink all difference and strive to win the war; that was the one and sole purpose. That was declared from every platform in our part of the country, and I am sorry Cape Breton is so far from the centre of civilization and population that the hon. member did not hear of it until now. It appears our hon. friend from Cape Breton North never heard of it during the election. Up in our part of the country it was announced from every platform that that was the basis of Union Government, that all minor matters were to stand aside, that all these matters the hon. gentleman has referred to in his discursive speech of three and a half hours to-night were not to be mentioned by men on this side of the House. The one sole object was to win the war, believing that nothing else mattered, believing that if we lost the war we lost everything. That was what brought these men together—and all honour to them—who, holding their opinions just as strongly as I hold mine, were prepared to lay them aside and to say: This is a special time when men are called upon to sacrifice, and we propose to sacrifice our opinions for the general good, and to devote ourselves entirely to the winning of the war and to nothing else until that has been accomplished.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will sacrifice everything but ploughs.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I will come to that presently.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: With reference to potatoes, I should like to ask—

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I shall come to McIntyre potatoes presently. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has said that I am ready to sacrifice everything but implements. He may think I am a man who avoids difficulties, but I will tell him that I am going to face that question a little later on if he will have patience. I say that the people of this country are unanimously back of this Government with the object of winning the war. They sent this Government here with a majority the like of which has never been seen in Canada before, and great things are expected of it. If my hon. friends do not believe that, let them read the returns which were placed on the table a few days ago showing the majorities by which members of the House were elected, and they will see that the overwhelming opinion of this country was

in favour of just what was proposed; that is, the winning of the war and letting all these minor issues which it is so easy to raise and so hard to allay, stand aside as matters of small moment until the one aim had been accomplished of downing the enemy, backing the boys at the front, and seeing that the sinews of war are provided in the way that Canada is able to provide them. That is what this Government was elected to do, and that is what this Government have set about to do. I do not admire the spirit that has prompted my hon. friend from North Cape Breton to-night to drag in so many ulterior subjects when the Empire is fighting for its life, when the liberty of the world is at stake, and when all those institutions that we have devoted generations to building up are in the balance and in danger of being lost. At a time like this my hon. friend would have us pay attention to some cobbler's letter that has been written from some little village or town up West. My hon. friend was surely trifling when he wished this House in war time to come down to such small talk as the greater part of his speech consisted of. I must say that for a man who has occupied a seat upon the Bench the frivolity with which he can debate public questions for such a length of time is surprising. My hon. friend asks if it was a shoemaker's bench. I cannot say whether it was so valuable as that. I do not know what kind of a bench it was but I am told that the hon. gentleman descended from a bench to come here.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is possibly looking for another invitation to go outside.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If my hon. friend is ready, I am quite ready to accept an invitation of that kind at any time although I do not think that such a spectacle would be fitting in the case of a judge. It might be in the case of an ordinary layman like myself but I think that the court that my hon. friend is supposed to stand in would not be elevated by the acceptance of such an invitation. This is a war in which, as I say, all provinces and all classes should be united. I am sorry to say that all provinces have not been as forward in this matter as they might have been but I am glad to say that in that respect the Dominion as a whole is improving. I believe that if the war continues, this pounding that we are getting will finally weld us together in such a way that we will, before the end of the war, be a united people with only one object, the winning of the war and the saving of liberty and civilization to posterity. That is what is entrusted to us at the present time and I hope we will not be remiss in our duty.

This is not a poor man's war only. We have often heard the statement: the poor man has to do all the fighting; let the rich do all the paying. That sounds very well. I do not know what part of the country these gentlemen come from who make such a statement as that. Up our way there is no division between rich and poor in that respect. The sons of the so-called rich, if there are such, are just as eager in proportion to their numbers as are the sons of the poor man in going out to the war and in offering their lives as a sacrifice for the benefit of the Empire and their country. There is no such thing as hanging back on the part of any in our community or throughout the province of Ontario. I am told that in most parts of the country it is the same. That is the general spirit that pervades rich and poor alike. All are contributing of their means and their blood to help to win this war. The war situation, too, is not as bright as we would wish it to be. The war situation has been, perhaps, more critical during the last few weeks than it has ever been at any time during the last three years. We hope that things are improving, but we know that more men are required to fill the ranks of our Canadian army, and, in my judgment, any man, whether he is an agriculturist or a city man, who throws any obstacle in the way of filling our ranks is not taking a patriotic view of the situation. I understood my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Kennedy) to take strong objection to the call that is now being made. The Government have been most lenient in making this call. The Government have stood back as long as they possibly could from making that call and now not from choice, but from necessity all men from twenty to twenty-three years of age are called on without excuse to come forward and be ready to take their places in the front line. It becomes the duty of every citizen and of every business man to see that there shall be nothing allowed to stand in the way of the enforcement of this regulation.

I had intended to say a few words with regard to the railway situation, which has been dwelt upon by several members of the House. I have no apologies to make for the Government in purchasing this Canadian Northern Railway stock. I believe that it was the proper thing to do under the

circumstances. We do not know yet what it will cost the country, but we do know that something had to be done to keep this road out of the receiver's hands. The Government, feeling that they would be called upon to put in money without finally owning the road if present conditions continued, agreed to buy the stock at a valuation that should be arbitrated upon. It was a very fair proposition and I think it should not be criticized until we know what the finding of the commission is. I believe that the nationalization of railways will come eventually, perhaps not entirely for a few years, but this is one of the problems that we cannot undertake during the war. We have enough on our hands now and we do not want to undertake a railway problem as well. The railway problem, as the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) last night said, is almost as big as that of the war itself, and its solution calls for almost as great a financial outlay. A few minutes ago the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) challenged this side to show where a dollar was every misappropriated by the late Government that he had the honour of supporting. I do not know that I can tell him of a dollar, but I can tell him of several million dollars. The late Government never thought it worth while to misappropriate a dollar. They went in on a much larger scale. My hon. friend's memory must be a little short if he does not know that. He will perhaps remember that there was once a road built named the Grand Trunk Pacific and Transcontinental and that it was built by a certain Government that my hon. friend was a supporter of. With all the virtues that he seemed to claim for that Administration, I think I can refresh his memory a little, although he seems somewhat sleepy at this late hour. There was a commission appointed to find out how this road was built, and this commission found that—

Mr. McKENZIE: A commission of superb liars.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not know whether my hon. friend thinks that he is parliamentary or not, but I do not think he is, Mr. Speaker. One or two of these gentlemen are in the Senate. They are just as honourable as is the hon. gentleman, and when he says that they are superb liars I would ask him to take that back. I would ask you to rule upon it, Mr. Speaker. At least one of these men is a member of the Senate.

Mr. McKENZIE: That does not matter; he was not a senator then.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I would appeal to you, Mr. Speaker. I ask if the characterization of superb liars, as applied to the members of a Royal commission appointed to investigate this railway, and one of whom at least is in the Senate, is a proper expression and whether it is parliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) meant to cast any reflection upon any member of the Senate, but if he did so, he should withdraw the expression.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not wish to dissent from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is a very mild one under the circumstances.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman tell this House why it was that the Government which he supports never dared to introduce that report into this House or to mention it within the walls of the Parliament of Canada?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If my memory serves me, they not only introduced it, but we had a very long debate upon it.

Mr. McKENZIE: You never did anything at all with it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think the famous George Graham, who no longer sits where my hon. friend sits, but who, I think, filled the seat fully better than my hon. friend does, made his famous speech of seven or eight hours upon the report of that commission.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He killed the report.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is still alive, and if my hon. friend will allow me, I am going to tell him what that commission found.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know what it found.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I might refresh the hon. gentleman's memory. If he does not know of any dollar that the Government which he supported misappropriated, I might remind him that this commission found that in that one matter alone they misappropriated $40,000,000 of the people's money. If the hon. gentleman has forgotten it I have not. Does he remember it now that I have refreshed his memory?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not true.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman says it is not true. What proof has he that it is not true? The facts and figures

are all given and they are recorded in black and white on the testimony of three men who spent a year or more investigating the building of that road. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) comes back with a very glib statement. Well, perhaps I can remind him of something else he has heard about, and that is the Quebec bridge. Did he ever hear of that? Does he know what happened to that bridge? Does he know how it happened that this country lost about twelve or fifteen million dollars in that structure alone? Still the hon. gentleman says that the Laurier Government have not misappropriated a dollar. The hon. gentleman probably has also forgotten the Newmarket canal. Did he ever hear of that? No, it is a long way from Cape Breton, and he does not travel very far from there to get his information. The Newmarket canal is a canal which exists without water; water is supposed to be pumped in under pressure of man-power to keep it going.

Mr. McKENZIE: You have some windmills up there that you do not want to hear about.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: There are some gas engines in the House that are very good indeed. If my hon. friend wants to be pugnacious I am quite willing to be the same. It is not very edifying, I admit. but when my hon. friend undertakes to tell this House that the Laurier Government never misappropriated a dollar I want to remind him of a few millions that were misspent, and there are many more that he can be reminded of if he looks through the whole period of fifteen years that he has traversed to-night.

The basis, as I have said, of the present Union Government was the winning of the war, and in order that I might not be recognized as the sole authority that there was such an arrangement, I want to read before I conclude an article that appeared in one of the western papers. I am very glad it came from the West because the value of things of this nature is almost double if produced West of the Great Lakes.

An hon. MEMBER: It is a good place to get them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is a good place to get them, as my hon. friend says, and I certainly have got very good testimony on that ground from the West. I believe that the whole conception of this basis of union was a very wise one, and I think it is desirable that we should know whether or not it is true. My hon. friend has said that he did not know that there was such a thing until I brought it to his attention. Well, I have here an article which I am going to read.

I shall not take my seat until I have dealt a little with the tariff question, with which my name has been so much identified by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and other hon. gentlemen. That is one of my reasons for taking part in this debate; I had no intention of doing so had not hon. gentlemen opposite devoted a great deal of attention to me. I am looked upon as a kind of a monster who is engaged in a business that is more illicit apparently than the liquor traffic, or anything of that sort. A man who is engaged in manufacturing, or supposed to be connected in any way, either directly or indirectly, with manufacturing, especially the manufacture of implements, seems to be regarded as a monster of the very deepest dye, who should not appear in polite society to any extent. My hon. friend from Brome shakes his head, but I am not imputing such ideas to him at all. Indeed, I have not the slightest objection to the remarks he made with regard to myself.

I am going to refer to that a little later on. I have said that there was a basis of union that was well defined, if not placed upon paper, and that was that all minor matters—I judge everything but the winning of the war to be a minor matter—were to be left in abeyance. That is the reason I made the statement. Hon. gentlemen opposite apparently thought that the joints of our armour could be most easily pierced in the tariff direction, and it is against the tariff, and especially against farm implements, that their attack is now directed. It is true that my hon. friend (Mr. McCrea) who is sitting on the front bench opposite, and who represents the paper business, has received a little bit of notoriety as well, and is, perhaps, a joint sinner with myself. He is a manufacturer engaged in the paper business. While my business is condemned by the member for Brome, that of the member for Sherbrooke I take it is largely supported by him—

Mr. McCREA: There is no protection on our business now.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: —at least, that is the attitude to which he addressed himself. I want now to read the article to which I referred. It is expressed, I admit, in rather strong language, but they do use rather strong language in the West. Being a man of moderate words, I think I should have put it more mildly. But it is so much in

accord with what I believe that I cannot do better than read it.

An hon. MEMBER: Where was it published?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: In the Winnipeg Telegram, which, I suppose, is known to some of our western friends, especially those from Winnipeg. I have occasionally seen it, and think it a well edited paper. I think the article appeared on March 30, although there is no date marked on it:

THE TARIFF DANGER.

Nothing more dangerous to the continued existence of the Union Government could well be imagined than the injection into parliamentary discussion at this time of the tariff issue.

I commend that to my hon. friend the member for Brome.

This fact is recognized, not only by the more responsible members of the Union party, but by the Laurier Opposition itself. For the very reason that it recognizes this question as the most vulnerable spot in the armour of the Union party, the Opposition would welcome any introduction of the tariff issue into the deliberations of Parliament.

Only by some such means could Laurier hope to divert to his own purposes the votes of certain ill-advised and short-sighted advocates of tariff changes among the Union majority—and he has no doubt hopes also of certain of the members of the cabinet itself—with a view to overthrowing the Government by stirring up discord over such a bitterly controversial subject.

It was well understood that above all things the tariff question was to be shelved until after the war.

I hope my hon. friend from Cape Breton will take note of these words.

That was the understanding upon which the Union movement was based. In no other way could the Union movement have made any headway. Every public man who had anything to do with the negotiations which led to the formation of the Union party was a party to that understanding. It was openly discussed; it was freely published; it was authoritatively announced. On the question of whether or not there was such an agreement there can be no doubt whatever. The agreement was understood by everybody to be in effect.

To break that agreement now would be a breach of faith, a betrayal of trust, which would be inexcusable. Not only would it be morally reprehensible, but in practice it would have the effect of destroying the unity of Union. It would result in the wreck of the Union Government. It would jeopardize the most vital interests of the nation.

Unfortunately there are Unionist members of Parliament pledged to refrain from advocating tariff alterations during the war who are to-day openly advocating and demanding those very changes.

However honest such men may be in general, in this particular they are both dishonest and dangerous in the extreme.

Unfortunately the Government has given a measure of encouragement to such unreliable persons by showing a willingness to tamper with the National Policy on which Canada's successful past was built, and on which its present and future prosperity depends.

This war has shown us as nothing else could show us the essential need of protecting and building up great industries from one end of Canada to the other. We must contiue steadily to become a completely organized and completely developed nation. We must not specialize in any one line of enterpries to the destruction of all other enterprises. We must be universal. We must become self-contained and dependent solely upon our own resources in any emergency that may face us.

The majority of the people of Canada recognize this fact. The minority, unfortunately, do not. For a generation, majority and minority have fought over this controversial subject both in and out of Parliament. Probably for years to come there will still be those who are determined to keep it within the realm of controversy. Consequently there is no pressing need to attempt to finish this domestic fight to-day.

The Union Government was elected for one purpose, and for one purpose alone—that was to win the war. All its followers were pledged to the same policy to the exclusion of all other policies. Any man so elected who undertakes to change his mind at this late date will prove himself to be a traitor to those electors of diametrically different views on questions of domestic policy who united on the one great patriotic policy for the preservation of their country.

Canada is destined one day to be as great a nation as the great republic to the south. Canada will run a serious risk of missing that destiny, of ceasing to be a nation at all, if the present national trustees of her honour permit themselves to be drawn into a domestic wrangle that will incapacitate them for accomplishing the one great thing for which they were appointed trustees.

There, Mr. Speaker, is a strong finding, and one, I think, that will carry conviction to the minds of all when they review the circumstances under which we are placed. It was not my wish then that this tariff issue should have been raised at this time, but I say, as one who has been attacked considerably during this debate by members, perhaps, on both sides of the House, that I feel it is my duty to stand to my guns, even if I do not have very much support. I am one of those who hold my opinion as conscientiously and as consistently, I think, as most, and whether hon. gentlemen agree with me or not, I think they will recognize that I try to be a fair fighter, and hang to my opinions when I feel them to be right in the face of all opposition. And that is the reason I am to-day, as I have always been since I was a boy and took any part in public matters, a consistent supporter of the National Policy, or of protection to a moderate degree for the industries of Canada. I have no apology to make for holding that opin-

ion to-day. It has been justified now by forty years of experience. Canada has gone too far along that road of development ever again to retrace its steps and become a purely agricultural country. I say that believing it to be absolutely true, and without any fear of successful contradiction. All men are not fit for the land; all men cannot make a success on the land; and why should my friend, who is a paper manufacturer, and I, who am more or less connected with the agricultural implement business, though having nothing whatever to do with its management, be condemned for helping in the upbuilding of the Dominion of Canada? That is what we are trying to do consistently, and we look upon a dollar produced in the factory as just as valuable as a dollar produced upon the farm. I know there are those who object to that statement, but that is our view which we honestly hold. I want to point out to gentlemen on both sides of the House that Canada to-day is no longer a purely agricultural country, that at least half its citizens, and I think a good deal more, derive their livelihood from other callings, and very nearly half our citizens are employed in factories. I am speaking now of that half of our citizens who are workers and producers. About half of them are workers in the factories of Canada.

My hon. friend from Brome, and, I think, most of those who took exception to the implement business being protected, say it is a mere handful of men that these duties are being exacted for. To all who hold that view I say, it is not the manufacturer who, I admit, is a negligible quantity, but all his workers who must be recognized as manufacturers and as master builders. Regardless of the opinions of those who may differ from me, I believe the workers in the factories of Canada work as intelligently and as hard, and put in as many hours, too, in the year, as do those of any other calling. That may be disputed, but let me point out that they work twelve months in the year, nine hours per day; whereas the agriculturist and the outside worker, though he puts in twelve to sixteen hours a day for a certain part of the year, has a great deal of sitting in in the winter time, while the workman has to put in just as many hours in the cold as in the heat. And, I tell you, it is the experience of many farmers who thought it was "easy money" in the city and have come in to make money in the factory, that, after putting in a few months, they have decided that the farm is hard enough for them and who go back to the farm. The lot of the workingman in a factory is harder than out on the farm, to say nothing of the danger he has of being injured, for in the heavy industries there are accidents every day. In the big smelting industries, and those requiring intense heat, he must work in the terrible heat; he has to endure that heat in the dog days when the temperature is 80 to 90 degrees outside and 120 degrees inside. Anybody who thinks that the workingman should not have some consideration is shooting entirely beside the mark.

I want to approach this subject, not from the position of a few manufacturers who control the capital, but from the position of the manufacturer and all his assistants, because the man behind the gun is the man that makes the factory, and the product cannot be turned out from the factory unless you have the men, as everybody knows. We have in the factories to-day probably six or seven hundred workmen, as intelligent as any in the world, who are producing per man as much as any country in the world barring only the United States, which exceeds us by a small amount. The average product of the workman in Canada is about four times what it is for the British workman, and between four and five times what it is for the German workman. You ask how I make that out. On the basis of the amount of power that is applied behind the individual workman, and on that basis the horse-power is threefold what it is in the older countries of Europe. In other words, we do by machinery, what is done in the older countries by hand. Anybody can see why production will be vastly more by machinery than by hand power alone. This applies to a very large number of the industries of Canada. The prosperity that has been experienced by the people of Canada during the war is very largely due to the fact that Canada was a manufacturing country when the war broke out, and we were in a very feeble position comparatively financially, and would have been in a very awkward position, had not our works been available for the manufacture of munitions of war. They were promptly turned to this work, with the result that millions and millions of money have come across the water and have helped to finance all our industries and have kept us going in a prosperous way, enabling us to lend hundreds of millions to the Mother Country, and to pay a large proportion of our war expenditure as we go along. That has been possible because years ago we es-

tablished a protective policy and laid the foundations broad and deep to make Canada a world power. Let it not be forgotten that Canada is destined, if we manage our public affairs aright, to become a world power by reason of the variety of industries we have in our midst. We have immense natural resources in the forest, the mine, the fisheries and the field. Wherever you look, we have all the resources necessary to make of us a great people. And it is too late in the day, as I said, to think of turning back now when we are producing in our factories about a billion and a half dollars, as we did last year. In point of value, exports of products of the factory vastly exceeded those of products of the farm. Does the member for Brome object to that statement? I believe it to be absolutely true.

Mr. McMASTER: Would this year or last year be a fair period for the making of a comparison between exports of agricultural products and those of the factory?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No; I admit the force of what my hon. friend says—a large amount of this export has been possible because of the war. But if we had not laid broad and deep the foundations of our industrial institutions while peace was with us, we should not have been able to take care of this war business. We had the plants, the resources, the enterprise, the skilled workmen—all that made it possible to produce what we produced last year, about $1,500,000,000 worth of goods, a large amount of which was exported to the Mother Country to help win the war. Exports to the Mother Country up to March 31, 1917—the figures for 1918, which I have not before me, are considerably larger— amounted to $790,000,000, a large portion of which consisted of munitions. This export has helped to sustain the Mother Country in her hour of need, and it speaks volumes for the industry, intelligence and enterprise of our people and the extent of the accumulation of capital in our industries. I do not know why a man should be blamed because he has been successful. As long as a man is losing money and his business is going to the dogs, he escapes criticism; but the moment he begins to make money, show enterprise, bring about development, people say: let us get after that fellow and put him out of business; he is making too much money. We had the spectacle last night of the member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Joseph Read) asking that new duties be placed on lead, simply because he had a son in that business somewhere in British Columbia; and at the same time calling for the pulling down of an industry that it has taken thirty years to build up. In other words, he is prepared to throw away the successful work of thirty years and to start a new enterprise, such as the smelting of lead, because his son in British Columbia thinks it would be a good thing and asks him to endeavour to bring it about.

The member for Brome is an intelligent man and an acquisition to the House—I say this without flattery. I have had the pleasure of meeting him in committee work on different occasions, and have looked upon his opinions as being very valuable. The hon. gentleman paid particular attention to what he considered my own business. He probably does not know that personally I have nothing whatever to do with the management of any agricultural implement business or the fixing of the prices of agricultural implements. I am simply a shareholder who has long since retired from an active part in the management of a business. The hon. gentleman quoted from some remarks of mine which he said he had been carrying around in his pocket. I deem it a high compliment to me that he should carry my remarks for months in his pocket. If he wants to be an intelligent statesman, I do not know that I can recommend him to a higher authority, especially if he is studying matters pertaining to the tariff. I am glad that the hon. gentleman, who has been in the House only a short time, should have discovered that I made a speech on this subject six years ago, and that he has taken part of his inspiration with respect to the policy which he has propounded, from the remarks which I made on that occasion. I feel it my duty to myself and to those who are looking to me for information that I should make my own defence in my own humble way with regard to any connection that I have with the implement business and show exactly what that business is and has been and what it hopes to be in the future.

In the Canadian Almanac for 1918 I find that the tariff on "implements, agricultural (wheeled), operated by hand power for use as seed drills, cultivators and ploughs," is: British preferential, 12½ per cent; intermediate 17½ per cent; general, 20 per cent; while the duty on implements not otherwise specified as above is 15, 22½ and 25 per cent. In addition to that, there is a war tax of 7½ per cent. I do not know that this is considered a very excessive duty. In the old reform days, a tariff for

revenue only of 20 per cent was looked upon as moderate; not until that rate was exceeded was there talk of protection for special industries. I do not think, therefore, that my hon. friend can reasonably make complaint with regard to the amount of duty charged upon implements.

To all who have criticised the implement business in this country, I say that that business occupies as high a position in Canada as any other industry, and that agricultural implements are sold in Canada of as good a quality and as cheaply, excepting only a few sold in the United States, as those placed on the market in any other country in the world. The member for Brome, who is giving me an attentive hearing, will, I am sure, agree with me in that respect. I am aware that the farmer chafes under this duty and is asking for relief. The Government endeavoured to grant him a little relief—it was a small mistake on the part of the Government, but I look upon it as a serious mistake in principle—when they took the duty off farm tractors. Within twenty-four hours after that action had been taken my protest was on the way to Ottawa. I do not know whether anything of that kind will occur again, but I hope not, because that is not what this Government was elected for, and it cannot be looked upon as a war measure. If the Government removed the duty from agricultural implements, not one additional bushel would be added to Canada's production during this time of war, nor would the slightest reduction in price be effected in respect of any article of food by reason of the removal of that duty. All manufacturers—not only those of agricultural implements—in sending out their price lists, have regard to the cost of production. The cost of production is the keystone to the selling price, and to that is added a fixed amount of profit which varies in different indusrties from 10 to perhaps 50 per cent. The member for Brome will agree, I think, that the cost of production should be the basis of the price. But when we come to compare that with agricultural produce, the argument is thrown altogether aside.

I only regret that my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McCoig) is not in his seat. I wanted to hand out a small bouquet to him. I look upon him as a "seven by nine" statesman, that is, a man of very narrow breadth who cannot see beyond the water-ditches of his own county either in peace or war. Yesterday that hon. gentleman made an attack on the implement men who are just as good and stand just as high in the community as does my hon. friend. I want to ask him: What about the price of beans? Let him tell us what he charges for his beans, and we will give our prices on agricultural implements. He accused a company of which he says I am a member—he used my name very freely—of advancing their price 25 per cent over others, and he quoted a firm in St. Thomas manufacturing ploughs—and he will excuse me, I hope, if I say that I never heard of them before. Upwards of 75 per cent of the ploughs manufactured in Canada are manufactured in the city of Brantford. They are not made by the Cockshutt firm alone, but by other firms in that city, and we think we have the business down to a science. Since the National Policy was introduced, the price of those implements has been more than cut in two. That is something to say, but the hon. member for Kent who pointed out such terrible overcharges with regard to agricultural implements, is prepared to sell for seven or eight dollars a bushel beans that cost $1 to $1.25 in pre-war days. I have bought hundreds of bushels of them myself for that price. The same is true in regard to his corn. Let my hon. friend look to his own in the county of Kent before he begins to thrash the manufacturers of agricultural implements. We would think that we were robbing the people were we to ask the advances that his people—and I understand he is in the business—are making out of their beans and pork. We base selling prices entirely upon the cost of production, that is the basis upon which our sales are made. But the cost of production has nothing to do with my hon. friend who sells for $8 a bushel his beans that can probably be produced now in war times for $2. He charges $8 a bushel because the people must have them. Let him hand out his prices. If we were to listen to my hon. friend from Kent we would think he was a man who got along on about five per cent profit.

My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) will excuse me for diverting for a moment to Kent, but I think that when I am called in question as I was by the hon. member for Kent yesterday as being the author of an outrageous charge that, he says, is being made on the people of this country, I have reason to resent an imputation that would mean I am excessively desirous of taking more profits than would be justifiable under the circumstances. I have endeavoured to bear my share of this war like a man. I have been

called upon to make sacrifices. One of my friends, the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid) read a pronouncement from the United Farmers. It certainly made a strong appeal to my mind and heart, especially that part where the hon. gentleman said that if I would only beg of this Government to remove the duties the United Farmers would wish me a place in everlasting bliss. I presume if the United Farmers control the portals of everlasting bliss, they probably also have the keys of the bottomless pit, and I am not sure, if they can consign me anywhere at all but that I shall have a better chance of the latter place than the former. My hon. friend, I am sure, desired to make that appeal to me in all frankness. I have said that personally I should be very glad to make the sacrifice in order that I might retain the good opinion of my fellows, but I am not the personification of agricultural implements; I am only a private individual of like flesh and blood with yourselves, the owner of a few shares in a manufacturing company which makes some of those implements. Although I am often charged with being the high priest of implement exactions, I am not the mouthpiece of those implement manufacturers. But I say freely that rather than have the reproaches that I have had to bear in this House from my fellows whose good opinion I do value, I would long ago have gone out of the business. Nevertheless, I think if I had been conducting a liquor business or something of that kind, I would not have been nearly so much persecuted as I have been with regard to my attachment to implements. I do not know whether it is really so serious an offence to be connected with an industry of this kind. We have endeavoured to manufacture good agricultural implements that have won a place in the markets of the world, and we are endeavouring to distribute them throughout the Dominion of Canada in a fair and proper way at reasonable prices considering the quality of the goods. I cannot say more than that. If the House, in its wisdom, is going to remove the duties on agricultural implements and run the risk of destroying all that business, it is going to jeopardise a great many million dollars' worth of capital and turn out of work a large number of industrious men who have spent their whole lives in the development of this industry. Let me tell the hon. member for Brome that such an action would hit probably from fifty to a hundred subsidiary industries that contribute the raw material of which the implements are made. I know he dealt a little with that subject, but seemed to think my figures were grossly exaggerated. It will touch all manner of things—iron, steel, nuts, bolts, screws, dies, cotton, varnish, dyestuffs, malleable iron, paints, and a multitude of other items that go into the construction of an agricultural implement, all of which articles are more or less manufactured in Canada. Let every hon. member remember that. If you gave us a reduction in the duties we pay on imported raw materials, and if we imported those goods, we would take all that trade away from the subsidiary manufacturers of Canada. I think my hon. friend will follow me in that, and I want him to follow me, because that is an important part of the situation.

Mr. McMASTER: I was merely estimating that the agricultural implement manufacturers took about one-sixth of the gross manufactures of iron and steel. I should be glad if the hon. member for Brantford would tell me whether my estimate was anywhere near the exact figure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I should think that is a fairly liberal estimate, although I have not before me the figures. I find no fault with that. One-sixth is a liberal amount to allow. All the subsidiary interests, in which thousands of men were locally employed, were embraced in the figures which my hon. friend thought were grossly exaggerated. That is the reason he did not find, in the return with regard to implements alone, the figures I had given. All the subsidiary interests that are more or less bound up in the manufacture of agricultural implements would suffer to a greater or lesser degree. We have established an all-round tariff in this country with a view to developing all those industries that are native to our soil and that can well flourish here. Everybody will agree, after a study of the industries of this country, that Canada has made tremendous strides in that direction. All honour to the men who have had the enterprise, ingenuity and technical skill to make the splendid development our industries have made during the past twenty-five years. It is a marvel, and I do not think it has been exceeded by any other country in the world. I do not think we should begin to pull down what has been built up in the years gone by. It would be a dangerous policy for the people of Canada to attack our industries piecemeal. That has always been the way the enemy of industries works. He does not make a

frontal attack and try to sweep them all away together. He says: "Here is an industry that ought to be got out of the way." He gets that out of the way, and then he looks around for another industry, and makes an attack on that. Let my hon. friend remember that binder twine was bowled out in that way. Eleven or twelve factories were put out of business at a stroke of the pen. The result was that binder twine became almost unobtainable in the West; that is a matter of common knowledge, and even to-day the supply of binder twine is very unsatisfactory. Take the case of barbed wire, an article that used to be manufactured in scores of factories in Canada. Barbed wire was suddenly put on the free list, and we have not had a pound manufactured in Canada since, not even during the war. Why not? Because the factories were put out of business long ago by the removing of the duty. I am not finding fault with that—let by-gones be by-gones—I am simply pointing out the result. You wipe out capital, put men out of business, destroy a valuable industry, and then in war time an essential industry like that is lacking. Free-trade Britain has wakened up lately to the fact that she had allowed Germany to take away many of her fundamental industries, and now when she wants these products she cannot get them at any price, and she has had to begin all over again to produce them. That is a deplorable state of things. I want every hon. member to realize that Canada is laying the foundation for a future great nation, and in order to have a great nation you must have a division of labour and different kinds of labour; and the tariff and industry are the only ways to produce the variety of labour into which our citizens should enter and will enter. Every man is not cut out to go on the farm, and I do not know why it is argued that everybody ought to be driven to the farm. I have heard farmers say that. If a farmer was talking about going into the plough business, I would certainly advise him against it, as a friend of the farmer and of the plough business. Farmers who would drive city men out to the farm would only be making more competition for themselves. More stuff would be produced and it would bring prices down. So it seems to me a very short-sighted policy for the farmers to adocate the driving of men back to the land. It would cut the prices down to where the stuff could not safely be produced, except in Prince Edward Island, where my hon. friend told us last night they could produce potatoes that beat the world at twenty-five cents a bushel; if that is so, all success to them, and if the farmers think the policy I have alluded to is the best to pursue they are certainly welcome to advocate the driving of men back to the land. I have tried to farm a bit myself in the last ten years, and in many cases it has cost me more than two dollars to raise a dollar's worth of produce.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member is an agriculturist, not a farmer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: And yet I am producing more food than my family is able to eat in a year, so I am doing a little bit indirectly, even if I lose in the operation. But it is making more competition for the farmer, and if I am as successful in farming as I have been accused of being in the implement business I shall get into hot water all round. I must confess that I have found the little bit of experience I have had on the farm most interesting. I look upon a dollar produced from the land as worth any five dollars I can make in the city, and I appreciate it more. It will not buy any more, but it gives you a feeling of satisfaction to have it in your pocket. A dollar made on the farm gives you a tremendous amount of satisfaction, and I for one am only too glad to see the farmers so prosperous. I do not begrudge them these high prices, but I want them to remember that they are getting high prices, and that the price of farm products is higher than the price of any manufactured goods that I know of in proportion to the cost of production and in proportion to what prices were before the war.

An hon. MEMBER: On what do you base your figures?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: On the cost of production, on the value of the land, the labour required, and the amount of money employed in the business. As I have already pointed out, I do not think it costs two dollars to raise a bushel of beans in the province of Ontario, so it looks to me not fair to find fault with the merchant or manufacturer who bases his selling price only on the cost of production. In the case of the farmer the product is sold for what it will fetch, no matter how high the price, and I ask any hon. member which seems the fairer way. It looks as if there was certainly nothing in favour of the prices charged by the agriculturists that cannot be said in favour of the prices charged by the manufacturer or the merchant.

This is a country of varied interests, and it must not be developed in a lopsided way; that is, we must have a good development of all our resources, and so far as I am able to take in the situation, I think Canada has grown satisfactorily in every direction. I am delighted to see the farmers having a good innings, and I want them to make all the money they can while the sun shines, but I do not want them to starve the Allies or our soldiers. I want to help them in every way I can to produce more stuff, but I think the price in itself ought to be an inducement, and I think it is an inducement. But we must remember that the demands of the world are very great. I believe the West to-day is in a sounder financial position than ever before in its history. I think the farmers are well content with present conditions, and therefore I say that this agitation which has been started in this debate, and which appears to spread not only on one side of the House but on the other, is not wise. We are not doing ourselves justice in debating what are really minor issues when the great issue of the war is before us.

Mr. McMASTER: Suppose there was a great demand for munitions and a great demand for machinery to make munitions, would the hon. member think it right to remove the duty from the machinery coming into this country for making munitions?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: As far as I understand, there are very few of these machines made in Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: I was putting a hypothetical case.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think if the machinery is not made in Canada—and I do not think it is—it would be quite proper to have the duty removed under the circumstances, because the industry of making munitions is a very temporary affair, and the machinery would have to be scrapped perhaps in the very near future. So I think in that case the Government would be well advised to let it in free. But I am not advocating that as a policy; I am in favour of protecting every interest and every industry; that is my platform, and I make no bones about saying so. I am a protectionist for every class, because I believe protection is good for every class. It has been proved so in the past, and will be proved again in the future, if we are not so foolish as to destroy what we have with pains and enterprise got together in the last forty years; and I do not believe Canada will do that. The farmers in Canada, in our part of the country at all events, have time and again supported the policy which I am now enunciating, and which I think is a very safe one to follow.

I will not weary the House any further. I have been drawn aside considerably from what I intended to say by a few interruptions, but I make no complaint about that, because it is always pleasant to be interrupted when you are speaking; it gives you a chance to get the blood circulating a little more freely. If I have spoken harshly to my hon. friend from North Cape Breton who seems to be resting quietly now, I hope he will be kind enough to forgive me for having provoked him to invite me to accompany him home. I have finished my remarks now, Mr. Speaker, and I regret having kept the House until such a late hour as this. But, I was compelled to go on.

On the motion of Mr. Papineau the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Maclean the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Friday.

Friday, May 3, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 71, to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for the revision of excessive or inadequate punishments.—Mr. Middlebro.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

MORNING AND SATURDAY SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and after Monday the 6th day of May next, until the end of the present session, the House shall meet at eleven o'clock in the morning of each day except Sundays, and that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock, p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day from one to three o'clock, p.m., and that on and after Saturday, the eleventh day of May next, and on each Saturday thereafter until the end of the present session the House shall meet on Saturdays and that the order of business shall be the same as on Fridays.

It has also been suggested to me that the following should be added, to which I at once assent if it meets with the view of the House:

—and that the various Committees of the House be at liberty to sit during the sessions of the House.

As far as the business to be proposed by the Government is concerned, it will all be on the Order Paper on Monday or in the Votes and Proceedings of that day. I do not think that anything which has yet to be brought down can be regarded as other than of a minor character, and I do not think it will be controversial. There are certain reasons which make it highly desirable that ministers should be relieved from their duties in Parliament at no very distant date, and we have our choice between two alternatives: One is to work a little harder and get through within the next ten days or so, and the other is to have an adjournment and for the House to meet again during the summer. I am convinced that the vast majority of the members of the House would greatly prefer the first alternative, and personally I certainly should prefer that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Prime Minister may rest assured that we on this side of the House have no objection to prorogation in time to allow the ministers to attend to the business that may call them elsewhere. I would observe, however, that there are a great many items which might be cut out of the sessional programme. We are engaged at the moment on the Budget debate; which is always important, and especially so on this occasion, in view of the circumstances with which we are confronted. The debate which has proceeded now for three days has been very interesting, and not a minute I think has been lost. The whole debate has been conducive to the public interests. There is also on the programme to-day the Inspection and Sale Act, which is important on account of the information it elicits; I suppose that Bill cannot be left over, but if we go on with it, it will take some time, though perhaps not very long. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has another Bill on the Order Paper for controlling exports and imports. I do not know exactly what it is, but it may lead to a very important discussion. Then there is the Civil Service Bill, which is largely technical, and will take one or two sittings to dispose of. The Consolidation of the Railway Act is also a very important and voluminous Bill, and if it is gone on with this session it will take a very long time. Perhaps the Government would let that stand over for another session. Then there is the Canadian Northern Railway Bill. I do not know exactly what it is, but it is important and will require a full explanation and a good deal of consideration. Then there are the main estimates which, however, are largely advanced, and the supplementaries. So, on the whole, there is still a pretty big programme. I understand, however, why the Government wish to press for an early close of the session, and I can assure them that we on this side of the House shall do nothing except to facilitate business as much as we can.

The only suggestion I would make to the Prime Minister with reference to his motion is that he amend it so that we would commence morning sittings on Tuesday, the seventh of May, instead of on Monday. The reason I ask this, is that many members are absent and could not be notified in time for Monday morning's sitting.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall certainly assent to that at once. With regard to the programme on the Order Paper, I shall go over it carefully to see what might be omitted. I hope we shall be able to pass the Railway Bill. It went through this House last session, but did not pass the Senate. This year it has passed the Senate, and if it should fail to pass this House, I am afraid the people of the country might reach the conclusion that we were only humbugging with it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a new House this session, and many of the new members would like to study this legislation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They would have to study it, of course, but it was very carefully considered by a special committee of this House last session, and the Bill which has come down to us from the Senate is practically the same as when it left this House, with one or two exceptions. One of those exceptions, I think is of some importance.

Mr. MURPHY: The Bill has been amended in the Senate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is one amendment of considerable importance, but I do not think the others are of first-rate importance. I hope very much that we shall be able to pass the Bill this session. The Civil Service Bill is founded very much on the present Act, except for the addition of necessary provisions to bring the Outside Service under the rules which have heretofore prevailed with regard to the Inside Service. I hope it will not be controversial and that it will not occupy a very long time. With respect to the Inspection and Sale Act I shall confer with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am informed from my hon. friend, the

Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that the resolution, item 23 on the Order Paper, is of importance and he would like very much to have it advanced a stage to-day if that should be possible. There is nothing more to say at the moment about the other items. I therefore beg to move the motion as amended making the first morning sitting of the House on Tuesday next, instead of on Monday.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) if the Order in Council affecting all unmarried men who were twenty, twenty-one or twenty-two years of age at the time of their registration last fall applies equally to those who have since married after having obtained their exemption. The Order in Council refers to unmarried men without mentioning whether it applies only to those who were actually unmarried or also to those who were unmarried on the 6th of July, 1917.

Major-General MEWBURN: The Military Service Act provides that every man who was married after the 6th of July, 1917, will be considered as unmarried, and I think that still holds good in regard to this.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for the House to again go into Committee on Bill No. 62, to amend the Insurance Act, 1917:

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance) moved:

That order No. 13 be discharged and that Bill No. 62 to amend the Insurance Act, 1917, be referred to the committee on Banking and Commerce.

He said: It is desirable that this Bill be referred to the committee on Banking and Commerce, and I hope the House will accept this motion.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

RENEWAL OR POSTPONEMENT OF PAYMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMPANY.

On the motion of the Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that as five-sixths of the six hundred thousand shares of the capital stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company have been transferred to the Minister of Finance as required by chapter 24 of the statutes of 1917, the Governor in Council may assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System, in renewing or postponing the payment of any indebtedness of any such company, on such terms as may be agreed on, by guaranteeing in whole or in part the payment thereof, with interest, or the notes or obligations given for such renewal or postponement: Provided that the amount of principal to be so guaranteed shall not exceed the amount of the indebtedness the payment of which is renewed or postponed; and, further, that the guarantee shall be in such form and signed by such person as the Governor in Council may approve, and shall enure for the benefit and security of the holder for the time being of the indebtedness or the notes or other obligations representing the same; and that any payments which may be required to be made pursuant to any such guarantee shall be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and the Order in Council authorizing such guarantee shall be conclusive evidence for such holder that the terms and conditions of this resolution have been complied with and that such guarantee is legal and binding.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I would remind the committee that last year a statute was passed enabling the Government to assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company, so soon as the Government had obtained a transfer to it of five-sixths of the capital shares of the company. This proportion of the total share capital of the company has been secured since the closing of the last Session of Parliament. Section 3 of Chapter 24 of the Statutes of last year provides as follows:

So soon as the said five-sixths of the said shares have been transferred as aforesaid, the Governor in Council may assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any Company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System, in paying and settling any indebtedness of such Company or postponing the payment thereof on such terms as may be agreed upon, and for such purposes may make advances out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

This section limited advances under the Act to $25,000,000, and that amount was actually expended in caring for the maturities and obligations of the Canadian Northern Railway Company last year. A statement covering such payments was laid upon the table of the House early in the session as required by statute. The hon. gentleman will observe however that this section only empowered the Government to assist the company by way of advances to retire maturities or to assist in renewing maturities by a payment of money. The Canadian Northern Railway Company have a number of short term loans or notes which are maturing this year and which are at the present time secured by deben-

tures, or bonds, of the railway guaranteed by the Government, or secured by securities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company which were issued prior to the Government guarantee. Therefore, we are in fact liable for the maturing note. The larger part of the collateral security of these loans bears a low rate of interest. Owing to the high rates of interest prevailing to-day, it is difficult to secure the renewal of these loans without increasing the rate of interest and perhaps increasing the collateral.

The section of last year's statute which I read does not empower the Government to guarantee payment of the short-term obligations of the Canadian Northern which have matured and are maturing this year, and we ask under this resolution that power be granted to the Government to guarantee when necessary the payment of such obligations or renewals of the same. Our total obligation is not to be increased under the terms of the resolution. The resolution provides, and the Bill will as well, that the Government can incur no greater obligation than now exists. In Great Britain and the United States during the balance of this year Canadian Northern short-term notes to a very substantial sum will mature. Naturally, we desire to renew them, if possible, in order to avoid at the present time the entire payment of such maturities. We wish, therefore, under the resolution to procure power enabling us to renew or extend, as circumstances will permit, these notes, and we ask power to guarantee the payment of any of such renewals, when necessary. I think it is a fair request to make, and I hope it will be readily granted. It is in the interest of the Canadian Northern railway, and it is particularly desirable, from the standpoint of national finance during the present year. I hope that any renewals which shall be made this year shall be for a period of at least three years, which will carry us over, I trust, the war period.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON: Can the Acting Minister of Finance state approximately what liabilities will mature this year?

Mr. CURRIE: I will supplement that question by asking the minister to read the list of securities that are coming due, the amounts, and what the guarantees are. I think he should take the House into his confidence with regard to this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The names of the holders should also be given.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. CURRIE: The names of the holders cannot be given, but the minister might state the amounts that are coming due. He has a list of them under his hand and might read it to the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would like to have the names of the holders also.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly. Perhaps the minister should have the list printed and distributed before the Bill comes before the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If it is agreeable to the committee I should like to have the resolution passed, and when I move the second reading of the Bill founded upon it, I will give the information desired. In the meantime, however, I will give a list of the maturities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the holders of the securities?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can only give the information asked for partially.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Give us what you can.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall give a list of the securities which have matured since March 31st of the present year and one maturing in June next. The London maturities are:

On March 31st, 1918.....	$ 929,533
April 9th, 1918.....	1,472,167
April 15th, 1918.....	2,919,062
April 15th, 1918.....	5,201,407
June 9th, 1918.....	486,667

These obligations matured and are maturing in London, and I think are held chiefly by the brokerage firm of Lessard Frères, London, and their clients.

Mr. CURRIE: Are they notes or bonds?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: These are notes.

Mr. CURRIE: Bonds of the railway?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think in most instances they are the notes of the company secured by bonds of the Canadian Northern railway guaranteed by the Dominion Government or by some of the provincial governments.

Mr. CURRIE: What we want to know is whether we are releasing any of the terms or not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot undertake to give the exact information which my hon. friend requires, but I promise to do so on the second reading of the Bill. The maturities in New York are:

July 10, 1918	$ 2,700,000
July 10, 1918	3,000,000
September 1, 1918	10,000,000
January 10, 1919	1,250,000
June 12, 1919	2,190,000

The New York maturities were sold by the brokerage firm of William A. Reed, New York. On August 12, there is maturing in London notes of the Canadian Northern railway to the amount of $9,733,333, secured by collateral. In respect of the London maturities I think they can be renewed at full, providing a higher rate of interest is paid. I am hopeful that the maturities in New York may be renewed by a very small principal payment.

Mr. RICHARDSON: To whom are the liabilities due?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry that I cannot give that information now, but I shall have it for my hon. friend when I move the second reading of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would have supposed that the Government had the power under the Act of last session to do the very thing that the Acting Minister of Finance wants to do under this resolution. If he thinks differently I will not press the point; it is just as well we should know exactly what the Government's powers are. I think, however, that the hon. gentleman should state not only the amount of the liabilities that he undertakes to redeem or renew, but should give us a full and accurate statement of the liabilities that we have assumed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under this Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes. Up to the present time we have not had a full statement of such liabilities. A statement was presented to Parliament last year, but it was understood then that it was not quite accurate, and that there were many subsidiary companies whose liabilities we are assuming. Up to date, therefore, we have not had that absolute and positive statement to which the House is entitled. We must therefore have an absolute and full statement of every liability that we have undertaken to provide for under the Act of last session. We are entitled not only to have the information which my hon. friend has just given us, but he should tell us who contracted those obligations. He should state not only the parent company, but the long progeny of subsidiary companies whose liabilities we have undertaken to deal with. We have no intention to delay proceedings at this stage, but when the Bill comes before the House we shall expect to have a full statement upon the points which I have mentioned.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand my hon. friend wants the fullest information possible as to all matters that would properly fall within the scope of the proposed Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What we want is a list of all the liabilities which we have undertaken by the Act of last session. We had a statement last year with respect to that, but it was admitted to be only a partial statement; the Government were not able to give us a statement as to the full extent of the liabilities which we are assuming. That is what we want to have now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My purpose in making the statement which I did a moment ago was this: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, proposes some day shortly to make a very full statement upon this subject, and I did not think it was necessary that I should now present a statement covering the whole scope of our financial liability in respect of the Canadian Northern railway. I am perfectly willing to give all possible information relating to the subject matter of the resolution and the Bill to be founded upon it. I merely want an understanding about the matter. I am willing to do what my right hon. friend desires, but I think it would be better to leave the complete statement as to our—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Minister of Railways will doubtless submit a mass of detail when he makes his statement, but the information which we desire is absolutely germane to the Bill which we are now asked to pass. That is to say, we should have a full statement of the liabilities which we have incurred by the Act of last session.

Mr. CAHILL: When this legislation went through last year, a statement was made by the Prime Minister that this whole question should properly be taken up by the first Parliament. We are in the position that we are passing legislation here day after day connected with the Canadian Northern railway. When the Minister of Railways and Canals takes up his estimates, he has only a simple amount of $25,000,000 to be voted as a loan to the Canadian Northern system. We are passing $50,000,000 and $78,000,000, and various other amounts. By the time he comes to his estimates the remaining Canadian Northern legislation will be all through and we have not yet had any

statement as to who is managing this railway. We are told by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Acting Minister of Finance that the people of Canada own the Canadian Northern railway. What I ask is: Who own the people of Canada? Mackenzie and Mann still seem to be running the Canadian Northern system. We are taking this road away from them by arbitration. They either have no interest in it or they have. If they have no interest in it, what is the object in allowing them to run it still? If we are taking over the liabilities, we should be in a position to manage the road. The legislation of last year authorized the naming of a commission to manage this road, not when we paid for it, but when we secured the stock. The Acting Minister of Finance says we have secured the stock. Then, why does he not put his own people in control of this system instead of leaving Mackenzie and Mann in charge of it. I have been trying to get that information from the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Acting Minister of Finance, but, so far, have been unable to get it. In his Budget speech, the Acting Minister of Finance did not mention anything about the liabilities of the Canadian Northern. We either own the stock or we do not. If we own the road, we should certainly have an interest in its management.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are not proposing to make any fresh advance to this railway company. Parliament was given exact details last session of the obligations which the country was assuming in acquiring the Canadian Northern system. I assume my hon. friend can very easily get it now, but if he—

Mr. CAHILL: Has the hon. Acting Minister got it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should be pleased to have it sent to him before to-morrow. We are not incurring any further obligations by asking Parliament to pass this resolution, and the Bill to be founded upon it. We are simply asking power to assist in the renewal of certain obligations of the Canadian Northern railway for a few years, at least until the war is over.

Mr. CAHILL: At the last session of Parliament the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) made the statement that in taking over these short-time liabilities of about $98,000,000, he did not expect to have to provide further financial aid in connection with the obligations of the road, that the Canadian Northern would renew them.

[Mr. Cahill.]

During that debate the Prime Minister said more than once that it was not the intention that this Government should run the railway, that there would be a commission appointed, and he also said that the question would be taken up at this Parliament. It has not been taken up, and we are now told that we must rush this measure through Parliament, although the matter referred to by the Prime Minister has not yet come up. We do not know what the liabilities of the Canadian Northern system are. There are fresh liabilities coming in every day to the Arbitration Board sitting in Toronto. Is it not a fact that the province of British Columbia is making a demand on them, and are not others doing the same? We do not know what the liabilities of this road are, and nothing concerning them was mentioned in the Budget speech, or we were not told how it was proposed to meet these liabilities. I think we should know about these matters before passing any more legislation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member is not accurate in his quotation of what I said last session. I did not say it would be managed by a commission, but I stated it would devolve upon Parliament, I hoped at this session, to decide the method by which public ownership could be carried out so as to prevent that political interference and influence which would be absolutely detrimental to public ownership and operation. The liabilities of the Canadian Northern railway, according to my recollection, were very fully set out in statements which were presented to this House at the last session of Parliament. There is not the slightest reason why they should not be presented again. But every hon. member must understand that all those liabilities have to be taken into account by the Board of Arbitration which is determining the question as to whether or not the people of this country have to pay anything for the stock. Whatever the liabilities are they are to be taken into consideration by the arbitrators who are considering that question now. The purpose of this resolution is to enable the Government to have the right to carry on this business without interruption. By reason of financial difficulties the road has been unable to finance for long periods; and it was necessary to make these short term loans. During this year and next year many of them will become due. It is not desirable that the country at this time should be called upon to make provision for paying them

in cash. Therefore, the Acting Minister of Finance comes to Parliament and asks for authority which will enable the Government to extend them by guaranteeing them. It is perfectly true that they are secured by bonds or debentures guaranteed by the Dominion or by the provinces, at least in most instances. But it is equally true that the short term loans so secured are not themselves guaranteed by the Government. It is considered a desirable thing that the Government acquire the whole of the stock so as to vest the beneficial interest of the road in the people of Canada, and that it should be enabled to extend these loans by giving a proper guarantee, which would obviate the necessity of raising the money at the present time for the purpose of paying them off. That is the sole purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The present resolution is simply a corollary of the action taken by the Government last year. We all understand that. It is also true that there was presented to us a list of the liabilities of Mackenzie and Mann and their different enterprises. But it is also true, and this must not be forgotten, that the Government could not tell us what the total liabilities of Mackenzie and Mann were. The Government did not know whether they were included in the blue-book presented to Parliament. What we desire to know at this stage is, whether or not all the liabilities are shown in that blue-book, or whether others are coming in as well. We should know exactly the amount of liabilities which we have undertaken under the Act passed last session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The information can be given, but, of course, the Government could not then pledge itself that the liabilities stated to the House last session comprised everything the company might owe. As a matter of fact, we have taken precautions, if I am not mistaken, either in the legislation or the agreement, that if any additional liabilities should be discovered, provision shall be made in the award to see that they are paid by the persons responsible for paying them; in other words, that they must be taken into account in the final payment made by the people of this country for the stock, whenever it may be acquired.

Mr. CAHILL: Before we give any further money to the Canadian Northern, I think it is a proper question to ask whether the Mackenzie and Mann interests are still operating that road. Are they still in charge as they were a year ago?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government is represented by a certain number of directors on the board. It was not thought desirable to interfere with the present arrangements until the award is made, and the stock has been actually acquired through payment. As soon as that is done, it will of course, be necessary that the country shall have complete control of the operations thereafter.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the country not entitled to know who the directors of the Canadian Northern system are?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The country does know.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not know it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is the exception.

Mr. CAHILL: Would the right hon. gentleman mind telling us?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot name them off by rote.

Mr. CURRIE: When the Canadian Northern matter was before the House on a previous occasion, some hon. gentlemen suggested the advisability of foreclosing and taking the road over as a Government measure. Against that it was urged by the Minister of Finance that the road would have to do a great deal of financing on short term notes and that these, if they had to be guaranteed by the Government, would become a security of the Government in the market against other federal securities which might be on the market at the same time. Do I understand that the assurance given to the House that the road would stand on its own feet and do its own financing without any guarantee by the Government is now to be violated, and that the Government will now have to guarantee these short term notes and make them obligations and securities of the country on the United States and other markets?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Our liability is not increased. These short term notes are secured by debenture stocks of the company guaranteed by the Government.

Mr. CURRIE: I understand that, but these bonds guaranteed by the Government have not been sold. A number of these bonds that were guaranteed by the Dominion Government and by the provinces have been put into the banks as collateral security for money borrowed on the

short term notes that now are being renewed, instead of being distributed among purchasers so that they would become an obligation thirty or forty years from now.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What was the rate of discount?

Mr. CURRIE: Twenty-five or thirty per cent, if the truth were told. The Minister of Finance gave as a reason for not foreclosing, the fact that the identity of the road should remain as it is so that when short term notes of this kind, or equipment notes became due, the railroad company itself would renew them without the Government guaranteeing the notes. I understand not only that the Government are guaranteeing the bonds now in the vaults of the bankers, but that every one of these short term notes will be guaranteed and also become a Government obligation. We are duplicating the security. Is that true?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the Government acquire the assets of the Canadian Northern railway they cannot well disclaim responsibility for its liabilities. It would be a highly satisfactory bargain for the country if we could acquire the assets of the Canadian Northern Railway system and not become responsible for any of its liabilities; but that is absolutely out of the question. Therefore, acquiring the assets of the road by acquisition of the stock, it is necessary that the Government, if the road is not to become bankrupt or be put in liquidation, should see that the road shall not default in the payment of its liabilities from time to time. There are two ways of doing that. One is to raise money in cash and pay the liabilities off as they become due, looking to some opportunity in the future, when the securities which would be freed by that payment could be marketed in New York, London or elsewhere. The alternative is that this Parliament confer on the Government power to give such a guarantee as will extend these short term loans for a certain period, and it is hoped that after the conclusion of the war financial matters will become nearer to normal when it will be possible to deal in a permanent way with these obligations more satisfactorily than is possible at present. That is the meaning of this resolution upon which the Acting Minister of Finance proposes to found a Bill. When the second reading of the Bill is taken up in committee the Acting Minister of Finance will be prepared to furnish such further information as may be necessary to make the proposals of the Government absolutely plain.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would it not be wise to postpone this legislation until we receive the report of the commission appointed to determine the value of Canadian Northern stock? The many raids of Mackenzie and Mann on the treasury are alarming the people. When the poor man is being asked to pay a tax of ten cents a pound on his tea and coffee, it is not good policy to again bring Mackenzie and Mann near the treasury.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No one is bringing Mackenzie and Mann near the treasury. Nothing in this proposal has the slightest relation to any such thing. The Government is acquiring the stock of a great railway system which is passing into the ownership of the people. As a part of this proposal, it is necessary to make provision for the payment of short term loans, (with which Mackenzie and Mann have absolutely nothing to do) after the stock has once been acquired and paid for by the Government.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the stock not already been acquired?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The road will not be taken over by the Government and operated by a commission as proposed in the Drayton-Acworth report until the report of the arbitration now sitting in Toronto is made. That report will probably be strenuously resisted by this Parliament—most assuredly it will by the people of Canada —and the taking over of the enterprise may be postponed for a considerable period. The transportation problem is a most serious one, and is knocking persistently at the doors of Parliament. The people are very uneasy about this matter, it means so much to the country. If we leave it in the air, we may not be able to take possession of this road for one or perhaps two years, and that will postpone the solution of the whole question. The commitments and liabilities of Mackenzie and Mann grow more appalling as the days go by. While the Government acted, perhaps, according to its best judgment in deciding to acquire the road, it has always been my view—and I believe this is the view of a great many of the people—that it would have been infinitely better to let this road pass into the hands of a receiver and let the provinces that made such vast guarantees pay the price.

If British Columbia, which guaranteed an amount of $79,000,000, chooses to ruin itself, that should be no concern of the Federal Parliament. Let the people of British Columbia, if they choose to elect a Government that is willing to ruin itself at the behest of Mackenzie and Mann, take the consequences. Equally so with all other provinces—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not all the provinces; there is one province which is not enmeshed in the net of Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I refer to all the provinces that guaranteed bonds to an enormous amount. This great question will not stand the postponement which may be necessary if the view of the Prime Minister is carried out. I do not wish, at the present time, to press for information beyond what the Acting Minister of Finance is able to give. The Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) has promised to make a complete statement when he brings down his estimates, and I thought perhaps that would be the time for this Parliament to consider the whole question carefully. Let us have a showdown on the railway question; let us know where we are at with the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, and the Transcontinental, and let us reach a solution in the interest of the country, so as to allay public feeling which is daily growing stronger.

Mr. CAHILL: The Prime Minister stated just now that when we acquired the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway system, we would appoint our own directors and take charge of the management of the system. We have been repeatedly told in this House by members of the Government that we had acquired the stock, and I think before we vote this money we are entitled to know whether or not we have acquired the stock, who are our directors on the Canadian Northern Railway Board, and in what position Mackenzie and Mann are.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We shall give my hon. friend all the information on that on the second reading of the Bill to be founded on this resolution.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: There are two things that I wish to know before I can listen intelligently to the discussion. Who disposed of the five-sixths of the stock to the Government, and what is the Government going to do in regard to the remaining one-sixth of the stock?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On moving the second reading of the Bill to be founded on the resolution, I shall be pleased to give the hon. member the information he desires. The greater portion of the five-sixths of the capital issue of the Canadian Northern Railway Company now held by the Government, was obtained from Mackenzie, Mann and Company, Limited. I think we have to-day $92,600,000 of the total par value issue of $100,000,000. The arbitrators now sitting at Toronto are endeavouring to ascertain the value of the equity in six hundred thousand shares as provided by chapter 24 of the statutes of 1917. I hope I shall be able to give my hon. friend all the information for which he asks.

Mr. CURRIE: How many shares does the Government now hold of the total issue? There seems to be some confusion in regard to the matter. I should judge the Government holds nearly all of the shares.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was necessary, inasmuch as the resolution was, in its nature, supplementary to the Bill of last session, to use the words "five-sixths" in phrasing the resolution. As a matter of fact, the Government of Canada have $92,600,000 par value of the total issue of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's shares. I cannot, at the moment, say what is the par value of the shares.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) added a rider to his statement that all the provinces were more or less caught in the net of Mackenzie and Mann. I am bound to protest. While it may be true that the province of British Columbia is committed to the extent of $79,000,000, I may say to my hon. friend that the province of Quebec is not caught in the net of Mackenzie and Mann for a ten-cent piece. That explains why we are not so anxious to become drawers of water and hewers of wood like the other provinces.

Mr. RICHARDSON: You are going to pay your fair share just the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thought we had done away with these raids on the public treasury by Mackenzie and Mann. When the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) have to maintain at Washington a permanent residence from which they may go hat in hand to the United States Treasury to get aid for the Canadian treasury, when our people are being bled white and are bravely paying taxes to carry on this war, we should stand for no more demands from Mackenzie and Mann. Last

year we decided to take over the liabilities of Mackenzie and Mann under the express condition that we would take over the road. We have not got the road. The same management is in charge. It is still Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have the road.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The day after the Canadian Northern legislation was passed last year, Sir William Mackenzie stated in a public interview that after the investigation was finished he would get a hundred cents on the dollar for his stock. Have you, Sir, ever dreamed of such brazen audacity? The country is committed to the extent of nearly $600,000,000 for Mackenzie and Mann, and Mackenzie and Mann coolly, quietly appear before a commission appointed by the Government and claim value for a stock which has been declared valueless by another commission appointed by the Government. It is a scandal to see those men around Parliament again, in these days of strain and stress trying to bleed white the people of Canada. Are we going to carry out the legislation of last session, legislation which was passed under compulsion much against the protests of His Majesty's loyal Opposition and of certain of the most able members of the Conservative party? I need not refer to Mr. R. B. Bennett, the former member for Calgary, and my hon. friend, the present member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) but I may say that, in Montreal, the gentlemen who constituted the backbone of the old Conservative party, protested most vehemently against that legislation. Be that as it may, that legislation has been passed. We have to assume the liabilities of the Canadian Northern Railway system; but in the name of decency and common sense, we should not allow Mackenzie and Mann to exact from this country the millions of dollars which they claim for a stock which has been declared valueless. Before we pass this legislation the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) will be kind enough to give to the House and the country a list of those liabilities and the names of the holders of those liabilities, because many names are being paraded before the public as being the names of gentlemen who were very active in the conspiracy which took place last year and which gave birth to the Union Government. It is unfortunate that many of the provinces were caught in the net of Mackenzie and Mann, and I am glad and proud that the so-called backward province of Quebec is free from that net. It is even stated that, when the provincial statesmen arrived in a great hurry at the capital city of Ottawa during the meetings which took place preceding the formation of the Union Government, they were welcomed at the station—by whom? Not by the right hon. gentleman, but by Sir William Mackenzie himself. I say this Parliament of Canada should not be under the control of any railway magnate who pulls the strings from behind the scenes. For my part, I shall be very exacting on the second reading of the Bill. I want a list from the Acting Minister of Finance of all the liabilities and the names of the holders, whether corporations or individuals, so that I can scrutinize every item. The country is in no mood to-day, when we have just committed ourselves to an expenditure of five hundred million dollars to carry on the war, to stand for any more raids on the treasury by Mackenzie and Mann.

4 p.m.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The province of Prince Edward Island, unfortunately, is in the same position as the province of Quebec with relation to this iniquitous agreement—I think I may use that word now—with Mackenzie and Mann. Our people have no interest whatever in the Mackenzie and Mann outfit. Their railway system may be of some benefit to the rest of Canada, but it is certainly of no benefit to the province of Prince Edward Island. When you realize that the purchase of this railroad is putting a debt of one hundred dollars on every child that is born in Prince Edward Island to-night, you can readily understand how our people feel about the action of the Government in drawing chestnuts out of the fire for these people and for the provinces that were foolish enough to guarantee their bonds. The Acting Minister of Finance should give us the names of the people from whom the Government purchased five-sixths of the stock. He has told us that Mackenzie and Mann held most of it, but we want to know who held the balance, and also who holds the one-sixth of the stock now outstanding. Then we also want information as to the accrued interest. I understand that the bonds are regarded as collateral security for the notes and, according to the Acting Minister of Finance, the interest is going to be increased on the renewals provided for by the proposed Act asked for. Will that increased interest be taken into consideration by the

arbitration now sitting in Toronto, as a set-off against the watered stock that we are asked to take over?

Mr. PAPINEAU: On what date was the stock acquired?

Mr. J. D. REID: I accepted it about the first day of last October.

Mr. CURRIE: When was the annual meeting of the Canadian Northern railway held when the new directors were elected? Was it after October?

Mr. J. D. REID: There has not been any annual meeting since October.

Resolution reported and read the first time.

On the motion for the second reading of the resolution:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That can be taken to-morrow. I think we should have the information that has been asked for first.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hope my right hon. friend will not press his objection, as I desire to have the Bill printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is nothing to prevent my hon. friend from having it printed now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That may be quite true, but I do not see what advantage can be gained by postponing the introduction and first reading of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The only objection I have is that we want to have the information that has been asked for, in advance of the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have told my right hon. friend I propose doing that, but it is not likely that there can be very much further information to give, because I imagine that practically every bit of information available was given to Parliament about a year ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If my hon. friend will say that he will give us all the information some day in advance of the second reading, I have no objection to his motion. Otherwise I shall raise my point of order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the point of order?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The point of order is that this is a money resolution and cannot be read a second time on the same day it is taken up by the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: On what rule does the right hon. gentleman rely?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have not Bourinot here, and I will not press the point. All I want is this, that we have this information a day or two in advance of the second reading of the Bill, that we may have time to consider it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no objection to that.

Resolution read a first time.

THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means (resumed from May 2).

Mr. LOUIS JOSEPH GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): The Acting Minister of Finance, in introducing the Budget, said that we must provide (Hansard, page 1304):

For Civil Budget..	$230,000,000	
For War Expenditure	425,000,000	
For advances to the Imperial Government for financing in part our export trade with Great Britain	325,000,000	
In all..	$980,000,000	$980,000,000

To discharge this there will be:

Revenue..	$270,000,000	
Advances by Great Britain to pay for maintenance of Canadian troops overseas, about ..	300,000,000	
Unexpended balance of Victory Loan, as of March 31, 1918	130,000,000	
	$700,000,000	$700,000,000
Leaving a probable balance for 1918-19 of..		280,000,000

That balance, our Internal Minister of Finance said, has to be made up by the people of this country. The Department of Finance is in the same position as the Department of Militia and Defence. We have an internal Minister of Militia in Ottawa and an external one in London. We have an internal Minister of Finance in Ottawa and an external one in the United States. The Acting Minister of Finance has told us that the money market in London is absolutely closed to us during war time and that the New York market is practically closed, so that, to get the $280,000,000 which

we require, we will have to appeal to the citizens of this country to absorb the victory bonds that will be floated when the money is needed. I claim, Sir, that the Government must secure from the country its entire confidence and that the Government must answer for and explain every act of legislation, or of administration, so that there shall be nothing concealed. In order that Canada shall be able to make her full contribution to the war, we must have peace and harmony in this country.

I protest very strongly against the restriction of discussion in this House. I see by the Order Paper that there is a notice of motion providing for the censoring of speeches of members of this House. Before you, Mr. Speaker, are permitted to make speeches for me, I intend to make a speech of my own because there are certain facts and arguments that I wish to insert in Hansard and which should not go unanswered.

In the Budget speech the acting Minister of Finance announced that there is going to be a war excise tax collected upon—

> —all automobiles and jewellery imported into Canada for sale or manufactured in Canada on or before the 30th day of April, 1918, and which on that day have not been sold to bona fide users of ten per centum of the amount of the duty paid value when imported and of ten per centum of the price when they have been manufactured and sold in Canada.

It is by legislation of that kind that you disturb trade in Canada. I believe it is my duty to state to the House that, in so far as the motor car trade is concerned, this legislation should not have been enacted and the tax should not have been imposed in the way it is intended to impose it. Here are my reasons for making that statement. I understand that the Government needs revenue and that the trade of the country must supply a part of that revenue, but if the Government disturb the trade of the country, traders will not be able to pay the income tax that they should pay, or to absorb the victory loan bonds that are going to be floated in the future. Take, for instance, the motor car trade. To secure an agency in that line of business, you must sign a contract in the month of December to distribute the quota in the territory in which you want to do business. The distributors of motor cars secured their agencies and brought in the cars they are going to sell before the new models come upon the market in July. They have been stocked up since last December with the cars they are going to sell up to the 15th June. They have been compelled to carry

the transportation charges, the duties paid to the customs house, the warehousing charges, they are losing the interest on their money and just at the time when they are going to reap a profit, and be in a position to honour their signatures, the Government comes in and puts an excise tax on cars that are kept in stock to supply the regular trade. It is not fair to the trade, and I am afraid that the motor car distributors who have been loaded up since December or January with cars will not, on account of this legislation, be able to dispose of their cars. The result will be that the Government will have practically no revenue. The collection of this tax imposes an additional duty on the Department of Inland Revenue. More than that, this law does not distinguish between new cars and second-hand or used cars; and in second-hand or used cars the Department of Inland Revenue will be entitled to collect this tax of ten per cent. Such a tax should not be imposed. I have no objection to those who are using motor cars contributing their fair share to the revenues of the country, but in order not to disturb trade this legislation should not be put into force before the 1st July, at which date the distributors will commit themselves for the balance of the year and the prices will be fixed by the manufacturers. The Government will lose nothing because it is the manufacturing concerns that will pay, and at no cost whatever the Government will be bound to collect the whole of the amount of the duty imposed upon that trade.

I now come, Sir, to the question of Military Service in this country. When the Bill which preceded the inauguration of compulsory military service was presented, there was a statement made that created quite a flurry in this Chamber and out of it. It was stated that the law would be defeated by the law itself. What has been the result? The result has been such as to indicate that the law ought to be amended because you cannot have conscription with a law providing for exemption. In times of stress like those in which we are living every individual in the land must abide by the dictates of the State. The law, as it stood, compelled every citizen who was of military age to appear before the tribunals appointed by this Government. The spirit of the law was that everybody was conscripted except those who were exempted. To ascertain if he was to be conscripted or exempted, a man had to present himself before a tribunal and hear from the officials appointed by this Gov-

ernment if he was to remain in this country for the benefit of the country, or if his utility would be greater on the battlefield. I cannot but regret, Sir, that the law was such that we have heard hon. gentlemen holding positions of responsibility in this House make the statement that there had been wholesale exemptions.

It could not be otherwise, Mr. Speaker, because I claim nobody had a right to enlist unless the tribunals appointed to decide in each case had rendered their judgment, and in order to do that the case had to be heard and tried. But what has been the result? The law provided for exemption but it was interpreted as meaning conscription, and there should not be any reproach to those who have simply followed the law. The law was unable to supply the one hundred thousand men asked for, and it was amended, and what has been the result? That every young boy in this country is flying to defend the flag and is putting himself at the disposal of the Government. Why? Because the amendments made to the law are not amendments for the purposes of exemption, they are amendments intended to facilitate conscription.

There is a fact to which I wish to call the attention of the Government. We are asked to bear a heavy burden of taxation. Nobody complains. Everybody admits that we are in this war to the bitter end. We are willing to be in it, we are willing to buy Victory Bonds and to pay the amount of taxation that is demanded; but I claim, Sir, that when the Government is asking for money for war purposes, it is nothing but justice that certain acts which have taken place in the province of Quebec should be ventilated in the House so that the ministers will have an opportunity to give an answer, and allay public opinion which, as a result of certain proceedings is visibly uneasy.

Now I wish to refer to the Desjardins case. Here is a man who was an employee of the Government and whose depositions I have before me. I can give you his very words—they are to be found in his depositions of March 21, 1918—to prove my statements. It has been established by Desjardins himself that he was an employee of the Government, and there is something further: The Government hired two attorneys to defend Desjardins. What had Desjardins done? Knowing that a conspiracy was going on in the city of Montreal, having been told by Giroux, the inspector of the federal police, that there was an association in Montreal known, or to be known, as the "Knights of Death," he went and met those young men, among whom there were two bandits, two ex-convicts, two desperadoes just released from the penitentiary under ticket-of-leave, who were running this association. Desjardins pays $25 to become a member of the organization. He gives $1.50 to one to go to Belœil and steal dynamite. He gives a revolver to another man named Paquin in order that the heads of the Government and other leading men should be removed—meaning the right hon. the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Militia, the General Officer Commanding the District of Montreal, Lord Atholstan, and others. Well, Desjardins, the employee of the Government, becomes an associate of these desperadoes, and in furtherance of his designs pays out to them Government money. That, Sir, is bad enough, but there is something worse. I admit that before the trial of these men took place the Government might have been under the impression that Desjardins had done nothing but his duty, but they subsequently took public money for the purpose of bailing Desjardins out. I have here a copy of the cheque issued by the Government with that object in view.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the amount?

Mr. GAUTHIER: $10,000.

1917-1918.

Department of Justice, Canada (42).

No. 1114.

Ottawa, Jan. 4, 1918—$10,000 00.

To the Bank of Montreal, Ottawa:—

Pay to the order of A. E. Corriveau, Clerk of the Crown, Montreal, Ten Thousand Dollars.

Bail-Desjardins case.

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy of the Minister of Justice.

J. E. Narraway,
Accountant.

Here was the case of a man accused of conspiracy against the peace of citizens of this country. The King issues a warrant, under his own name and seal, to have this conspirator apprehended and put in jail, yet the Minister of Justice of Canada takes out of the public chest the sum of $10,000 to bail this conspirator out. The representative of the King in this Chamber desires to stop the King himself from exercising his functions in the judicial district of Montreal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER: He wants to stop the judicial authorities from dealing with this

man Desjardins. As I have already said, it was quite possible that up to this time the Government might well have been under the impression that Desjardins had only done his duty; but when all the facts had been brought out at the trial do you not think, Sir, that it would have been better in the interest of appeasing public opinion that the Government should have stopped there. They did not stop, but after all the facts had been brought before the court, they gave a cheque for $10,000 to bail this man Desjardins out. So far no explanation whatever has been given. We have tried by every means in our power to bring this matter to the attention of the House, but at every attempt made there was always a reason assigned for postponing it. I want to be very clear on this point. I was a candidate in the last general election, but I knew that my party would not win. We have been beaten and I admit the defeat. I went to the table to play the game knowing that the dice were loaded against us. I do not complain of the result, but I say to the Government: If you have been elected by the will of the majority of the people of this country to administer the business of Canada, do not commit acts of that stamp unless you can explain them. The allegations in this matter should not be allowed to remain unanswered, and I hope that before the present debate is completed we shall have on this question a reply from the Minister of Justice who is in charge of the department which handled this matter. We want to know, Sir, why the public money was used to hire two attorneys to defend a conspirator like Desjardins, and why the public money has been used to bail out this man who was a friend and the associate of the conspirators banded together under the title of "the Knights of Death."

In this discussion, I do not want to bring in any political bias. Everybody knows that I am a partisan, and I am not ashamed of it. But, Sir, if I was as partisan as some hon. gentlemen may think, I can tell you that the head of the conspiracy was a man named Elie Lalumière. That name must sound familiar to those who sat in the last Parliament. This man, Lalumière, was the tool employed to secure the return of a minister of the Crown. He has been charged in this chamber with having committed a crime against the electoral law of this country. He had the help of an inspector of the federal police, and a private employee of the Department of Justice. I believe, Sir, that a charge like this

[Mr. Gauthier.]

deserves more than a postponement. We must have an answer to this charge, and the sooner we have it, the better for all parties concerned.

I now pass to the Department of Railways. The president of the Canadian Pacific railway in his address on May 1, this year, stated:

> In view of the abnormal and constantly increasing cost of railway operation, the Board of Railway Commissioners, after due deliberation, authorized an increase of ten to fifteen per cent. in specified zones in the tariff of charges for the carriage of passengers and freight.

We are suffering in this country from the same disease that is prevalent in the United States. Railway employees claim that the railway magnates, in order to comply with the demands of the employee, have increased the haulage capacity of their motive power, and have made their employees work like slaves. To secure an increase in rates for freight and passengers, they have left their rolling stock without being overhauled. That is the charge which is publicly made. I drew the attention of the Minister of Railways to that matter, and he told me that when his estimates came up he would give me the explanation. I intend to discuss this increase of rates, and to supply him with certain information, so that he may be in a better position to answer me. There has been in the United States a wage commission investigating wages of railwaymen, and I have here a statement made by Mr. Warren Stone, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. I quote from the April issue of the Locomotive Engineers' Journal:

> The conditions confronting us at the beginning of winter could not have been much worse. Any practical railroad man could have foretold what was going to happen. Never before had the railroads made as little preparation of any kind for winter, and never before had we gone into a winter with our power in such rotten condition. On many railroads no effort was made to get power in condition. It looked to the men, at least the rank and file of these great labour organizations, as if the railroads were trying their best to make all conditions as hard for the employees as possible, and charge it all to application of the eight hour law, for the purpose of making a showing to support their claims to the higher traffic rates they were asking from the Government.

Mr. Stone was cross-examined by Mr. Lehmann, who asked him:

> You spoke of long hours of service, some cases twenty, thirty, forty and fifty hours. Do you mean that during that time the men were actually confined to their positions on the train, and they had no opportunity to leave and get rest and sleep?

Mr. Stone: No, sir. You have to keep your engine ready for service. You do not know what moment you will be ordered to move. The sleep they get if any is not much, folded up like a jackknife on a seat box in the cab of the modern locomotive.

Mr. Lehmann: How about the conditions of comfort and safety?

Mr. Stone: There is no comfort on the modern locomotive at all; it was not built for that; but to pull tonnage.

Further on, Mr. Lehmann says:

You said there was no shortage of engineers, Mr. Stone. Is there a shortage of engines?

Mr. Stone: There would be no shortage of engines if they had gotten their power in any kind of shape.

I am receiving every week complaints from railway employees to the effect that the same state of affairs exists in this country as Mr. Stone describes. Yet what do we see? This Government asks Parliament to grant it power to borrow on the credit of the country $50,000,000 a year this year, and until one year after the war, to purchase railway equipment for railroads which have done their worst to have their hauling power out of order. Is that fair? I say, no, and the people of this country should know the real reasons. The Government desires to take $50,000,000 out of the public treasury to purchase equipment for railroads who have not been able to take care of the property they have now, and who have been compelled to come to the Government to secure an increase in freight and passenger charges of ten to fifteen per cent. This should be explained in such a manner that the employees of the railroads and the public will know that the Government has reasons of its own for proceeding with this policy. Our Government will go down in history, I suppose, as a Government of imitators. They have been trying to imitate our neighbours. I do not complain about that, but I would like them to imitate more consistently, not merely the bad features, but imitate everything, the good as well as the bad.

When the eastern part of the United States last winter had no fuel, the United States fuel controller ordered a heatless day. In Eastern Canada, when we had all the coal we wanted, the Canadian fuel controller ordered a heatless day. In December last the United States Government decided that no State Government should issue bonds without permission of the federal authority —and that was according to their constitution. In Canada this procedure has been imitated, notwithstanding the fact that we have not the same constitution as they have on the other side of the border. One is amazed at the explanations given of this action on the part of the Government. The Government want to stop the issue of bonds by provinces or by corporations holding charters from provincial governments; they want to regulate the issue of bonds so that they shall be in a position to secure the best part of the money of the people.

I desire to call the attention of the Government, especially of those ministers who are supposed to look after the interests of the agricultural classes, to what has been done in the United States for agriculture. They have established a Federal Farm Loan Bureau; they have opened banks to help the farmers; they have done all they can to keep farmers on the farms and to bring from the congested cities all those who can engage in farm work. I commend to members of the Government an article which appears in the Literary Digest of April 6, 1918, with regard to what the United States has accomplished along this line. Permit me to quote the following:

The practical operation of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau has been almost co-incident with the first year of the war. While the members of the Farm Loan Board took the oath of office on August 7, 1916, they were occupied from that date until February, 1917, in the preliminary task of determining the boundaries of the twelve districts established by the Farm Loan Act, the location of the bank in each district, and the selection of the officers and directors of those banks. The first bank was chartered March 1, 1917, and the first Farm Loan Association March 27. The first loan was closed in April, 1917. Up to January 1, 1918, there had been 2,407 Farm Loan Associations chartered. In the month of February, 274 additional associations were incorporated, and the number in March will probably be about 250, so that the total number of associations chartered in the first twelve months will be about 2,931. These associations average about twenty members each, and their loans aggregate about $40,000 each, so that the 2,931 associations will represent a total membership of about 58,620, and a total of about $117,240,000 loans.

Up to January 31, 1918, there had been 112,146 applications for loans aggregating $260,556,981. Of these applications 71,035 had been approved to the amount of $139,050,471, while 24,020 had been closed, amounting to $50,782,432. A considerable proportion of the applications for loans have been either rejected, reduced, or withdrawn. The loans closed in the month of February amounted to a little over $11,000,000, and for the month of March they will probably approximate $15,000,000, making the total of the loans closed for the first year something in excess of $75,000,000.

Loans have been made in every State of the Union in amounts ranging from $100 to $10,000. These loans have all been made to owners cultivating their own lands, and for one or more of the purposes specified in the

Act, viz., the payment of existing indebtedness the purchase of land, the making of improvements, or the purchase of fertilizers, live stock, or farm equipment. Where they have been made for the payment of existing indebtednes, they have relieved the farmer of doubt as to his ability to meet the maturing principal of his mortgage, by enabling him to substitute an amortized mortgage, upon which he makes annual payments of a constant amount until the principal is liquidated.

What has been the result of this policy of helping the farmers? According to the census of 1909, the total agricultural products of the United States were valued at $5,486,615,000 in that year. In 1915 the amount had increased to $6,768,598,000. Last year, on account of protection granted to the farmers, the estimated value of all crops in the United States jumped to the enormous figure of $13,580,768,000. I commend these figures, as well as the legislation described in the article which I have read, to members of the Government in the hope that instead of taking away the farmer's boys they will leave them here to engage in the work of production. Nobody believes that you can increase production by having college boys and women replace farmers' sons. Instead of pursuing that course, the Government ought to increase their protection of the farming community. Let the Government cease for a while their protection of the railway magnates and come back to the farmers. You are appealing to them to increase their production, and at the same time you are taking away from the farmers the very men who are able to increase production and thus benefit this country and the Allies.

I said in opening my remarks that it was necessary to the welfare of the country that trade should not be disturbed and that peace and harmony should be restored. Some people contend that this country is threatened with a yellow menace which is coming from the Asiatic continent. I believe that there is a yellow menace, but it is not coming from Asia; it is coming from Ontario. It springs from Orange lodges, and it sows hatred in order to reap votes at the polls. We have had enough of that campaign. I appeal to the Government to stop that campaign of arraying province against province, race against race and creed against creed. I do not boast of my religion, but I claim I have a right to belong to the Roman Church. If I have a right to belong to the Roman Church, I admit that another man may be directed by an Orange lodge. I do not complain of that; but if my own church intrudes on my political liberty, I resent it, and if another sect intrudes on the political liberties of the rest of this country, I resent it too. So far as I am concerned, a man may go to any church he wishes to attend; according to my feeling he may if he so chooses go to no church at all. But he should not try, through religious influences, to have a political preponderance in this country, because if this condition of things is not stopped, we shall have to take action in some way or another to have it stopped. We want harmony and peace in this country. We do not want to dominate any province or any race, but we do not want to be dominated by any other province or any race. The only thing we ask is to be allowed to do our duty as we know it. In Germany there are to-day two battle cries—one of hatred and one of admiration. The battle cry of hatred is "Got strafe England." The Prussians realize that Great Britain is the greatest check to German "kultur," and they want Great Britan to be badly beaten. Great Britain, paying no heed to the "Hymn of Hate," goes on fighting the battles of liberty and civilization. But there is another cry, the cry of admiration. This is "Hoch the Kaiser, hoch the superman." We have in this country the same two battle cries, and they are coming from the yellow men. The battle cry of hatred is "Got strafe Quebec." Have you, Sir, not read in the papers of this country, when the disaster occurred at Halifax, the statement that an injustice had been committed; that this disaster should have been the lot of Quebec, not the lot of Halifax. But there is another cry, the cry of admiration. In Germany the cry is "Hoch der Kaiser." In this country it is "Hocken the Sentinel." We are unmoved by the "Hymn of Hate" and by the hymn singers; but we want to have our share of liberty, and we are willing to assume our share of duty. But if we have to do our share of duty, we are entitled to our share of liberty, and the sooner this is realized, the better it will be for all parties in this country.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Toronto Centre): Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) on the very able presentation he has made of the condition of the financial affairs of this country. I also desire, if I may, to congratulate hon. members on the splendid patriotic tone and character of the speeches which have been delivered in this House during the Budget debate. I can assure my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)

that we are only too anxious to see the people of his race have all the freedom and justice to which they are entitled. All we in this country ask is that as far as possible there should be peace and harmony, equality of service of sacrifice and of obligation.

I listened yesterday with a good deal of attention to the speech delivered by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). His speech sounded to me like one of the old time political speeches of pre-war days, particularly that portion in which he referred to Sir Joseph Flavelle and the Davies company and took the Government of the day to task, because, as far as I understood him, they had not in some way criminally prosecuted Sir Joseph Flavelle, or in other ways put the processes of the criminal law in motion. Sir Joseph Flavelle happens to be one of my constituents, and I think perhaps it is fair, and I am going to give the hon. member for North Cape Breton the benefit of the doubt, that in suggesting yesterday that Sir Joseph Flavelle was a criminal and had been robbing the people of this country, he really spoke in good faith. There are three matters to which he called attention. One was the cold storage destruction of poultry in Winnipeg. I do not suppose it needs any argument with him or any other hon. member to say that cold storage companies are necessary in this country. If there were more of them, and if they were under Government control, that would be very much in the public interest. The idea of a cold storage company is, as everybody knows, to take in the particular products of the season of the year when they are plentiful and keep them for use by the public in seasons of the year when they would otherwise be unobtainable. I do not believe my hon. friend suspects the Davies company of desiring to have spoiled in cold storage in Winnipeg a very large number of tons of chicken. When I tell my hon. friend that the cause of the spoiling of the chicken was due to the sinking of one of the walls and, in that way the putting out of order of the refrigerating surface of the plant, he probably will understand that the company was not desirous of having this happen, and that if it had not happened, the chickens and other products in this particular cold storage plant could have been sold for the benefit of the company and of the public. People, I suppose, in their own houses, have things spoil even when they exercise every possible care, and I am sure my hon. friend, who is an excellent laywer, would not say that anybody should be criminally indicted for an unfortunate accident of that character.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am sorry that the commission which inquired into the matter makes no reference to that as being the cause of the disaster to the goods.

Mr. BRISTOL: I have not, perhaps, read the report as carefully as has my hon. friend, but I am quite satisfied that my facts are right, and that is why I am stating them.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have a complete copy of the report, and I shall be very glad to give it to the hon. member. There is in it no mention of that cause.

Mr. BRISTOL: My hon. friend was very much concerned about the British Munitions Company, the whole of the stock of which was owned by the Imperial Munitions Board. It is quite obvious

5 p.m.

that if the whole of the stock of the British Munitions Company was owned by the Imperial Munitions Board, and if the British Munitions Company was making any profits out of the transaction, the Imperial Munitions Board would eventually get it. I do not think my hon. friend intended to suggest that Sir Charles Gordon, or Sir Joseph Flavelle, or any of the other directors are drawing a dollar from the treasury of either of these companies, which are the property of Great Britain. It is well known that such is not the case. One thing my hon. friend seemed concerned about was an agreement for a five per cent commission between, as I understood him, the Northern Electric Company and the British Munitions Company, Limited, which was payable by the latter company to the former, and which he suggested Sir Joseph Flavelle and his friends participated in. This is absolutely incorrect. The object, as I understood it, of the formation of the British Munitions Company, Limited, was the making of fuses in this country.

One of the most vital parts of the shell is the time fuse, which has to be accurately constructed to go off at a given moment, or otherwise it would kill our own people. The time fuse problem has caused a great deal of difficulty in England, in the United States and in Canada. When the British Government first gave contracts for shells in this country many of the constituent parts were made in different parts of the United States and Canada, but eventually

the whole shell was made in this country. What caused the greatest possible difficulty with the time fuse, and resulted in the British Government being charged what they considered a high price for the shells, was that its manufacture called for a high degree of technical skill. There were very few men who could do the work, and they were hard to get. The Northern Electric Company, which I understand to be a subsidiary of the Bell Telephone Company, was the only company in Canada that possessed a technical staff capable of doing the work, and they furnished this highly trained and highly paid staff of technical experts on a basis of five per cent. That this operating charge was reasonable is shown by the fact that as a result, not merely has the whole cost of the plant of the British Munitions Company been written off, but the company has to-day, I understand, a surplus of over $400,000, based on the manufacture of time fuses in this country at the same price they were being manufactured for in the United States. So Great Britain has saved practically the cost of her factory, and has four hundred thousand dollars to the good, and has also, located and operating in Canada, the best time fuse factory on this continent, and to Sir Joseph Flavelle and his associates belongs the credit of this achievement.

Coming to the Davies Company, there is no question that the company made a profit of eighty per cent during a certain period of time, but the gravamen of my hon. friend's charge was that the Canadian people were being robbed in some fashion. The Davies Company has been in existence, to my knowledge, a generation or more, and has been doing business for fifty years in the English market. During the first two years of the war, if I am correctly informed, this company sold its entire product to the British Government at the market price such product was bringing in London at the time of its arrival there, and it was sold in competition with similar products from the Swift and Armour Companies and the other big packing plants of the United States. In other words, the Davies Company or any other of these packing houses had no more to do with the fixing of the price than had hon. gentlemen opposite. The price was fixed by the British Government on the arrival of the product in London. Subsequently, the British Government, on account of transportation reasons, changed their policy, and the product was sold at the price it would bring f.o.b. port of shipment in United States or Canada. So throughout all their transactions, the price the Willian Davies Company received for the bacon my hon. friend was speaking about, was fixed by the British Government and by no one else. I have been told that as a result of the prices ranging over a certain period of time the profit derived by this company from the sale of its bacon was two-fifths of a cent a pound—and I believe those figures to be correct,—on an article costing, I think, 32 cents, but varying of course in price. What I want my hon. friend to understand, and what I think it is only fair the Canadian people should understand, is that the William Davies Company had no monopoly. They bought their hogs in the open market in the United States against American competition, and in Canada, and they sold them at the market price that they and every other company had to take from the British Government, when that Government took over the product. And the best proof that the price was not exorbitant is that from the time these transactions started until now there has not been one word of complaint from the British Government against the Davies Company as to any price asked or received by them in the London market on the product they sold to that Government. I know from other sources that no company in Canada stands as high to-day with the British Government as does this same William Davies Company. There have been abnormal prices in this country for products of various kinds, and particularly for bacon. Every one knows that on account of the millions of men who have been taken out of production to engage in war, the price of wheat and other farm products has of necessity gone up, and, in addition to that, the soldiers in the camps are consuming enormous quantities of meat—far more than they consumed in peace time. With the gradual depletion of the world's stocks, prices have naturally gone up. I want to say to my hon. friend from Cape Breton that if this profit was made, it was not made by an exaction of high prices, but by reason of the fact that this Canadian company was able to do business better and cheaper than its American competitors in the open markets of the world, and with an enormous turn over they made a large amount of money on a small capital. Furthermore, forty per cent of the hogs that were made into the bacon in question, were bought in the United States in competition with Swifts and Armours and other packing houses there, were brought into this country and manufactured into bacon, and so were

a benefit to Canadian labour. The bacon was then shipped to the English market and, being lower in price and better in quality, it beat the American product. In my humble judgment that was a credit to the company and a credit to Canadian enterprise.

So far as Sir Joseph Flavelle is concerned, I have personally no brief for him, and no interests directly or indirectly with him, but I have known him for a number of years and I do not believe that a more honourable and straightforward business man exists in this country. I say that the fact that the British Government have maintained him in the position he occupies in this country through all these years, and are continuing to deal with the William Davies company is proof that the charge that this company has made an enormous profit is absolutely untrue. As soon as the word profit appears we hear about profiteer, pirate, robber, and so on. These statements carry no weight with the British Government. The facts have not been given to the Canadian public in such a fashion that they could form an unprejudiced judgment of what the transactions actually were.

My hon. friend has suggested that the Government of Canada should in some way supervise the enormous expenditure of the Imperial Munitions Board in this country, because he says it is the money of the Government of Canada that is being spent. It is true that the Government of Canada has loaned money to the British Government in this country in order that she may buy through the Munitions Board Canadian farm products and Canadian manufactured products for the use of Great Britain in this war. It is true that Great Britain is paying out millions from day to day and week to week for the maintenance of our soldiers overseas. It is true that there is a balance in our favour for one hundred million dollars. But my hon. friend is too good a business man and too good a lawyer to suggest that because Great Britain has a credit with us we have a right to dictate how she shall spend her money, and who shall handle her finances in this country. The fact remains that the British people, and particularly the British Government, which I suppose comprises as able a body of business men as are to be found in the world to-day, continue to employ Sir Joseph Flavelle in the distinguished position he occupies, and until my hon. friend can show something more than he has done it is high time we left Sir Joseph Flavelle alone and let these baseless charges shrink into the oblivion they deserve.

What has been the position of our farming friends throughout these transactions? No Canadian can but desire that the farming community in this country should prosper; but we need not bother ourselves about that.

The farming community was never so prosperous. As a matter of fact, referring to the particular product that I was mentioning, while the farmers before the war, or about the time the war broke out, were getting from $6 to $9 per hundred for pork, since the war they have been getting from $13 to $20. So it is with practically all the products that the farmer has to sell. There was a long period in the history of this country when the farming community undoubtedly suffered and endured great hardships. I heard a friend of mine the other day saying that thirty years ago down in Nova Scotia he had started life as a boy working on the farm. He said that he was about fifteen years of age, that he got up at five o'clock in the morning, worked all day and in order that he might spend his evenings profitably he was allowed to string apples until three o'clock in the morning. He said that after three months of this work he gave up, ran away and left a note behind his stating to the farmer who hired him that he had broken his contract because the farmer, when he entered his employ, had promised him steady work whereas during two hours of the night he was allowed to sleep. Although that may have been the position of the farmer thirty years ago, the position of our western farmer, to-day is a very different matter. Our western farmer, although he had probably twenty years of struggle before the war, has now reached the point where he is in a more prosperous condition than any farmer in the world and I congratulate him. Manual labour for him is largely a thing of the past. He does his work by machinery. He no longer gets up early in the morning to milk the cows; he does not need to, because he uses condensed milk. He does not require horses because his farm machinery is driven by motor power or steam. He goes to town in his automobile and he spends his winters in Los Angeles. I have been told by one man who was out west that their condition was getting so bad, as regards exercise, that some of them were erecting gymnasiums in their barns, or Whitely exercise in their houses, because manual labour had become a thing of the past. The suggestion

that the farmer is the sufferer at the present time is one with which I am afraid a great many people in this country, like Government employees and those who are living on fixed salaries, will not feel any special sympathy. I think that the farmer, the same as every other person, should bear his fair share of the taxes inasmuch as he has received his full proportion of the wonderful prosperity of the country so that I cannot at present sympathize with the claim for free agricultural implements.

I want to deal with one particular tariff matter and that is the business profits war tax. If there is one thing that we have tried to do in Canada, it is to attract capital and men to this country. We have tried to make this a splendid country for people to come and settle in. We have tried to make our farming communities prosperous, and we have tried to give people who come here and invest capital a reasonable opportunity for success. That has been the policy of every Government since Confederation. It is perfectly obvious that if we are to continue the wonderful prosperity which this country is enjoying, and has been enjoying for a long time past, we must make it equally as attractive as our great neighbour to the south for business and settlement. What happens? When the business war tax of 25 per cent was first enacted it was accepted cheerfully by the Canadian community, as will be any tax, because there is not a man who is not anxious, in my humble judgment, to do his full duty to the state in whatever capacity he may be able to serve it. I am not calling this matter to the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance from the point of view that somebody may wish to escape the tax, but I do urge that we must make this country as attractive as possible to foreign capital in order that it may be induced to invest and assist in the development of our resources. We must make it as inviting as any other country, such as the United States. We have alongside of us the United States, a country which for three years had immunity from the war. It is of necessity in a highly prosperous state. Most of its industries are not in need of any financial assistance from the banks to carry on their work now or for the purposes of extension after the war. We have imposed an excess profits war tax in this country, which works out on the average fifty per cent higher than the like tax in the United States. If a Canadian had a profit of $75,000 on a business having an invested capital of $300,000 he would pay about $12,500 more in taxes than he would pay if he were in the United States. I submit that it is not in the interest of the people in this country to put the business people of Canada in a worse position than are our friends to the south of us. It is unquestioned that capital will go where it is treated best. There is nothing in the financial statement which we had presented to us that indicates that the finances of this country are not in such shape that we should not carefully consider in any taxation measure we may enact whether we are doing anything that will drive capital out or thwart any existing industry in the country. The matter is so important that I want to put a couple of examples on Hansard. The Canadian business profits war tax was enacted on the 8th June, 1917, and the following rates were imposed:

Profits.	Tax.
7% to 15%	25%
15% " 20%	50%
20% and over	75%

In the United States the deductions include (a) $3,000 allowance, and (b) the profits up to an amount equal to a percentage based on pre-war period earnings. These may be 7 per cent, 8 per cent, or 9 per cent. The United States War Profits Tax was enacted on the 3rd October, 1917. That is about four months later than we enacted ours, and it was deliberately put lower than the Canadian tax. The rates are as follows:

7%, 8% or 9% to 15%	20%
15% " 20%	25%
20% " 25%	35%
25% " 33%	45%
30% and over, maximum	60%

I will give a couple of examples showing how these two systems of taxation work out:

Examples showing how the Canadian Business War Tax Act compares with the American War Excess Profits Tax.

Example A.

A firm having a capital of $300,000 makes $75,000 or 25% on a year's business.

If in Canada that firm will pay a tax of ..	$ 24,750
If in the United States it will pay a tax of ..	12,150
Under the Canadian Act it works out thus:—	
Invested capital ..	$300,000
On which 25% is made or ..	75,000

			Tax.
Up to 7% or on	$21,000	these profits are exempt	000
From 7% to 15% or on	24,000	Tax 25%	6,000
From 15% to 20% or on	15,000	" 50%	7,500
In excess of 20%	15,000	" 75%	11,250
Total Tax			$24,750

Under the American Act it works out thus:

Invested capital, $300,000.

On which 25 per cent profits are made, $75,000.

Presuming that in the pre-war period this company had been earning 8 per cent, it would be granted exemption to that amount.

Profits up to 8 per cent or $24,000 exempt.

Addition allowance, $3,000.

Total amount exempt from tax, $27,000.

Amount remaining that is taxable, $48,000.

Taxable Profits.

		Tax.
From 8% to 15% or on	$21,000 at 20%	$ 4,200
" 15% " 20% "	15,000 " 25%	3,750
" 20% " 25% "	12,000 " 35%	4,200
Total Tax		$12,150

Thus where the Canadian firm pays $24,750 the American firm similarly situated will pay $12,150 or less than one-half.

Example B.

A company with $100,000 capital makes 33% profits or $33,000.

If in Canada it will be taxed.

Exempt to 7%	$7,000	
7% to 15% or	$ 8,000 at 25%	$ 2,000
15% to 20% or	5,000 at 50%	2,500
20% to 33% or	13,000 at 75%	9,750
Total Tax		$14,250

or 40% of earnings.

If in the United States will be Taxed.

Exempt to 8%	$8,000 and $3,000 allowance	11,000
8% to 15% or on	$ 7,000 at 20% Tax	1,400
15% to 20% or on	5,000 at 25% Tax	1,250
20% to 33% or on	10,000 at 35% Tax	3,500
Total Tax		$6,150

or under 17% of earnings.

In the case of example "A". Supposing the company pays out 10 per cent to its shareholders, the Canadian company, after paying the tax out of profits can carry forward $20,250. The American firm doing the same thing would have $32,850 to carry forward.

In a three year period the American firm could bring its capital to slightly less than $400,000, while the capital of the Canadian firm would be $360,750.

Example C.

A Montreal with a capital in 1914 of	$250,000
Made a loss in 1915 of	85,000
Made a loss in 1916 of	59,000
And a profit in 1917 of	130,000

The company's resources were impaired by the end of 1916 to the extent of $144,000, the combined losses of the two years, and were really down to $106,000. In 1917 the profits amounted to $130,000 and with this the directors had hoped to make up the impairment of capital. Their Excess Profits War Tax took $71,000, leaving them as the result of three years business $85,000 poorer than in 1914.

The American firms also have this further advantage.

The Excess Profits Tax in the United States only became effective on January 1, 1917. While the Canadian Excess Profits Tax has already been in force for three years.

Many American firms were allowed to accumulate large profits during the first, second and third years of war, during all of which time the Canadian firms were paying heavy taxes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is within the knowledge of many of us that there is always more or less capital seeking investment in Canada, and to-day that capital is south of the line. The position of England renders the investment of English capital in Canada for some time to come a very remote possibility. And unless, as I say, we treat Canadian companies and Canadian citizens as well as the United States treat companies similarly situated, we cannot expect to attract that new capital, by way of investment, to this country. Not only so, but the situation works out this way: If between the Business Profits Tax and the Income Tax you take from the Canadian companies a sum so much in excess of what the American companies pay, then after the war is over and it becomes a question of taking the industries in this country and putting them into a shape to carry on new industries or such new lines of manufacturing as they will have to have recourse to, they will be practically bereft of capital, and in the financial conditions that confront the country it is a very doubtful question where they will be able to get a new supply, or whether they will be able to get it at all. I would, therefore, ask the Minister of Finance to give this question the consideration which I feel, in the interest of the business communities and the prosperity of the country, it de-

serves. What is asked for is equal treatment for the great business interests of the country with our friends to the south, and at the same time to make this country so attractive that a very large amount of capital will be drawn here from time to time which will permit taxation to have a much larger spread, and enable Canada to meet more easily the obligations of the future.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, that so far as the cities are concerned, and particularly Toronto, has excited a good deal of comment, and it is the question of alien labour. There is a strong feeling in certain sections of tne community that for alien labour to be receiving eight to ten dollars a day, whereas our Canadian soldier is only in receipt of $1.10 per diem, is hardly a fair situation for the fighting men of Canada to be placed in. I understand that the Government have given a great deal of consideration to this question, and, so far as the labouring people are concerned, I can only say this: When they see the wife and daughter of the alien enemy walking down our streets attired in silk dresses, and so forth, and the alien enemy himself getting such high wages and taking the job of the son or brother or husband at the front, it certainly fills them with feelings of a very unpleasant character; and if the Government could take any action in that regard I am sure it would be welcomed by a very large section of the community.

There is a further matter which in Toronto has been attracting a good deal of attention, and that is the number of fires that have taken place in munition factories or other factories utilized for war purposes, resulting in the feeling that more stringent action should be adopted in reference to the internment of alien enemies or at all events the more careful watching of them. I understand that any communications sent to the Minister of Justice by any responsible citizen in regard to a matter of this kind will receive the most careful attention; and possibly it would be in the interest of Canada if different public bodies in this country would do as they have done in the United States, who of their own motion volunteer to give information to the Justice Department, and in that way practically attaching themselves and forming part of the secret service department, so that all loyal citizens might to a certain extent aid the Government in possibly finding out if there are alien enemies of the country who are doing the harm, or who should be interned in the public interest.

I am glad to see the tone which has characterized this debate and to find that, while we may differ, perhaps, on tariff questions, on one matter the members of the House are absolutely united. With no single exception every member has shown the strongest possible desire to help this country win the war. That is really what this Parliament was constituted for, and I am sure that there is no citizen in the country, man or woman, who is not most anxious to do his or her part in this great struggle, to the very best that in them lies. So, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my friends, whether from Quebec or Ontario, from the Atlantic to the Pacific— no matter from what part of Canada they may come—with all the force I can to aid us in becoming a united and harmonious people. Let us endeavour with all the strength we can to show that we are worthy of those splendid Canadians who have won undying fame for Canada at the front, so that when these gallant men return to us victorious we in Canada will not be ashamed of the part that we have taken, and so that we may be able to say hereafter that the finest page in the history of this war was the part our country played.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (translation): Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in listening to the financial statement delivered by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the acting Minister of Finance. It was so much more attractive owing to the fact that the hon. member is the same gentleman who, year after year, since the people of this country have committed the serious error of overthrowing the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was always the first to rise on behalf of the Liberal party and criticise the incautious and often unfair methods of taxation of Sir Robert Borden's administration. We, on this side of the House, were anxious to hear him, to find out which of the two groups that compose the Union Government would gain the upper hand. Would it be the Tories or the Protectionists? Would it be the Free Trade Liberals? The Right Honourable Prime Minister, when the cabinet was formed, stated that both political parties would be equally represented, on the basis of fifty-fifty, to use his own expression. If it is equally divided from a numerical standpoint, I believe I can say without fear of denial that those of our friends who left the cold regions of the Opposition to sit on the Treasury benches have endorsed the

old protectionist Tory policy, which has never served to protect the people and the consumer, but has always assisted the manufacturers and the millionaires.

When I carefully look into the estimates submitted to our consideration, it appears to me that the Government is not over-solicitous of the lot which falls to the people; that is the workingman, the toiler; I even believe that they have more compassion for the Mann and Mackenzie Company. Why cannot the Government find some means of reducing the cost of living through a more equitable distribution of the taxes, in such a way as to lay the burden upon those who are better able to bear it? As you must know, Mr. Speaker, those foodstuffs which are absolutely essential to subsistence, have reached such heights in price that the workingman is forced to undergo the most cruel privations; still, this is the class which bears the brunt of the war. Shoes, clothing, in short, everything, is selling at exorbitant prices, while there has been scarcely any increase in wages. The manufacturer is allowed to double his wealth, while the workingman is put on short allowance, compelled to eat brown bread and to go without meat. Besides, Mr. Speaker, does not the Government itself set the example of extravagance? If we compare to-day's ordinary expenditure with that of the Laurier Administration, we find that it has more than doubled. Take, for instance, the number of Cabinet members: under the Laurier Government, we had fourteen ministers, and to-day, we find twenty-five of them; we even have two ministers of Militia and two ministers of Finance. I think that, in these times of war, several ministers have a good deal of spare time and that they could have taken over the management of two departments. But I readily understand that this would not have answered the purpose of the Government's friends.

Now, what about commissions? As soon as any question arises that might prove somewhat embarrassing to the Government, presto! a commission is appointed, in the belief that all responsibility ends there. And these commissioners, creatures of the Government, draw salaries of five, six and even seven thousand dollars per annum. The number of the Civil Service employees has also been increased twofold without any necessity whatsoever; so true is this, that the hon. Minister of Public Works, himself, stated in this House, that there were far too many employees in his own department. Now, Mr. Speaker, what shall we say of the Militia Department's expenditure? That I may not be taxed with disloyalty, I wish to state my position clearly: I am in favour of Canada's participation in this war, I want the Allies to win; I realize that it is a struggle of Democracy against Autocracy. We are fighting for Belgium, we are fighting for the smaller nations. However, we, French Canadians, the minority in this country, would carry on our part in this war with far greater enthusiasm, if the majority did not treat us in the same fashion as the Germans treat the lesser nations of Europe; if certain people stopped slandering, calling us pro-Germans and slackers, because we believe with Lord Rhondda, with Herbert C. Hoover and others, that the best way to help England is through an increased cultivation of our land, a more intense production to supply food to the Allies; for, after all, though we do need soldiers, if we are unable to feed them, they will not be fighting very long. I know the feelings of my compatriots, I know they all desire the ultimate victory of England. Is not our past a pledge of our loyalty? Was it not the French Canadians who, upon two memorable occasions, saved Canada for the British Crown? Every one still recalls the battle of Chateauguay; 1774 and 1812 are two dates which remain indelible in the history of Canada, and fanaticism, whencesoever it may come, shall never be able to efface their memory. And did not the Government themselves admit the justice of our claim when they adopted an Order in Council to the effect that farmers and farmers' sons should be exempted from conscription; but, at that time, we were on the eve of the elections, and in electoral matters as in many other cases, the fear of the voters is the beginning of wisdom.

Crushed under their taxes, direct and indirect, alike, our people are going through a crisis unprecedented in this country which one was pleased to call in former times a privileged land. What will be the outcome of it all? Let us hope that the people will willingly bear the new burdens imposed upon them. Our country is evidently passing through a novel experience. However painful, it must nevertheless be accepted, though not perhaps without recrimination. But once the war is over, the Government will have to face the harsh day of reckoning to the voters of this country.

If, owing to their heavy taxes, our private citizens are forced to economize, the Government must find it necessary to do likewise, and the least that can be expected of them, is to exercise the greatest care in the expenditure of public funds. To be extravagant

in times such as we are now experiencing, is nothing short of a crime.

More than at any other time, the people are keeping a sharp eye on their Government; they closely watch its every move, scrutinize its doings, and it rests with this Government to provide the country with such an administration as will safeguard the essential resources of the nation, develop them at home and uphold our credit abroad.

Mr. J. E. PREVOST (Terrebonne) (translation): Mr. Speaker, the Estimates as brought down to this House, have been made the subject of elaborate discoursing by the greater number of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me. Avalanches of figures have been paraded before ours eyes; millions, batallion upon battalion of them, in close formation, have whirled in front of us in a dance of demoniacal fury, whilst close in their wake, came several regiments of taxes.

In fact, the Minister of Finance must have quite a tremendous army of these recruiting officers of the Exchequer, otherwise known under the name of taxes, and which have all been set loose on the trail of Canada's citizens; not a single one will escape.

What can you expect? It can't be helped: owing to the urgency of the fiscal needs—resulting from the exigencies of the war situation but arising as well from the extravagance of the Administration and from the improvidence which has characterized the guidance of the affairs of this country during the last three years, the Minister of Finance is compelled, every now and then, to increase once again the already heavy taxation whereby the people's gold is being diverted to the treasury.

It is not my intention to go into the matter of our expenditures, the amount of our debt, the total of our interest disbursements, and the assessment of taxes. Other gentlemen have dealt with these problems and still others no doubt will do so. Besides, there is another feature besides the purely material side of the management of affairs that must be considered; bread is not the only food required by man, and the financial policy of a government must not hold all the peoples' attention.

It is desirable, Mr. Speaker that, for a moment, the very soul of the Government be pried into, that its constitution be fathomed, in order to ascertain just what are the motives that shape its policy, as well as to find out if we, who are opposed to its policy, are on that account unworthy citizens, disloyal British subjects, and unpatriotic Canadians, according to what is being thought and said in certain quarters. To all the foregoing remarks, I feel sure the Government will deem its reply sufficiently peremptory when it shouts the pompous cognomen it has assumed and answer with emphasis: "We are the Government of national Unity!" Are we so sure of this?

The word Union, particularly in the present day, is a big word which stands for a high ideal because union makes for strength; and strength, the moral force, the national force, are the fruits of victory in the tremendous struggle we are now engaged in.

Now or never is the time, now when so many nations are fighting side by side in the same struggle for the triumph of Justice and Right; now is the time to put to shame those who think ill of others because forsooth, their race and creed are different from their own.

Now is the time, when all endeavours tend to insure the triumph of the might of right over might without right, now is the time for minorities to claim their rights.

Without the existence of a spirit of fellowship how can one fight for the liberty and equality of each and every citizen in the eyes of the law.

The ambitious dreams of a world-dominion, as imagined by Germany, are amongst the chief causes of the present war. It is evident that, for a considerable time in the past, this dream of world domination has haunted the minds of Germany's leaders of all ranks; it is reaffirmed in the conceit displayed by its generals, its philosophers and professors in their public utterances and writings.

It has been said, and rightly, that the causes through which this war was brought about, cannot be clearly understood unless one refers to the views expressed by the German philosophers and authors from time to time during the last half century. The consensus of their findings may be summed up in the following statement recently made by a German professor: "The German is conscious of his rights and of his duties, and he intends to rule the world."

And that is why the whole of the material and moral forces of those who had resolved not to be enslaved were lined up in this war in order to crush the enemy who would reduce them to slavery. The pursuit of this goal gave birth to union.

In Canada, unfortunately, I look in vain for the sacred union that ought to prevail.

We have, it is true, a Union Government, but, what a mockery, therein lies the very cause of disunion in the nation.

Twice in our political history has this word, union made its appearance: in 1840, Canada had a Union Government, and then came the Union Government of 1918. The latter administration has proved to be as unwholesome in its results as the former was mischievous in its designs. In both cases, they have failed to fulfil the splendid hopes which their very name implied; both have brought about the disunion of the nation.

The Union of 1840 was intended to abolish the political influence of the French Canadians to banish the French race from Canada; the administration sought to force itself upon the country through a fraudulent election at which part of the electorate were deprived of their political rights. This regime was inaugurated by a Cabinet which contained not one single French Canadian and only one minister of which professed the Catholic faith.

One is led to believe that the Unionist cabinet of 1918 reflects the image and the spirit of that first Union cabinet of 1840; so much so that one is tempted to ask if we may not say of the present Government what Lord Gosford said of the former in the House of Lords: "It was cradled in a trade conspiracy."

It is indisputable that Unionism has created disunion in the nation. The unfortunate disunion born of the Borden Government has been deepened and encouraged by the Union Government which is forcing upon the country a measure nowise called for and which has thrown Canada into an irrational, unreasoning and unreasonable participation in the war.

This union which the Borden Government sought to bring about for the elections, and which it proclaims blatantly, why was it not attempted and realized when the war started? The Government made no move in that direction. Every concession made for the sake of union came from the Opposition. But this union was short-lived, because of administrative scandals, in the first place. The love of gold was stronger than the love of civilization in the hearts of our administrators and their friends. The Borden Government outdid anything we had yet seen in the matter of administrative scandals. The partisans of the Government rifled the public treasury. All the transactions made by the Government since the inception of the war have been just so many scandals. From the contracts for clothing, for shells, for arms, for remounts, for boots, for hay, up to the purchases of binoculars and pharmaceutical products, in everything, the friends of the Government pocketed exorbitant profits. A scrutiny of the uses to which were put the funds necessary for carrying on our part in the war shows that these sacred resources were pilfered by the friends of the Borden Government. That was the beginning of the revolt in the minds of our people and of the disunion which made its way into their hearts. The Canadian Northern purchase capped the climax of the administrative misdeeds committed by the Government; this scandalous deal by which the Borden Government who, under section 24 of the law of 1914, had the right to take over all the property of the Canadian Northern without spending one single dollar, nevertheless went ahead and bought this very company, thereby adding $600,000,000 to the debt of the country and forcing us to purchase for $10,000,000 a load of stock which had been declared worthless by a committee of inquiry which the Government itself had appointed. This onerous transaction was condemned by every business man in the country, Conservative as well as Liberal, notably by a group of eminent financiers from Montreal and Toronto. The maladministration of the Government continued to widen more and more the cleavage among the people of the country. The cost of living, in which the Government took no interest, allowing the trusts and hoarders of the Flavelle type to pocket millions at the expense of the consumer, was also a powerful contributing factor to the discontent and profound discord which were rampant in Canada. Elsewhere, governments took a hand, at the proper time, in lightening the burdens which were bearing down on the shoulders of the people in this critical phase through which the world is passing. We can see that the intervention, opportune, able and wise, of the governments of other countries, has brought good results, which condemn the inactivity of the Borden Government in the matter. In other parts, the cost of living did not leap in the same proportions as here: for instance, between 1914 and 1917, the cost of living increased only 9 per cent in Australia, 25 per cent in the United States, while in Canada the increase was 44 per cent. The conduct of the Borden Government with regard to the cost of living can be stated in two words: inertia and ineptitude. The Borden Government, by their arbitrary laws drove the Canadian people still further asunder. I shall mention only the War-time Elections Act, which was not drafted to beat the Germans, but to defeat the Liberals.

This Act, with impudent cruelty, disfranchised thousands of British citizens. Canada had pledged her word to all those whom she accepted as her citizens that they would enjoy the same rights as other British subjects. This pledge is found in Chapter 13, Section 17 of the Canada Statutes, 1881. The section reads as follows:

An alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted shall, within Canada, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject within Canada.

This guarantee to aliens who became British subjects was afterwards approved by the Acts which the Canadian Parliament passed in 1886, 1906 and 1914.

The War-time Elections Act disfranchised hundreds of thousands of the naturalized British subjects to whom the Government had promised equal rights with other Canadians. Yes, but we don't see the Government exempting these disfranchised subjects from paying taxes, especially the income tax which the present Government is demanding from them to-day.

In return, through this same damnable enactment, the Government granted the franchise to 800,000 women, whom they themselves selected in such a way as to make sure of a favourable plurality; moreover, they gave the ballot to thousands of alien soldiers who knew nothing of our country, its history, its geography, its politics and its interests.

Finally, with conscription, the Borden Government destroyed for many years to come the union which we so sorely needed in this country. This question inflamed the four corners of Canada. Rather than be content with volunteer recruiting, as in Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, the Transvaal, Newfoundland; rather than submit the Conscription Bill to a referendum, as was done in Australia, the Government throttled the will of the nation and imposed compulsory military service. This was fatally destined to accentuate the cleavage amongst the people. We will listen to the words of one of the former ministers in the Borden Cabinet, who resigned his post rather than be responsible for the conscriptionist policy of the Government.

In his letter of resignation, the Hon. Mr. Patenaude, amongst other things, said what follows:

Dear Sir Robert,

On the 18th of May last when you acquainted the House with your intention of presenting a Bill providing for compulsory service during the present war.

From the moment you submitted your intention to the Council, I drew your attention to its extreme gravity and to the consequences which, to my mind, would follow.

. . . . . .

I have, however, thought it my duty in these critical times, to abstain from any hasty decision, as long as I could entertain the hope that these considerations, as well as the very serious events which were meanwhile developing, would induce you to modify, if not to completely change your decision.

I cannot now expect that my hope will be realized; you have in fact decided to introduce, without further delay, your proposed Bill, and have it passed during this session.

Therefore, I feel bound to sever my connection with the Cabinet on this question.

I have always thought, and do yet think, that the best interests of Canada make it a duty for this country to give to the cause of the allies its most generous support. But to do this, I cannot concur in any measure which in my estimation imperils national unity. The proposed law, I have every reason to fear, threatens to destroy this unity, and to give rise throughout the country to deep internal divisions of long duration, and even detrimental to the needs of the present moment. Indeed it is better to keep the country united in the present effort then to attempt a mightier one at the cost of national disruption.

If only conscription had become necessary through the failure of volunteer recruiting. But that excuse does not hold water. The Prime Minister himself, in January 1917, in this House during the debate on the Speech from the Throne, used these words:

Recruiting has gone well in every province of Canada. The call to arms has been admirably answered. In the Maritime Provinces and in the province of Quebec, the movement was, perhaps, a little slow in getting under way, but I know from information received lately that everything is going along now as well as we could hope and that the call is being answered in splendid fashion.

And the Prime Minister was right. I find in Hansard for July 19, 1917, some very interesting figures. At the time when the Government was deciding to impose conscription on the country, of the 500,000 Canadians of military age, 550,000 had enlisted as volunteers. Twenty-five per cent had been refused as physically unfit, and 400,000 had joined the colours. Moreover Canada had, at that moment, according to the Prime Minister himself, 304,000 men in the munition factories. Besides, our railway transportation—and Canada has the highest railway mileage, per capita of population, of any country in the world—and other public utilities which contribute to war-work employed perhaps 200,000 men.

Now, in Europe, all munition workers, all transportation employees are considered as being on active service.

If this be so, then Canada had mobilized for war purposes, altogether 900,000 men; that is one-eighth of our population. While

France had mobilized one in every six, England one in ten, Italy one in eleven and Russia one in twenty.

In order to appreciate Canada's splendid military effort, let us compare it with the United States. If Canada mobilized 400,000 men with a population of 7,500,000, the United States, with their population of 112,000,000 would have to recruit 5,600,000 men to equal Canada's proportion. Which fact prompted ex-President Roosevelt to say: "So long as the United States have not sent 5,000,000 men to the front we have not the right to place ourselves on the same footing as Canada in the great struggle which is now being waged for Democracy."

Furthermore I claim that conscription drags Canada into an unreasonable and unreasoning participation in the war; it throws us into an undertaking which is beyond our financial resources, it causes a continuous mobilization of our best men which is out of all proportion, and deprives us of the labour which is absolutely necessary to us if we are to play the economic role which belongs to this country.

More and more the war is becoming an economic problem rather than a struggle exclusively military. This war, which has lasted nearly four years and which threatens to continue just as long, is a war of endurance. More than ever do the words of Lloyd George ring true: "Victory will belong to the last golden sovereign, to the last stack of wheat."

Let us act in such a way as to be really useful to the Allies, and for that purpose, let us strive to maintain our national prosperity which is as important to them as to ourselves. Let us make sure of increased agricultural production. Let us enable ourselves to fulfil our role—a decidedly important one—in the economic effort of the nations leagued against Germany.

In a moment I shall speak of the labour shortage here in Canada. For the present I wish to say a word concerning our financial position.

Canada, as a country, is in the millionaire class, as far as wealth and natural resources are concerned, but she is comparatively money poor. Sir George Paish, reputed the highest authority within the British Empire on matters of political economy, placed the total indebtedness of Canada, just before the war, at $3,000,000,000, or over $400 per capita of population. Of this amount, $300,000,000 represent the increase in the debt during the 50 years preceding. Now, in three and a half years the war has added one billion dollars to our debt, which is three times more than Canada spent during 50 years for public works.

According to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, Canada's war expenditure has reached $875,000,000, and this amount does not include the outlay for pensions and for the interest on the war debt.

At present we pay $78,000,000 interest every year. This is equivalent to more than one half our customs revenue, with the war tax added.

Let us compare once more with the United States: if we presume that the total wealth of the United is 74 times as great as that of Canada, we find that our war expenditure represents an outlay of 80 billion dollars on the part of the United States.

Our railroads, with one exception, are bankrupt.

The Government is forced to impose an income tax, thus establishing direct taxes, a thing hitherto unknown in this country.

And we are forever borrowing. We must find 980 millions to meet our budget requirements for the present year.

Whither are we bound? What sort of future is in store for us, thanks to ourselves?

The war requires sacrifices, very well; but it does not require national suicide. If, in striving to avoid defeat, we ruin the country what will it profit us? Wouldn't it be acting like the man who jumped into the water so he wouldn't get wet in the rain?

Our extravagance is bound to bring reaction. This reaction will come about as surely as it did come in the past. We shall witness the same things over again: the ultra-imperialists of the present day become separatists. When all is said, it was a question of finance which, in 1774, separated the United States from England. And in Canada, after the business crisis which occurred here around 1848 and 1849, there arose an annexationist movement which had as its followers or rather, I should say, its leaders, the English inhabitants, men like Molson, Bleury, Holmes, De Witt, Holton, Abbott.

Amongst those who are eager to send our last man to the firing-line how many are not anxious to survive this last man? Amongst those who are eager to contribute our last cent how many would be willing to sacrifice their parliamentary indemnity to war needs?

They will answer that one must live. Well, the same is true of the nation. Only recently the Montreal Star declared that Canada should throw herself into the war "to the utmost of her strength, both physical and

financial." This limit has been reached. It is anti-Canadian and anti-Ally to empty the country and to expend millions in the process. The Prime Minister's own words are an acknowledgment that up to the 4th of April, 1918, conscription had cost the country $1,424,785. It has brought us 30,000 soldiers and 200,000 exemptions as was stated by the Hon. Mr. Carvell. And the Manchester Guardian was justified in its statement of September 8, 1917, that conscription in Canada would not be worth what it would cost.

Let us observe that, due to the cost of clothing, of pay and of transportation charges, 400,000 soldiers cost Canada as much as 2,000,000 soldiers do England or France.

I say that we are making a military and financial effort which is beyond our strength, which is out of all proportion to our wealth and our population; moreover, it is a serious menace to the economic role which is ours by right in this war.

It is evident to every serious-minded and well-informed observer that the organization of our agricultural production is more important, more necessary, more urgent than conscription for the army. What the Allies are shouting for is food. Their cries of distress reach us every day, more and more insistent. At the beginning of March last the Food Controller of Great Britain sent a cable to our own Food Controller, saying that England was sorely in need of all the wheat, all the flour and all the meat that Canada could spare.

This cable announced the establishing of food-rations in England and explained the food situation in the Allied countries. We read in it that: "On March 1, London and its suburbs were put on rations. More than 14,000,000 adults are limited to one and a quarter pounds of meat, four ounces of butter or margarine and one-half pound of sugar per week. After March 25, this ration will be imposed on the entire country."

We all know that a few months back Lord Rhondda, the British Food Controller, made this statement:

"We are doing our very utmost to increase our own production and to reduce consumption, but the first solution of this grave problem is with our American Allies, and with Canada. I feel sure that they will not abandon us."

And elsewhere, the same Lord Rhondda, who seems to know what he is talking about, says:

[Mr. Prévost.]

"My experience of America, both before and since the war, has given the opportunity of appreciating how tremendous are her resources. If they are organized to their full capacity I am confident that the German hope of starving out the Allies or of depressing the people through food shortage and high prices must of necessity be abandoned."

You cannot get away from Lord Rhondda's conclusion: "The most perfect system of distribution and the most equitable regulation of prices would be merely a waste of time and effort unless the necessary steps are taken to maintain the Allies' supplies at a constant level. And that depends, to a vital degree, on the United States and on Canada."

At the very start of the war, the dictator of the British Empire, Mr. Lloyd George, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, sounded to the people of England this salutary warning I quoted a while back: "Victory will belong to the last golden sovereign, to the last stack of wheat."

I happened to read a circular sent out by the Ontario "Organization of Resources Committee". This committee is presided over by Sir John Hendrie, Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario; its vice-presidents are the Prime Minister of the province, Sir W. Hearst, and the former leader of the Opposition, Mr. Rowell, at present a minister in the Borden Cabinet. Amongst the members of this committee we find the names of several of Ontario's most prominent citizens.

In this circular, which is headlined: "A Crisis—Famine is at our Door," we find, amongst other things:

"Since February 1, 1917, more than a million tons of foodstuffs have been destroyed through the torpedoing of numerous vessels. Mr. David Lubin, the United States delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture has just made his official report to Washington in which he states that on the 31st of March last there was a shortage of 150,000,000 bushels of grain for the needs of the world until August, 1917."

"On the 10th of April the president of Armour & Company declared that the United States were well on the way towards a catastrophe if the government did not take immediate steps for the conservation of foodstuffs. Famine, continues the circular "is spreading more and more throughout the whole world. In Ontario, 365,000 acres less were cultivated than in 1915 and the harvest of grain of all kinds fell 27,141,615 bushels, while

the vegetable crops gave 21,458,902 bushels less. This food shortage which is being felt the world over is such that there is grave danger of Canada being left without sufficient supply, and even if our production took a decided bound it is out of the question to hope for any improvement in the situation. Even if peace were to come within the year we can still see no bettering of food conditions, since we shall still have to send enormous quantities of food to Europe."

Before the war, France, England and Italy alone, imported each year more than one-half billion bushels of cereals. Next fall they will have to import nearly one billion bushels, according to the War Lecture Bureau, the official bulletin of the Director of Public Information at Ottawa.

The hon. Everett Colby, an assistant of the American Food Administrator, in the course of a speech delivered in Ottawa, a few days ago, said:

" Nine months from now we shall hear the cries of distress coming from the children of France and of Belgium; nine months from now famine will devastate these two countries."

This indicates an extremely serious situation; a situation for which the authorities should prepare.

Almost at the same time Mr. Crerar, the Minister of Agriculture emphasized the seriousness of the situation when he wrote in the Standard: " All the labour available in the country parts is being employed; our extra production must rely chiefly on the labour furnished by the cities."

The Prime Minister himself, Sir Robert Borden, in a recent message published in the bulletin of the Canada Food Board at Ottawa, speaks of how extremely urgent it is for America to feed Europe. Our First Minister declares that the production of foodstuffs in the country must be as great as possible during the present months, or else we will be confronted with a "serious" crisis which threatens us to-day " and the extent of which cannot be overestimated."

Dr. D. W. Robertson of Ottawa, lectured in Montreal, a few weeks ago, on the seriousness of the food crisis, and on the means we should adopt to increase farm production in Canada, both for the feeding of our own population and for the relief of our Allies. Dr. Robertson insisted on the fact that the success of the Allied arms is dependent in great measure on the agricultural production of Canada and the United States, and that the chief cause of the decrease in our agricultural production during the last three years has been the withdrawing of so many workers from the farms, whence they have gone either into the army or into the munition shops. The lecturer showed that, in 1917, France produced only 47 per cent of her normal crops of wheat and potatoes; both she and Italy are suffering from a shortage of wheat, flour and fats. England is no better off, for if she does receive more ood than they, she must divide it with them; England's supply is only 55 per cent of what it was before the war. Even if they limit their imports to what is strictly necessary, the Allies will have to import this year over two million tons, or 40 per cent more than before the war, although the total tonnage of ocean-going vessels has been very much curtailed. Therefore America, this year, must produce more cereals of every description, than she has ever produced before, since the Allies expect to receive from this continent 360,000,000 bushels of cereals over and above the amount of their total yearly imports before the war.

The President of the Council, the Hon. Mr. Rowell, thought he had discovered the solution of our farm labour problem when he said, in the eloquent speech which he delivered in this House, a few days back, that during the war the women of Canada, could and should do what the women of Great Britain and France are doing.

We know of the heroic task accomplished by women on the soil of France; but we know too, that, despite their efforts the agricultural production of France has suffered considerably during the war. The Hon. Mr. Rowell omitted to say so.

An article from the pen of a well-informed writer, published recently in the " New Republic ", shows that the total seed acreage in France was only 8,970,820 hectars, whereas in 1913 it had been 12,580,465; that her crops which amounted, in 1913, to 163,388,000 cwt., reached only 90,174,140 last year.

These figures mean that, notwithstanding the admirable work of the women, children and old men, the soil of France yielded only 55 per cent of its total harvest of 1913.

Here in Canada, harvesting is far more difficult for women than is the case in France, because of the tremendous acreage of our farms and also on account of the climate. In Canada, more than anywhere else, farming is a man's work.

Let us observe also that our country is one of the Allies' chief providers of cereals and foodstuffs. The Allies rely on us to

make up what they lack. We must give it to them and at the same time insure the feeding of our own population.

And it is in the face of these crying needs of the Allies and of Canada that the Government brings on its Bill for compulsory military service, which is intended to deprive our country of 100,000 men or more. Still, there is a shortage of farm labour in our country which makes it impossible for us to keep up our agricultural production, while we really have need to double it. In The Agricultural Gazette of Canada, published by the Dominion Department of Agriculture, issue of May, 1917, I find some very important expressions of opinion on the question of farm labour in our country. The Departments of Agriculture in all the different provinces speak of their anxiety anent the shortage of labour on our farms.

Mr. Arthur S. Barnstead, Secretary of the Department of Industries and Immigration, in Nova Scotia, says:

The farm labour problem will assuredly be acute in Nova Scotia this year. Hitherto we have depended largely for extra farm help upon the immigration of agricultural newcomers from Great Britain. The supply of these is of course cut off, and, moreover, thousands of our young farmers are now engaged in military service overseas. Again, the services of many young men which would formerly have been available are now fully engaged in our munition factories and steel works. Thus the present outlook for securing, during the rush seasons, any extra help for our farmers from the usual sources is not encouraging.

Mr. W. A. Riddell, Superintendent of the Trades and Labour Branch, Department of Public Works, Ontario, has this to say:

The need for farm labour in Ontario is quite as acute as it is in any of the provinces. Evidences of this may be seen by such facts as the following:

"We can use 500 farm labourers in our municipality," writes one reeve. The same mail brought an application for a boy in which it was stated: "We could use a carload of boys in this neighbourhood".. .. .. .. With regard to the Americans, there are five men working in the United States at the present time urging men to come to Canada. In some cases their fare is advanced.. .. .. So far the attempt to get men in this way has not been successful, nor the men obtained very satisfactory. The class of men that can be drawn from the United States at the present time for farm labour is rather poor."

Now we come to Mr. E. H. Auld, Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Thos. M. Molloy, Secretary of the Bureau of Labour, Saskatchewan:

Realizing that a limiting factor in our crop production this year is the shortage of labour a special effort is being made to recruit all available former farmers and farm workers to assist in putting in the crop.. .. .. .. Then special farm labour agents from this province are in the United States.

Mr. H. A. Craig, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in Alberta uses these words:

During the past winter those who were interested in increased agricultural production have been anxious about the evident scarcity of farm labour. Owing to the fact that so many young men from Alberta have enlisted for overseas service, the available supply is much less than the requirements.

It was Mr. Marshall, Minister of Agriculture in Alberta who, at a reunion of all the Dominion's Ministers of Agriculture, at Ottawa, last fall, spoke thus to the Federal authorities:

You cannot satisfy the needs of both militarism and production at one and the same time; you must choose between the two. If what you need is increased agricultural production, then you should leave on the farms those who are already there and further you should attract to the land all those who could be of help in farm work. If, on the other hand, recruiting is the more necessary of the two, then we should enlist in a body and let agriculture go to the dogs. But for the love of God, let their be a choice made right now between these two alternatives and let the Government tell us what they want.

Then we have Mr. William E. Scott, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia, telling us that:

The labour question, however, is the great difficulty, and the debarring factor at the present time to increased production. The farmer realizes that it is his patriotic duty to do all he can to increase the supplies of foodstuffs, and would do so, could he secure the necessary labour. It is a very acute question in British Columbia just now, and what is the best solution it is difficult to say.. .. .. They are facing the same situation in the United States, and labour for the farm is also scarce there.

It is not only the farmer who is suffering from scarcity of labour. Our mines, logging camps, mills and industrial works are all complaining that they cannot get the labour that they want for carrying on their work to the fullest extent. It must be remembered that approximately 35,000 men have left this province for overseas service since the war began.

As regards the province of Quebec, I received a short time ago a copy of a resolution adopted by the production engineers and other official agricultural experts, at a convention held recently in Quebec. Here is the purport of this resolution:

Whereas the scarcity of farm labour is becoming more and more acute at the very time when increased production of foodstuffs is most imperative; and

Whereas the Federal Government, through the Canada Food Board, has requested the province of Quebec to increase by 600,000 acres the land already under culture; and

Whereas the military conscription law deprives us every day of a large number of young farmers and of young city men who are able to give effective help to our farmers;

It is hereby moved by Mr. R. A. Rousseau, B.A.S., official agricultural engineer,

Seconded by Mr. Georges Bouchard, professor at the School of Agriculture, Ste. Anne de la Pocatière,

And it is unanimously resolved:

That the official agricultural experts, the agricultural representatives of the district, the professors of the agricultural colleges and the travelling agricultural instructors, assembled in convention for the campaign in favour of increased production, this 26th day of March, 1918, urge upon the higher authorities of this country, to enact clearly and effectively, the exemption from military service of every farm worker duly engaged to labour on a farm during the present year.

While lecturing on the labour question, in Saskatchewan, the 26th of February, last year, Mr. R. B. Bennett, then Director of National Service, said what follows:

In all likelihood the scarcity of foodstuffs will be felt more acutely than at present before the next harvest, in Great Britain, in France and in Italy, and as Canada is, of all the Dominions, the least remote from the countries, they naturally turn to us; they see in us their first source of supply.. .. .. The labour shortage is the main obstacle to the accomplishment of these ends, and we intend doing all in our power to improve this situation.

In the presence of this scarcity of farm labour, which is making itself felt everywhere, it is small wonder that the number of acres sown in western Canada, showed, in the four years from 1912 to 1916 an increase of only 1,500,000, while in a single year, from 1910 to 1911, the increase has been 3,500,000.

Every province in the country is crying out for men for the next planting season, and especially for the next harvest. A carefully prepared estimate tells us that the farms need 83,000 men to carry on their ordinary work.

Alberta is asking for 6.000 men for seeding, and 7,000 for the harvest; Saskatchewan, 10,000 for seeding, and 15,000 for harvest; Manitoba, 7,000 for seeding, and 10,000 for harvest; Ontario, 7,500 for seeding, and 12,500 for haying and for getting in the crops, besides 15,000 boys and 5,000 women; Quebec needs several thousand men; New Brunswick, about 2,000; Nova Scotia, 2,500; Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, although suffering less than the other provinces, nevertheless require further hands.

We are shouting famine into the ears of our neighbours in the United States who sent us thousands of men last year. They cannot repeat the effort this year. In this connection let me quote you the important declaration of President Wilson, shortly after the great Republic had declared war on Germany. The first and the most urgent appeal of this statesman was towards the development of industry and agriculture. In a manifesto addressed to his fellow-citizens, Woodrow Wilson said:

Thousands of men, or rather hundreds of thousands, although fit for military service, will, owing to the needs of industry, be rightfully exempted from that service and sent to perform essential and productive work in the fields, the factories and the mines, and they will belong none the less, for all that, to the patriotic forces of the nation, just as much as do our men at the front.

The man who spoke these words is at the head of a nation of 112 million inhabitants; and we, a people of 7 millions, who have already seen 530,000 of our citizens leave our shores; we who are an agricultural people, whose country is rightfully styled the granary of the Empire, we would give no proof of the same prudence, the same foresight.

When we witness the unthinking policy of the Government which persists in mobilizing for the needs of the army the most healthy and most vigourous element of our country we do not wonder that public opinion is beginning to rouse itself all over Canada. We lately saw l'Evénement, a Government organ, reproaching the Government with not exempting young farmers. The English provinces are becoming alarmed over the question of farm labour. Telegrams from New Brunswick and from Ontario speak of meetings of farmers calling upon the Government to considers the necessity of keeping in Canada all young men adapted to work on the land. Toronto informs us that a delegation of 2,500 Ontario farmers is getting ready to come to Ottawa and demand the exemption of all farm workers, from 20 to 23 years of age, who have been called to the colours. I wish to point out that the last delegation of agriculturists which came to Ottawa was from the English farm owners and Anglo-Canadian agricultural experts from the Montreal district. The Toronto Star, a Unionist paper, in its edition of last Saturday, published the following report:

The farmers all through Ontario are taking definite means to force a reconsideration of the recent Order in Council which calls to the colours all the farmers, both freeholders and tenants, or farmers' sons who have never done anything else but cultivate the land. Last night farmers' meetings were held throughout the province and vigorous resolutions were adopted setting forth that the crops and food production in general would suffer if the farmers were forced to rely solely on the help from inexperienced city hands. The principal meetings were held at Brantford, Woodstock, Goderich and Ayr.

The same newspaper informs us that the United Farmers of Ontario intend sending a

delegation to Ottawa. So that the policy and the maladministration of this Government have divided the Canadian nation instead of uniting it, as the Unionist Government boasts of having done. The grievous blunders committed by the Government were not resented in Quebec alone, as some people are pleased to claim in certain quarters. The other day, the hon. member for Russell eloquently vindicated Quebec of the attacks that have been made against her; he made triumphant reply to all these criticisms born of the frenzy of unseeing fanatics. Allow me to add just this: The province of Quebec was not the only one to disapprove of the Government's policy; she is not isolated in her opposition to the so-called Unionist Government which has sown the seed of discord in our ranks. An analysis of the vote recorded in the last election will bear this out.

According to the official figures, the Unionist Government holds a majority of 71 seats in this House, since the government has 153 representatives and the Opposition 82. Taking the vote as a whole, province by province, as also the distribution of the ballots cast throughout the whole of Canada, the exorbitant majority of the Unionist Government in this House is not justified. The total vote, both civil and military, was 1,057,793 for the Government, and 763,371 for the Opposition. But these figures do not take into account the election by acclamation (17 in the province of Quebec alone). Taking the number of votes cast for the Opposition in the 48 constituencies of Quebec province where contests were held, and where the Opposition was victorious, in order to establish an average, we find that we must add nearly 70,000 votes to the total of the Opposition if we wish to establish the true relation between the two parties throughout the Dominion.

In this way the total division would be 800,000 votes for the Opposition against 1,000,000 for the Government. This statement is important for the purpose of demonstrating that the Opposition, in Parliament, is not limited to the group from Quebec. It is a fact that, out of a total of 82 members on the Opposition side, Quebec elected 62, which leaves only 20 members from outside our province, but an analysis of the vote throughout the entire country shows that the Liberal group represents a very large number indeed of the voters of this country: outside of the province of Quebec there were 519,940 citizens who voted against the Government.

[Mr. Prévost.]

For instance, in Ontario: the Opposition holds only 8 seats with a vote of 269,093; while the Government, with 515,140 votes, has 74 seats.

That is to say that with a vote considerably less than double the vote accorded the Opposition, the Government is represented in this House in the proportion of 9 to 1. The true proportion of the votes obtained by the Opposition in Ontario is 34 per cent of the total vote cast in that province which, normally, should give us 28 seats while all we have is 8.

In the Western Provinces the total Government vote was 346,935, and the Opposition vote, 153,568. So that the proportion of the Opposition vote in the four western provinces and the Yukon is 31 per cent of the total vote cast; still, out of the 57 representatives that these provinces send to Parliament the Opposition has only 2, while the exact ratio, based on the number of votes obtained, should give us 17 seats.

In Nova Scotia the contradiction is—still more evident. The Government obtained 41,684 votes there and the Opposition, 41,305. But the Government holds 12 seats against the Liberals 4. The Liberals obtained merely 379 votes less than the Conservatives, and still they have only 4 seats, while the Conservatives hold 12. In Saskatchewan, where not one solitary Liberal candidate was elected, the Liberal candidates polled 33,500 votes, or nearly one-third of the total; the Conservatives garnered 81,420.

The province of Alberta elected only one Liberal. At the same time, the Liberal candidates polled 49,920 votes, while the Government candidates got 74,974.

In British Columbia one-half the total vote was cast in favour of Liberal candidates, and still, not a single one of them was elected.

We must deduce from this that, not only is our method of representation altogether unfair, but also—which is most decidely important at the present time—that very, very false are the claims of those who are waging a campaign of ignominy and of slander against the province of Quebec, seeking to make people believe that the opposition to the Unionist Government comes from Quebec alone.

The Government majority in this House is abnormal and nowise represents the real difference of opinion in this country.

I repeat that the province of Quebec is not isolated. The Opposition group in this House, though most of its members come from Quebec province, represents the wishes, reflects the opinion, of 800,000 Canadian

voters, of whom 519,940 are from outside Quebec. Now this figure of 519,940 votes, is equal to one-half the total vote cast throughout the Dominion in favour of this Government.

Putting Ontario and Quebec to one side, we find that the voting in the rest of the Dominion resulted as follows: for the Government, 466,639; for the Opposition, 250,847; so that the proportionate percentage of the Opposition vote is 40 per cent of the total.

Now let us glance at the civil vote throughout Canada. On the total of this vote, taken altogether, the Government's plurality is only 97,095 which figure does not take account of the 70,000 votes represented by the 17 acclamations in Quebec.

In a word, out of a total of 1,586,793 votes cast the Opposition polled 744,849, or 47 per cent of the total vote.

Therefore the Opposition group may, and must, stand their ground solidly in this House; the province of Quebec is not isolated from the rest of Canada. The province of Quebec reflects the true Canadian opinion which the Unionists tried to gag and which they succeeded in stifling through that most perfidious enactment, the War-time Elections Act.

Neither is the province of Quebec isolated in its share in the war; and the French-Canadians especially have contributed most generously.

I cannot go into details and give statistics which would carry me too far afield, but I do intend to say that it has been proven, figures in hand, other things being equal, as many soldiers were recruited from the province of Quebec as from any other province. It has been proved that if we compare the Canadian-born enlistments, that is if we take away the British-born from the number of recruits in Ontario and the other provinces, the enlistments in the province of Quebec were proportionate to the enlistments in the province of Ontario and the other provinces.

The "Citizen" of Ottawa, day before yesterday, asks if the opinion of the English-speaking people of the country will not have to be altered with respect to enlistment in Quebec, when they have been informed of the figures recently brought down in the House of Commons concerning the volunteer recruiting of Canadian-born citizens. Out of a total of 197,473 all-Canadian recruits, the province of Quebec made the important contribution of 50,000.

In 1917 Ontario numbered 164,000 recruits, including 118,000 immigrants, which leaves a purely native-born enlistment of 46,000. The province of Quebec numbered 42,000 which figure included 25,000 French Canadians.

It would appear that Ontario with 46,000 native recruits takes precedence over Quebec by 50 per cent; but when we remember:

1. That Ontario has 265,176 males over 21 years of age, which is 114,138 more than Quebec, with only 151,038;

2. That, in the cities of Quebec province there are only 135,000 males between the ages of 17 and 45, whilst among the native-born population of Ontario, there are 395,050, or 260,000 more;

3. That in Ontario the males outnumber the females by 75,000, while in Quebec the difference is only 20,000;

4. That, according to the recent census (page 68, volume III) Ontario has 170,789 workingmen who earned, in 1911, less than $500 per annum, and Quebec (page 76) only 111,852; which leaves in Ontario a majority of 34 per cent among those men of the working class who would feel the spur of poverty and would be led to hope that by enlisting they would better the lot of their families; we realize that, as regards the facilities of volunteer recruiting the equation between 46,000 Ontario citizens and 25,000 French-Canadians is perfect. No native citizen, no matter from what province he has sprung, is entitled to criticize the province of Quebec or to claim that we have not enlisted in just as large proportion as any other group of Canadian-born.

The soil of Flanders and of northern France is saturated with the blood of French-Canadians who have offered their lives on the altar of the Allied cause. At this very moment our compatriots are fighting, and dying, always for the same cause.

Sorrow, mourning and anguish stalk in many of our homes. We should not be insulted, to boot, by hearing that the French-Canadians have not done their duty. They have done their duty generously, heroically, and with more credit than a great many others.

All the others are fighting for their own country, their homes, their families, their interests, their fatherland. The French-Canadians alone are fighting for an idea devoid of all personal interest.

They have no country but Canada, and still, they are fighting and dying three thousand miles away from their own land.

Let us reflect and remember that where a nation takes root is in its burying-ground; it is there, in the cemeteries, that you will find the palpitating heart of a people faithful to the cult of ancestry. It is here that

our fathers were born and were buried: they are sleeping their last sleep beneath this Canadian soil where our ancestors have been laid away for the last four hundred years. What other race in this country can say as much?

But while defending the French-Canadians from the unjust attacks which have been launched against them I do not intend to preach a French Canadian doctrine. No, the political doctrine which must guide our country and towards which all our manifestations of national life should converge, should be, first of all, the Canadian doctrine.

We are proud of being British subjects, but we place still higher out title of Canadian citizens.

To give the last man and the last cent to this war is not a Canadian doctrine; it is an imperialist doctrine, an anti-Canadian doctrine.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a loyal subject of the British Crown, if ever there were one, and who in the turmoil of the difficult times through which we are passing, represents the true Canadian idea which will survive the present crisis; this statesman whom recent events have placed in history not only as the leader of a party, but the real leader of the Canadian nation; this patriot who is outside of unionism because he is above it, and dominates it, spoke thus in this House on the 24th of July, 1917:

> I would be delighted if we could send more soldiers to General Currie. I wish that our population and our resources would allow of our sending not only half a million but a million men. But the question is how many men can we take from the life of the nation at the present time without imperilling the public services which are essential to this country, and essential to carrying on our share of the war. This is a subject which, in my humble opinion, has not been sufficiently considered by the Government. They went into this war without any previous calculation whatever, without taking any census of our resources in men and in other respects. They asked for 100,000 men, 200,000 men, 300,000 men, 400,000 men, and, at last, for 500,000 men. When they reached the 500,000 figure they were told by several people that they could not get the men. One of the most important captains of industry in this country, Lord Shaughnessy, expressed his opinion in no uncertain terms, that the men could not be got without injury to the public services. But the Government paid no heed to that. They paid no heed to the other consideration, that it is not only men the Allies require at the present time, but food. They paid no heed to the question whether the men could not be better employed in producing food in Canada than in fighting at the front.

It is late, but not too late for the Government to look to itself and moderate recruiting until it has been clearly established, as I said to my constituents. "That after the tremendous effort which we have already accomplished, this recruiting may go on without harm to Canada, or to the Allies, and this can be demonstrated only after a very careful inventory of our local needs, the economic needs of our country, particularly with respect to farm labour, to the interests of industry, the needs of our transportation system, the operating of our mines and other natural resources which will insure our national prosperity."

I believe that I follow the true, the only real Canadian tradition; I believe I am moved by the real national spirit which must reign in this country and unite all our hearts.

To those imperialists who, wittingly or unwittingly, seek to betray the interests of our Canadian land for the interest of the Empire or the Allies, I will always oppose a heart that is adamant, a heart inflamed with one passion, and one only, the passion for Canada.

Glory to our dead who have offered their youth to the sacred cause which we all hold dear: Yes, by all means.

But glory as well to our own dead, at rest amongst us, to the fathers of our Canadian fatherland, to those who have discovered, colonized, developed this country, to those who have won us our liberty, our political autonomy and we have bequeathed to us a constitution, a deed of Canadian nationality which we should strengthen and not endanger.

Leaving to Germany her materialistic and ambitious aims, we have, ourselves, with the Allies, adopted an ideal goal; World Freedom and the Triumph of Right. This war is not between England, France and Germany, it is a war between might and right, between the pride of conquest and the lofty ideal of the equality of nations, between the hidebound spirit of caste; militarism; and the spirit of liberty, democracy.

Let us not fall victims to the evils we are striving to fight and conquer.

Let us first and always, safeguard the interests of Canada. We must not allow outside interests to dominate the politics of our country.

In all patriotism there is a legitimate part of selfishness. Is Canada's patriotism alone to have no "right to live"? We are perfectly willing to help others avoid death, but, before all, we must live ourselves.

In 1774 and in 1812 the French-Canadians took up arms in defence of Canada; they acted on those occasions as true Canadian

patriots. They wish to follow the same rule of conduct in 1918, that is, to show themselves "Canadians, first of all."

Our country, I repeat, is Canada. Our patriotism which most decidedly takes cognizance of those great humanitarian principles which exist in the higher realms of all races, all creeds and all lands, our patriotism is first of all Canadian. We desire to do our share in defending liberty and civilization, and we are doing it; but we owe ourselves, before all else, to the defence of our own land first conquered by our fathers, to the defence of the soil which they have bequeathed to us, where they are at rest, and where we ourselves desire to live and die.

Like all people who do honour patriotism, we are bound first and foremost to our own fatherland. It is in that land, and for that land, that we are all willing to perish, if need be, to protect our homes and defend the nation.

Were the enemy ever to invade our territory and try to deprive us of the heritage bequeathed us by our ancestors, like the patriots of all times, just as the people of Carthage, in their supreme struggle gave their gold, made ships from the wood of their houses and rigging from the tresses of their women, we will give all for love of our country and, this time, it will be a sacred duty for us to contribute our last man and our last cent, since we will be acting in defence of our native soil, the land of our forefathers.

I would advise those who consider my words too Canadian and not sufficiently imperialistic to turn their gaze upon the escutcheon of the British Crown which has used French speech for centuries and which is entitled to exclaim with the authority of ages: "Honi soit qui mal y pense. Dieu et mon Droit."

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

TORONTO, NIAGARA AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the motion for third reading of Bill No. 37, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Stand.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there any question about this Bill?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that some documents were to be supplied.

Mr. CURRIE: The Minister of Railways and I had a talk about it this afternoon, and he has not yet received the information that is needed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

THE CANADIAN NIAGARA BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill No. 43, to incorporate the Canadian Niagara Bridge Company—Mr. Stewart—Mr. Currie in the Chair.

On section 10—consent of Municipalities.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Currie): An amendment has been added to this section as follows:

(2.) The Company shall not construct or operate any of the works mentioned in Section 8 of this Act upon or over the boulevard of the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park Commission without first obtaining the consent in writing of the Commissioners of the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park upon terms to be agreed upon with the said Commissioners, and failing such consent then upon such terms as are fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

That was agreed to by all parties concerned.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—amalgamated Company may borrow money and mortgage property.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Currie): There is an amendment to this clause, to the effect that the borrowing powers are not to exceed eight million dollars.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before you report the Bill, I note it contains a provision that the undertaking is "for the general advantage of Canada." I am not familiar with the terms of the Bill. Perhaps the promoter will explain.

Mr. STEWART: It is the usual clause which appears in all Bills of this nature. This is a bridge across the Niagara river, accommodating the United States as well as Canada, and in addition to the railway a roadway is provided for passengers and vehicles.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that is an international bridge?

Mr. STEWART: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: If it is, that is quite satisfactory to me.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE DYNAMIC BALANCING MACHINE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill No. 58, respecting certain patents of The Dynamic Balancing Machine Company.—Mr. Fripp.

On Section 2—Certain rights saved.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Currie): This clause is struck out.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GOSPEL WORKERS CHURCH IN CANADA.

House in committee on Bill No. 59, to incorporate the Gospel Workers Church in Canada.—Mr. Middlebro.

On section 4—First General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Currie): A subclause has been added providing that the head offices shall be at Thornbury, Ontario.

Section agreed to.

On Section 5—Power to acquire property:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose these are the usual powers?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Currie): The section has been amended.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Currie): The proviso that "the annual value of real estate which the Church may possess in any one municipality shall not exceed the sum of twenty thousand dollars" has been amended as follows:

Provided that the value of real estate which the Church may possess in any one municipality shall not exceed the sum of two hundred thousand dollars.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

FRASER LUMBER COMPANY, LIMITED.

On motion of Mr. Elkin, the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 9, respecting Fraser Lumber Company, Limited, and Fraser Companies, Limited, was read the first and second times and concurred in.

THE BUDGET.

The debate on the Budget was resumed.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, before commencing to discuss the Budget, I should like to refer to the few remarks that the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bristol) directed at the farmers of Western Canada in particular. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his seat, I would have been better pleased if he had been. I am at a loss to understand why hon. members, particularly those from the cities, have to be continuously referring to the position of the farmers. I have not heard the farmers or their representatives speaking in a similar fashion in regard to them. This reference to the farmers seems to come particularly from those who have a protectionist argument to advance. They seem to use the assumed prosperity of the western farmers as an argument why they should not be asking for more tariff reductions. If the farmers or their representatives so desired, they could use the very same argument in regard to those gentlemen. We could find it easy to do as they have done, to refer to automobiles, men of means and leisure and so forth, and we could go further; we could speak of limousines. There are many other things that we might use for our argument. But if you, Sir, will permit me to use the expression, that is not our style, we do not resort to that kind of argument to bolster up anything we wish to say; if we cannot tackle a question fairly and squarely from an economic standpoint and make our case good, then we are prepared to leave it absolutely alone. The hon. member said that the farmers should be prepared to pay a fair share of the tax. The farmers are prepared to pay their fair share of the tax. The farmers were the first class of people in Canada to ask that the income tax, which is now being so heavily imposed, should be levied. That request is and has been for a number of years a plank in their platform. What they, however, do object to paying, is a tax where for every dollar that goes into the public treasury, anywhere from two dollars to four dollars go into the pockets of private individuals or private interests. We do object to paying a tax in that way.

The hon. gentleman referred to the Saskatchewan farmers as men of leisure. He said: They keep no stock; they buy condensed milk. He made a number of equally absurd statements. I would advise the hon. gentleman, before he attempts to make another display of his supposed knowledge, to take the statistics of the western provinces, compare them with similar statistics of the eastern provinces, and I think he will not make as big a blunder and exhibit such a lack of knowledge of conditions outside

of his own little sphere as he did in this House to-day. It is said that the smallest place in which a man can possibly live is within himself, and I am afraid that the hon. member for Toronto Centre is a very close inhabitant of that particular place.

He referred to the western farmers as all having automobiles. There are between 130,000 and 140,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan alone. The number of automobile licenses taken out last year in that province was a trifle over 30,000, nearly 20,000 of which, or possibly just a little more, were owned in the cities and towns. Consequently 10,000, out of 140,000 or so of western farmers, possessed automobiles. The hon. member might have looked up the statistics along that line. He also referred to the farmers as having to build gymnasiums on their farms so that they might take exercise. The waistline is a very good indication of the amount of exercise that a man takes, and I think if the hon. gentleman will go to the trouble of sizing up a few of the western farmers represented here to-night, he will find out that he is mistaken. I myself am probably about as corpulent as any of them, but up to the present I have found no difficulty in seeing my toes, neither have the rest of our friends.

The western farmers do not provide as much merriment for the boys when they come into the cities. The boys do not go up to the western farmer and ask him to get out and not be hiding behind that barrel as they do with some of our city friends. It is a common expression of the boys at least in some of the cities I have visited, when they see some of those gentlemen coming along the street, to ask them: "Why are you always hiding behind that barrel?" I am free to admit that the farmers of western Canada are in a better position now than they were a few years ago and if that were not the case, very few of them would remain on the farm. If they are prosperous, it cannot be said of them as was said by a Toronto editor of the manufacturers of eastern Canada, that their prosperity is ninety-five per cent due to protection and five per cent due to brains. For the farmers have had no protection whatever; they do not want it; they absolutely refused it when it was offered them. They were offered protection on their products going into the markets of the Old Country but they said: No, we will have nothing whatever to do with protection, we are prepared to sell our products in the open markets of the world, and if we cannot meet the competition there we will switch to another product on which we can compete in those markets; we will not ask for protection to enable us to live on the labour of others. There are, in my judgment, only two ways of securing wealth; either produce it yourself, or take it from the fellow who has produced it, and we believe in producing it ourselves.

I must congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance on the fearlessness he displayed in his Budget. I may criticise him a little, but it will be for sins of omission rather than for sins of commission. I also wish to congratulate the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Redman) on his remarks the other evening. I might be tempted to say he stole my thunder, but I will not. I am very pleased indeed to know that the young men of Canada, particularlyy of western Canada, are alive to the situation that confronts us at the present time as it is only by facing it squarely that we shall be able so to guide the destinies of this country as to escape the dangerous shoals. The only criticism I have to make of his remarks is that he might have gone a little further, and so should the Acting Minister of Finance. I do not see why the Income Tax should not be applied to smaller incomes than $1,000. There are thousands of young men in Canada, at all events in western Canada, who are earning higher wages to-day than they ever did before; thousands of them are working on the farm for from $600 to $800 a year, and found. That leaves a farm labourer with a nice sum at the end of the year, and I can see no reason why the tax should not be applied to such an income. I would not suggest that the same rate of taxation be applied, but a moderate tax. The minister has seen fit to tax the necessities of life of every one of us, so why should he not apply the Income Tax to all incomes, putting a moderate tax on the moderate income?

The Acting Minister of Finance referred to the taxes on household articles as a tax on luxuries, but I cannot quite agree that tea, coffee, and tobacco, if you will—I never use it myself—can be termed luxuries. But if they are luxuries, what shall we say about silks and satins and fine furs and other expensive articles of clothing? Surely these must be luxuries too.

I was disappointed at not finding in the Budget any provision for giving assistance or encouragement in any way to agricultural production. We had thought the minister

would have seen his way clear to give us at least a little encouragement along that line, but the Budget proposals will have the very opposite effect. That may seem a little strange, but it is nevertheless true. Automobiles, for instance, are considered luxuries by the Acting Minister of Finance and are taxed. Now there are certain types of automobile that can be called luxuries, but there is another type the lower-priced car, which, so far as Western Canada is concerned, when we take into consideration the shortage of labour, the great distance some of the farmers live from town and a number of other considerations, are almost a necessity on the farm. Very many of our farmers in order to reach town have to travel from thirty to sixty miles, yet—labour being very scarce they have to put in every possible hour they can on the farm. I have in mind one particular district where there is a settlement of six or seven thousand farmers who are an average of thirty-seven and a half miles from market. Now if any class of our population requires assistance surely it is those people. But the minister in his wisdom, or otherwise, has seen fit to tax every class of automobile. I have no objection whatever to the tax on the higher-priced cars which can properly be considered luxuries, but I repeat, the lower-priced car running from $600 to $800 is almost a necessity on the farm; and when we take into consideration the price of harness, vehicles, horses and of hay and grain for feed, it is almost an economy to purchase an automobile, altogether apart from the great saving in time. These farmers who have to drive anywhere from twenty-five to sixty miles, take two to three days to make the journey with a horse without any load at all, and from two to four days with a load. The district I have in mind was settled six to ten years ago. A number of the settlers have been in there ten years, they went in expecting a railroad would be built. A line was projected, and the assurance given that it would be built, but up to the present time they have no railway and they are almost isolated. These people have done everything in their power to have a railway built. They have gone to the extent of getting a competent engineer and surveying the road at great expense. They put their case before the powers that be. But there was nothing doing. They went back again to their people, organized themselves from one end of the country to the other and then came back with another proposition that they were prepared to build the entire grade of the line absolutely free of cost. Up to the present time that offer has not been accepted. They came back still again and said that they would furnish the labour to lay the steel if the railway company would build the line. But they have not received much encouragement yet.

Where people have been so liberal in their offers of free labour, it seems a pity that the Government cannot devise some means of assisting them in the matter of transportation. They are living in as fine a strip of country as you can find anywhere. They are producing very little, simply for the reason that they cannot do it. The distances are too great for them to haul their grain in the winter time; consequently, when they are drawing their grain in the summer, the land is left and the result is that production in that part of the country does not amount to very much. If the Government in their greater production campaign could see their way clear to give these people that necessary assistance, it would increase production there to a degree that cannot be duplicated in any other part of Canada.

Then, speaking of the automobile in another direction, I would like to ask the minister why he is going to penalize the man who has yet to purchase a car and apply no tax whatever to those who have already secured their cars? Why would it not be far more equitable, if you are going to charge a man who has yet to purchase his car, anywhere from $75 to $300, to require those who already have their cars to pay an annual tax into the Dominion treasury? They are paying now into the provincial treasury. I cannot say whether this is feasible or not, but if it is I would have no hesitation in recommending that steps be taken along that line. Personally, it would affect me just about as much as any other citizen, as being a farmer, I have two cars, one for trucking produce and the other a family car. Therefore, I would at least be taxed as much as the average person.

But there is yet another use for the lower-priced car to which I would ask the minister's attention. They are being largely used in Western Canada as tractors for doing farm labour. We have an attachment now in the West for use on the lighter-powered cars, and they are working out a process of putting them on the higher-powered cars as well. For about $240 you can secure an attachment by which, in

about twenty minutes, you can transfer your touring car into a tractor. It has been demonstrated time and again—I have seen it myself,—that it will do as much work and pull as great a load as is claimed for the much-talked of Ford tractor that they are introducing into this country now. The minister said the other day that this tax did not apply to truck or delivery cars. There are thousands of those lighter cars in western Canada that are changed into trucks of one kind or another; they are bought as cars but are changed later. Most of the trucks that are turned out from the factories are more useful for town delivery and such work, but the car that is largely used for working in the country is the runabout that has been purchased and afterwards changed by the person who has purchased it. We have hundreds of those cars working in Saskatchewan now, and I expect there will be several hundred more of them in operation before this season is over. I think the minister might make an allowance in the tax that would be paid on these cars, depending upon the classification which might be put upon them, distinguishing between utility cars and cars of a more luxurious class. The utility or working car is an absolute necessity as far as Western Canada is concerned, but I would not say that the other was. We could get along without the higher-priced car, and those who are able to purchase it, I think, might well make up the difference in the amount that would be lost in the levy by permitting the lower-priced car to go free of any duty or excise tax.

The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) made a reference or two to the farmers. He seemed to have an idea that the income tax was not going to affect the farmer the same as other people, and he was of the opinion that the farmer could get along with much less income than could other people. There may be something in his argument. I agree entirely with his suggestion that the minister levy a straight tax on land values. We have been advocating that in western Canada for years and we have practiced what we have been preaching. We have had a straight land tax in the rural districts for the last twenty-three or twenty-four years and we have seen no reason for changing it yet. But the hon. member for North Winnipeg makes no suggestion whatever that would affect those who have an income of less than $2,000 and who have no land to apply this land tax to. His constituents largely, or probably almost entirely, are city dwellers. We are quite used, of course, to that. All kinds of suggestions are being made by the city residents and representatives as to ways and means of taxing the agriculturists. Just the moment that he begins to get his head a little above water there is some one in close proximity with a club ready to drive him under again. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why the farmers have decided that they will have at least a few representatives of their own in Parliament to state their case on the floor of the House. We have a few of them from western Canada. From the province that I represent, out of sixteen members, there are thirteen or fourteen that are actual farmers—not buckboard farmers at all, but actual farmers living on the soil and carrying blisters on their hands. If you do not believe me come to rooms 116 and 117 some day and I will demonstrate to you that they are the horny-handed, sunburned sons of toil.

An hon. MEMBER: Room 216.

Mr. MAHARG: Did I say 116? I am sorry; it should be rooms 216 and 217. I do not want to get into room 117. I would not want to make any predictions as to what would be found there, but as to the occupants of the other two rooms I am well posted.

For the benefit of those who are championing the cause of the eastern manufacturers, I may say that we are not quarreling with them at the present time. We have not asked for tariff reductions, as such, since we came here. Any of us who have spoken on that subject have spoken of it as a war measure, a temporary means for the increase of production. If, after the war is over, the Government considers that a reduction of the tariff is not warranted, well and good; but our argument is that nothing should be left undone that can be done at the present time to encourage production in all lines. There are many things that can be done, but for the benefit of the member for North Winnipeg I made a suggestion a little while ago. I referred in particular to the farm labourer, but I think it would apply equally to the labourer in the city. In case the hon. gentleman was not in the Chamber at the time, I would say for his information that I would propose a lowering of the minimum amount of the income to which the tax should apply. Probably it might be made $300 lower. I do not think any serious hardship would result. The hon. gentleman referred to farmers as not being bookkeepers. How

many of them, he asked, keep books? For his information I would say that there is not the incentive to the farmer to keep books that there is for those engaged in other occupations, because he is not one who furnishes credit. If there is any credit insofar as the farmer is concerned it works the other way; he is generally the debtor and not the creditor, consequently he has not the necessity for keeping books, and he has not the other incentive that some other business concerns have for keeping books either; he has nothing to gain by cooking accounts, by watering stock, or doing any of those things that are so skilfully manipulated by bookkeeping. He has nothing to gain by that even if he wanted to; so his books are honestly kept. But for the hon. gentleman's information I would say that there are thousands of our farmers who do keep books, and I venture to state they keep them as systematically probably as the men in his own profession. We have farmers who are quite capable of doing that. I keep a slight record myself, and I know just about where I stand. I never had any university education or academic training, but I know that two and two make four, and it is a matter of addition, multiplication, subtraction and division; that is all there is to it. If you do your book-keeping honestly, there is no scheming or hidden secrets whatever in connection with it.

The hon. gentleman also referred to the prices that the farmers are getting for their grain; $2.21 for wheat, $20 to $21 or something like that for pork, eggs, butter and other products in the same proportion. The hon. gentleman has quoted those prices correctly, but they are for a No. 1 article. You have got to produce the goods, Mr. Speaker, before you get those prices. I venture to say that if there were fixed prices for the services performed by the members of some of the other professions, and they had to produce a No. 1 article, or give a No. 1 result, possibly they might see where the farmer comes off sometimes when a hail storm strikes him, or frost or rust blights his crop. Then probably they would have a better idea of what it means to produce No. 1 articles. Possibly, also, it might have some effect on their income, just as it has on the income of the farmers, and that in a great many cases their incomes might probably come within the category of those that escape taxation.

The hon. gentleman also said that the farmers are making money faster than they ever did before, and in the very next breath he said there are very few of them that are making $2,000 right now, that is, who have got incomes of $2,000 a year. Now if they are keeping their families on $2,000 a year, and if they are making money faster than they ever did before, I would ask the hon. gentleman what must the position have been of those people a few years ago. As I stated a minute ago, the farmers have a good representation in this House now, a quite sufficient representation to be very effective along any particular lines that they wish to pursue. But, Mr. Speaker, this Government was elected to win the war. That was the chief purpose for which they were returned to power, and in so far as the farmers of western Canada are concerned they are prepared to assist the Government in every way to win the war. It has been said that there was an agreement between the two parties, before the Union Government was formed, that the tariff would be left in abeyance during the duration of the war. It is hard for me to believe that any group of men would enter into an arrangement whereby the fiscal policy of the country would be left in abeyance for an indefinite period of time. Personally, I cannot conceive of such a thing. Such an arrangement may have been entered into, but I am very doubtful of it. To go further: Some of the eastern papers, I think certainly some of the Toronto papers, have said that the western members were pledged to support the Government through thick and thin. Well, I cannot speak for all the western members but I think I can speak for some of them and I can speak for myself, and, so far as I am concerned personally, there is no arrangement, no agreement, no understanding, either written, spoken, or implied, of that nature. And I know of a number of other western members who are in exactly the same position. They may speak for themselves a little later on. Nevertheless we are prepared to give this Government every assistance, and just as loyal assistance as though we were pledged.

But there are differences of opinion as to what should be done. I may think that it would be essential to deal with the tariff to assist in winning this war. A number of us are of that opinion. But we have been told recently that it is not a question of food production, but a question of men. Well, time will tell. We had the figures given us, and it looked as though that was the situation. Every person seems to be of that opinion. But it is difficult to under-

stand why conditions should change so rapidly. We suppose that those in charge of our affairs nationally and internationally have a fair perspective of what may be expected at least a few months ahead, and it is only a few short months since we were told that production was paramount. Now, production apparently is being left in the background, and the cry is for men. As I said, time will tell. We from western Canada will give this Union Government every opportunity to make good, if you will pardon the use of that term. We will give them every opportunity and assistance, but we are not prepared to take their say-so for everything for an indefinite length of time. We will use our own common, horse sense acquired during the years we have followed rural occupations, and there may come a time when we will ask the members of the Government at least for a little more information than we have so far asked for. It will not be more than a year, probably six or eight months, until there will be another session of Parliament. In the meantime we will keep our ears close to the ground, and will use what little intelligence we have, and when we come back here we may have something to say. That is the western viewpoint and it may be stated a little plainer, than it has yet been stated this session.

As I said, the western people were prepared to give this Government every assistance. We buried our economic views entirely last December. We have not changed our views at all—not at all. Our economic views have not been changed, at least in one direction, in fact war conditions have intensified them, and we are more convinced now that the views held by western Canada for the last few years have been economically sound. They are being gradually adopted by this Parliament, one after another; and if this keeps on it will only be a matter of a few years until Parliament will have swallowed holus-bolus that platform propounded in 1910.

The people of our country are probably just a little different from those of eastern Canada; they may see things from a different viewpoint. This was fairly well demonstrated during the visit of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to western Canada last December. A demonstration was given then as to the spirit and feeling of the western people. I do not think any politician or statesman or any other man ever had a greater reception in western Canada than did the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In all the cities the people who went to hear him could not be accommodated. The churches and halls in which the meetings were held were crowded, and overflow meetings had to be arranged. To the eastern mind, and possibly to the leader himself, things looked very hopeful for a Liberal victory in western Canada. But we who were on the ground knew differently.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If I may be permitted, I may tell the hon. gentleman
10 p.m. that the leader of the Opposition acknowledged that the receptions were most cordial and enthusiastic, but he never entertained the illusion, in view of the War-time Elections Act, that he could rally the West for his party.

Mr. MAHARG: Since the hon. gentleman has mentioned the War-time Elections Act, I might say that, so far as the results in western Canada are concerned, that Act cut a very, very small figure. Hon. members from western Canada know that, and I will make bold to say that had the War-time Elections Act never been placed on the statute books the result in western Canada would have been very similar to what it is at the present time. I venture to say that that Act drove probably as many votes away from the Unionist candidates as the Act itself drove away by disfranchisement. I know whereof I speak. The War-time Elections Act gained no sympathy in western Canada, not a bit. I have no sympathy with it, and never had. It never was necessary in so far as western Canada is concerned. She has shown her patriotism; she has been loyal. The protectionists of the East charged us a few years ago with being annexationists and traitors. If that was so, the West has redeemed herself—she never needed to redeem herself, for she has shown continuously that there is no more loyal part of Canada than the western plains. And in so far as the West is concerned, you can take your War time Elections Act off the books any time you like. If it is necessary to rally in order to win this war, western Canada will be found there every time "with the goods," as the saying is, and as she always has been. Take her patriotic efforts, if you like: We have a very large foreign population, particularly in the province of Saskatchewan, but take that foreign population out of Saskatchewan, and there is not a province in Canada which has contributed as much per capita as Saskatchewan has, and I think the other prairie provinces have done about as well. It used to rile us somewhat some years ago when they commenced talking about our un-

patriotic attitude; but practically all the things we have advocated have been done. We have our free wheat, and a lot of other things, and there is not a word about it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must not depart from the Budget too far, although it seems to be quite the order of the day to go anywhere you like, and not even to mention the Budget at all. I do not want to get too far away. Coming back to what I was saying when the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) interposed, I was referring to the reception given to Sir Wilfrid Laurier as illustrating the spirit of our people. They talked about us a few years ago as being a bunch of Grits; everybody was a Grit out there. For the information of this House, I want to say that we have no Grits now, or very few of them, and no Conservatives, or, if any, very few. We do not recognize the old terms "Grit" and "Tory." We regard the issue before the people, and act accordingly; we do not care what it is. That is why I say that western Canada in the meantime will be keeping her ear close to the ground to hear what is going on. If anything requires mentioning, she will not be backward in making herself heard when the proper time comes.

This Budget is designed to take care of our debt. During this war we have been piling up a national debt the extent of which is indeed becoming alarming. Several changes will have to be made in our policies if we are to meet the commitments that we have undertaken during the last few years. It is simply a question of development. In every province we have the natural resources, but the difficulty is that they have been largely dissipated; they have fallen into the hands of private ownership, and we are not receiving the benefit from them that we should. I am glad that the minister has taken steps to take into the Treasury at least a portion of the profits made by some of these industries; I wish him Godspeed, and suggest that he go a little further. In western Canada you can apply income tax as severely as you like, so long as it is fairly and equitably administered. We stand for that, and have always stood for it. We stand for the direct land tax, have always stood for it, and are prepared to bear our share of it at any time.

As I say, in order to meet our commitments we should see to the development of our natural resources. The western plains are possibly a field easier of development than any which may be found in the other provinces. We have there very large areas of uncultivated land which is owned or held in trust by the Government. The prosperity of our country for some time to come will depend largely on the production of the western plains. True, we have other resources, but it takes time to develop mineral or timber resources. On the plains it is different; the resources of that part of the country can in twelve months be converted into productive activities, and the Government should look around and see whether something cannot be done in that respect. Millions of acres of land out there, held by private corporations—railway companies and land companies—have been lying idle for years, do not produce anything, and are a detriment to the country because they retard development and education. The Government could do nothing better than devise some means whereby this land could be brought under cultivation; that is the quickest way of producing revenue. The people of the western country have initiative; they are prepared to go ahead. If you take our labourers from us, we will simply increase our man-power, as we have been doing for the last ten or twelve years. Most of the people who went to western Canada were accustomed to driving one, two or three horses—we see it done often down here yet. But they have gradually developed until in the West to-day it is not uncommon to see a man driving eight horses on an ordinary farm implement—and they will continue increasing their man-power indefinitely by the addition of more up-to-date machinery, and the like. The western plains, therefore, offer a field which, for immediate results, cannot be duplicated in any other place.

In western Canada large acreages of what are known as school lands are held by the Dominion Government in trust, as it were, for the assistance of education in the provinces. A great demand for that land exists all over the country; people are anxious to cultivate it; they are prepared to take the chance, expensive as it is, of bringing that land under cultivation if the Government would only make it available to them. I have done all I can to persuade the Government to throw that land open for cultivation. Large acreages are being put up for sale, but hundreds of thousands of acres are not being sold, notwithstanding the demand that is being made for them. I have had numerous inquiries in this respect from people in my constituency. I have had inquiries from men who are prepared to break

an entire section of this land, 640 acres, during the month of June and bring it under cultivation next year. One gentleman who wrote to me has a large engine and twelve horses ready to start to break up one of these sections any day; another has sixteen horses ready to engage in similar work. Numerous others are anxious to cultivate sections of this land, but our Government says: no, you cannot do it. The only excuse I have so far been able to get from the Government for their attitude in this respect is their fear that the land will become infested with weeds. Weeds will grow on it anyway; they have been there for years. Whenever the land is cultivated, weeds will grow upon it; we are not worrying about that. Weeds have produced better farmers and more of them in western Canada than all the work that has been done by the Department of Agriculture, either of the Dominion or of any of the provinces. Weeds will tell you what to do; you do not have to go to the experimental farms for advice. You either look after them, or they put you on the road. Even if there was a danger, we might better have the difficulty of eradicating a few weeds than have the blot on our nation that we refused to allow this land to be put under cultivation when millions of people were starving. The policy of the Government in this respect is a most short-sighted one, and I can see no excuse whatever for the position which they take.

The member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) during the course of his remarks the other night, congratulated the Acting Minister of Finance, and then entered into a tirade of high-protection talk. I have no quarrel with him in so far as his high protection talk goes, he can speak as much as he likes. But I do object when he commences to speak about the farmers as he did. I shall not attempt to deal with his argument at all. In fact, to my mind, he did not advance any argument whatever further than that as, in his opinion, the farmers were prosperous, they should be satisfied to continue paying the duty into the packets of the manufacturers. That seems to be the argumentative stock in trade of those gentlemen.

I should like to refer to one remark my hon. friend made in regard to the basis the manufacturers took for fixing the prices for their goods. I am prepared to agree with him that the cost of production should be the basis, but only in so far as an industry is a suitable industry for the location in which it is being carried on. To carry his argument to its logical conclusion I might just as well advance the argument that, if I as a farmer should start growing sweet potatoes or oranges in western Canada, the Government should protect me in order that I might be able to take the cost of producing those articles of food as a basis on which to fix the prices which the consumer will have to pay for them. If there is in any country any industry that cannot stand on its own feet, there is something wrong; either it is in the wrong country, or there is mismanagement. Possibly the editorial columns of a Toronto paper describes the case properly. A location may be a proper place for an industry, provided the management is one hundred per cent brains instead of five.

The hon. member also to some extent enlightened me on what he had been basing the prosperity of the western farmers. He said that he was a farmer, and that he had made a certain amount of money from his farm. He also stated that he valued a dollar that he made off that farm twice as highly as a dollar that he made anywhere else. Probably he is of the opinion that the same thing applies to the western farmers —that when they make a dollar on the farm it is equal to two dollars, or three dollars, or four dollars. That may be where he gets his ideas of the untold wealth of the western farmers. He further stated that the removal of the duty would not increase production. The hon. gentleman no doubt is wise in his day. According to his address here he would lead us to believe that he was a walking encyclopaedia, but there are a few of us who have spent from twenty-five to forty years in western Canada, who have just about as good an idea as the hon. gentleman from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) himself as to what will increase production in western Canada, and we have no hesitation whatever in saying that the removal of the duty will enormously increase production in that part of the country. We are not, however, holding out for that. If production is not as essential as it appeared to be six months ago, all well and good, but if a time should come again when production is absolutely essential, then we shall at least advise the Government as to what we think should be done in regard to increased production.

I just want to refer briefly to a little piece of poetry which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) gave to the House, and which was afterwards added to by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richard-

son). With your permission, Sir, I should like, before sitting down, to offer a further contribution in the hope that when Hansard is completed we may be able to select from it a volume which even the most fastidious collector would desire to have on his bookshelves. In order to make the matter intelligent, so that hon. members will understand it, I think I had better quote the poetry from the beginning. By the way, I was just going to say that apparently some of the legislation that the Union Government has been passing is at least very productive of some things, possibly the season of the year may have something to do with the case—we usually have in the spring a number of budding poets. The hon. member for Brome started out something like this:

> The clock we have pushed forward
> For gardening after tea;
> But as for farming implements—
> We can't admit THEM free.

Then the hon. member for Springfield added this contribution:

> In his celebrated platform
> Of eighteen ninety-three,
> Upon which he was returned to power,
> Farm implements were free.
>
> But when, later on, the tariff
> Was brought down by Lauri-ee,
> The combine was on top again
> And the farmer up a tree!

I have a little further contribution that was handed to me by another spring poet. I wish the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) were here so that he would have the benefit of listening to the poetry being spoken instead of having to read it in Hansard. My contribution runs in this fashion:

> We are told that the farmer is now up a tree
> In regard to his implements coming in free;
> But that tree is now pulpwood, and between you and me,
> The High Priests of Protection will soon be at sea.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, at this very important stage of the session when the Budget is under discussion, I rise to express my personal opinion on the policy of the Government concerning the war. It seems to me that the Government does not fully realize the actual condition of the war and deliberately refuses to meet the obligations which are evidently imposed upon this country. The great task of the hour, that our full and effective participation in the war requires us to perform, is to give immediate assistance to

the millions of soldiers at the front and to the people of the mother country who are on the verge of starvation. Since the beginning of the war I have stood with those who believe that Canada should do her utmost to keep the British flag flying. It is not necessary for me to recall the fact that since 1912 I have had the honour of being a member of the Quebec legislature, and during the progress of the war I have given my hearty support to the Gouin Government in everything it has done to help the mother country and the Allies. Not only have I done that, but in 1915 in our district, the district of Ottawa, I had the honour of organizing an important committee of relief, the presidency of which was conferred upon me.

I shall stand in this House against any measure of conscription, and I think I may be permitted to say I am close to the heart and soul of my fellow-countrymen in the province of Quebec. I was elected as an anti-conscriptionist, and I am more and more convinced every day that the voluntary system would have produced better results than conscription. I am more confident than ever that the greatest contribution we could make to the Mother Country and the Allies is an increased food production. In fact, we have been told by this Government since this session began, and before, that the paramount duty of the moment is increased food production. The Prime Minister himself said on the 19th of March last:

> I cannot emphasize too strongly the absolute, urgent and vital necessity of increased food production in Canada during this year and next year. I absolutely agree with what my right hon. friend said a moment ago that the issue of this war may depend upon food production in the United States and in Canada.

It is of vital importance that we should increase the production of food in this country as upon the production of food the issue of this war may depend. The Prime Minister in his message sent out to the four corners of Canada said:

> The campaign for increased production of foodstuffs now launched by the Canadian Food Board is of the most vital importance to the victory of the Allied cause. Because of our geographical position, the United Kingdom and the Allied Nations are depending on Canada for food as never before. Specific suggestions will be issued from time to time by the Canada Food Board for the guidance of the people; and it is the earnest hope of the Government that every citizen will realize his or her personal individual duty to adopt and carry out these suggestions. Mere perfunctory observance will not be enough; the crisis is grave and urgent beyond possibility of exaggeration; and it will only be through an earnest sense

of individual responsibility that Canadians will be able in this matter to honour their obligations to their heroic soldiers overseas, who are defending our liberties at a cost beside which any personal inconvenience or discomfort on our part is insignificant.

R. L. BORDEN.

But that is only one of the appeals which have been made to the people of Canada. Other appeals have come from the other side of the ocean. Only a few days ago the British Food Controller appealed to our people in these words:

In these stern days it is inspiring to learn that Canada is tackling the food problem with redoubled energy. The terrific pressure on our military front makes it all the more imperative that those behind the lines shall strain every nerve to defeat the enemy's avowed object of destroying the British Empire.

Germany hoped first to starve the Old Country by the submarine campaign, and then to smash her land forces. She has failed to starve us and she will fail to smash us, but we cannot achieve victory without food. There never was a time when it was more needed.

The Canadian farmer and Canadian farmhand now have the opportunity to make an effective reply to the enemy's present onslaught, by bending their undivided energies to the increased production of those food supplies, for which we depend to such vital extent upon your great Dominion.

That is not all; we have been told by our own Food Controller in his last report, dated the 18th March, that food production is vital. On page 15 of that report he says:

When I accepted office as Food Controller I studied the situation very carefully and very seriously. I was guided not only by the knowledge of others in Canada whom I called into council, but by experience in Great Britain and by the attitude of Mr. H. C. Hoover, Food Administrator for the United States, whose qualifications for the part he fills are admittedly very high. I came to the conclusion that several things were essential, and my policy throughout has been based upon the consideration involved:

1. To stimulate production—to speed it up to highest limit. The need of increased production are based not so much upon our own home requirements, as upon those of the Allies. If the people of France and Italy starve (and they are on the verge of starvation), and if their armies are not fed up to the standard of fighting strength, the war will be lost. We must bear in mind, too, that before the next crop is harvested there will be six million men—British, Americans and Canadians—in arms at the French, Belgian and other fronts—men taken away from productive pursuits—to be victualled as well. If there be not enough food raised and saved so that we can spare for overseas the amount necessary there, then again the war is lost. I have tried with all earnestness, and the Food Control Administration has tried with all its might, to impress upon the public the great seriousness of production. And along with production go the other essentials.

If we would answer those urgent appeals—and it is our duty to do so—we must see that the necessary farm help is secured. On the 15th March the War Lecture Bureau of this Government under the heading "Soldiers of the Soil" appealed to the school boys of the land to go and work on the farms, stating that twenty-five thousand would be required. The appeal read:

The Bureau has been asked to get behind the recruiting of boy labour for farms. Canada is in urgent need of twenty-five thousand boy volunteers for farm work. From no other source can the necessary number of farm workers be obtained. In no other way can the Greater Production campaign be a success . . . . The principal factor, if the effort at greater production is to be successful, is to have sufficient farm labour for seeding and harvest. The land is waiting, but we must have farm help to work it.

I humbly submit that the scarcity of farm labour is sufficiently proved, in fact, it is admitted by every one who knows the actual condition of affairs in this country. I say that if you want effective production you must have good farm labourers, not school children from the city. Farming is a professtion, a great profession especially when carried on by those who have experience in it. Farmers and the sons of farmers are needed here to maintain our food production which is so necessary to the success of the Allies.

If you read the Votes and Proceedings of this House since the beginning of the session you will find that several motions have been introduced by members tending to demonstrate the fact that there is not sufficient labour in this country for the requirements of our great national industries. The Government acknowledges the necessity of farm and industrial labour, for it has seen fit to create a portfolio of immigration and colonization. But what kind of immigration could we expect to get during these days? It is now time, in the interests of this country, in the interest of our efficient participation in the war, and in order to help the mother country, that the Prime Minister should re-consider his policy and tell us what the Government intends to do in order to solve the important problems of the hour.

If I had to express a personal opinion, I would say, first, that food production seems to be the paramount necessity, and to take precedence over all other demands, if we are to render the greatest service to the Allies and to the Mother Country. Connected with that question is the problem of transportation by rail and ocean. Then, there is the new industry of shipbuilding

to which the Government is giving its attention. Second, if you want to make a success of those industries you must not count upon immigration but you must retain in this country our farm helpers and labourers. Let us stop at once the emigration of our workers by the suspension of the Military Service Act of 1917 and employ immediately on the farms, and in the industries the thirty thousand soldiers who have been raised but have not yet left the country.

Why should we not discuss this matter now before it is too late? The Government of Great Britain discussed the other day the question of getting back from the front twenty thousand soldiers in order to meet the requirements of labour, and nobody as a result has been taxed with disloyalty. During a discussion in the House of Commons of submarine losses and shipbuilding enterprises in Great Britain Mr. Asquith said:

> In the next place you must exert every possible effort to draw more skilled labour into the shipyards. I know the difficulties perfectly well. We were at this task of trying to get men from the army, and I know the difficulties and the objections the military authorities raise, in perfectly good faith, and it is nothing but the strong and direct exercise of cabinet authority that can really bring from the front the men who are needed for this purpose; but that they can be brought is proved by the fact that they are being brought though not in the numbers or at the rate we should desire.

During the same sitting of the House, the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, said:

> That has got to be done with very great care. Twenty thousand is the figure wanted; it is the figure we shall work up to.

In Great Britain they have discussed this question of getting the necessary skilled labour for the shipyards, and if they do not find it in Great Britain they go as far as the army, even to the front, and they contemplate bringing twenty thousand back in order to work in the industries of England. As a citizen of the Empire, with equal rights before the King, I ask the same privileges as those enjoyed by the citizens of the United Kingdom. I stand in this House as a free man and I say: Stop at once the emigration of our boys; they are needed at home for the sake of the Empire.

Have not the Government abused their power? They have been elected on their programme of selective conscription with the understanding that farmers would be left to pursue their occupation. It is true that this election which took place in virtue of the War-time Elections Act was nothing else than a camouflage, because the will of citizens of this country as expressed at the polls, has not prevailed. At the first opportunity, the Government, contrary to the wishes of the people and in defiance of the constitutional rights of Parliament, hurriedly adopted an Order in Council abolishing selective conscription and enacting the most rigid form of conscription under which it is proposed to send farmers to the front. The Government have introduced regulations, under the Military Service Act contrary to the rules of civilized countries, by virtue of which they are conscripting for overseas service the only living son of a widowed mother supporting a family.

We must realize unfortunately that the party in power and their majority have denied the privileges, responsibilities and sanctity of fatherhood. Only one man can know, and he will never disregard, the sacred words which fell from the lips of his dying father addressed to him as the eldest son: "You will now take my place and take care of your mother and your little brothers and sisters." There is no sane man who will dare to deny that that son is the head of the family and that he fills the place of the departed father. In conscripting that son the Government have deliberately violated the last will and testament of the father. I accuse the Government of deliberately depriving widows and orphans of their only support, of throwing them into the street and making them beggars.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret very much to have to call the hon. gentleman to order, but he is calling in question an Order in Council which has been passed by this House. It is the law and it is not open for him to call it in question.

Mr. FORTIER: I was only referring to the Military Service Act, 1917, which does not provide for the exemption of the son of a widowed mother or the only son of a family. I say that in every civilized country of the world there is no one who would take the only son of a widow, when that widow has a small family to support and when that young son is working to provide the livelihood of mother and orphans. There is no power on earth that should take that son and send him away, and allow that widow and her orphans to become a charge on the public.

In the presence of this great conflict, in which for the last four years the British

and the French have been fighting under their respective flags for the eternal principles of civilization, Canadians are confronted with the two-fold duty of facing the enemy and if necessary dying at the front, and of saving their own country and their homes. But the province of Quebec is opposed to conscription. Not only is that the attitude of the people in general, but the educated men of that province have favoured voluntary enlistment rather than conscription in this young Dominion. Is it not a regrettable fact that nearsighted politicians by the policy which they have adopted have thrown this country into its present unhappy state? The attitude which the French Canadians have taken on the question of conscription is, in my opinion, honourable and patriotic. That French Canadians are lacking neither in patriotism nor bravery is attested by the record of their compatriots who have been honoured at the front as well as by the conduct of those French Canadians who in earlier days defended Canada against the incursion of military forces from the country to the south. The French Canadian is opposed to conscription because he loves his country and his family above everything else in the world. How is it possible that the supreme authority of the Dominion can condemn such sentiments as these in any man? Is it not the supreme duty of the Government, not only to save our country and preserve our homes, but to procure for the Allies what they apparently are most in need of, supplies of food on which to subsist and to enable them to conquer and throw back the invader? Under the circumstances it seems to me that, confronted as we are by such a situation, the Government should not persist in the policy of conscription which seems likely to prove so ruinous to our fair country.

Mr. THOMAS EDWARD SIMPSON (Algoma, W.): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House very long at this hour of the night. I did not intend to take part in the debate until I heard my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) address the House a day or two ago, when he introduced the very important subject of the development of our natural resources, particularly the iron ore industry. I then felt that it was my duty to make a few observations in connection with this particular subject.

The development of our iron and steel industry, to my mind, is of paramount importance to Canada and should receive the sympathetic and favourable consideration of this House. Our national debt is increasing very rapidly, and it is bound to go on increasing so long as we continue to bear our just share in the defence of the Empire. It necessarily follows that ever increasing amounts will be required from year to year in order to pay the interest and sinking fund charges on that national debt. Is it not fair then to expect that our national resources of forest, of field and mine might be utilized to the fullest extent in liquidating these obligations? The hon. member for Fort William has submitted figures to show that there are vast deposits of iron ore in Canada awaiting development. In New Brunswick they have approximately 20,000,000 tons of magnetic ore, with a concentrating plant capable of handling about 1,000 tons of ore per day. In Nova Scotia the iron mines are said to have about 4,000,000 tons of ore proven, and one company has a plant capable of treating over 200,000 tons annually. In British Columbia experts estimate that the iron ore deposits already discovered contain over 35,000,000 tons of ore, and in Ontario we have the Atikokan range with 10,000,000 tons of ore proven up, and the company there has a blast furnace and roasting plant at Port Arthur. Large deposits of magnetite ore have been discovered near Kakabeka falls, and promising deposits of hematite ore have recently been located east of lake Nipigon, and also near Loon lake. These deposits are quite close to the Canadian Northern railway. The Moose Mountain Company have developed their mines, proving the existence of about 100,000,000 tons of magnetic ore. They have installed a mining plant, and erected a Grondel concentrating plant capable of producing some 250 tons per day of concentrated ore, assaying 63 per cent iron content. There are the Balmont, Wilbur, Farnum, and many other magnetic properties in eastern Ontario. Then we have the Lake Superior Corporation and the Algoma Steel Corporation of Sault Ste. Marie. They have shipped from the Helen mine at Michipicoten over 2,263,000 tons of hematitic iron ore; on the same range about 10 miles north of the Helen, the Josephine iron mine has been proven up by diamond drilling, and it contains about 1,400,000 tons of hematite ore; and both of these properties have vast deposits of siderite ore. The Magpie mine also contains large deposits of siderite ore, carrying about 36 per cent iron, but when roasted it carries about 52 per cent iron of excellent quality, and supplies about one-sixth of the ore used in the Algoma Steel Company's furnaces at Sault Ste. Marie.

Canada apparently has hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and on the extreme East and West we have abundant sources of fuel and flux. We have some eighteen blast furnaces, and several extensive steel plants, costing approximately $100,000,000, and producing about 1,500,000 tons of finished product per annum, worth about $75,000,000. Notwithstanding the immense deposits of iron ore we have in this country, we find that over 90 per cent of the iron ore used in these furnaces is imported largely from the United States.

Why is this being done? Because most of our iron ore is of a lower quality, containing a smaller percentage of iron content and a greater percentage of sulphur than the American ore from the lake Superior mines, and in order to bring it up to a value equal to the American ore and to make it suitable for use in the manufacture of steel, it is necssary to have the ore roasted to eliminate the sulphur and other injurious contents. This necessitates the erection of expensive roasting or concentrating plants to treat the raw ore. This treatment, we are told, costs from 35 cents to $1.25 per ton, with the result that American ore can be laid down at the blast furnaces in our own country for less money than ore from our own mines. In addition there is the problem of raising the large sums of money necessary to provide the concentrating and roasting plants. I submit that at a time like the present, when the Government is endeavouring in every legitimate way to reduce the trade balance standing against us with the United States, they would be well advised to consider favourably the suggestion of my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) and to allow a bounty, of say fifty cents a ton, on the iron ore mined and smelted in Canadian smelters. I feel sure that this would result in increased activity in the mining industry, and would also remove to a very large extent the reason the steel manufacturers have to-day for importing from the United States and other countries. I would like to read a few lines from the first annual report of the Commission of Conservation in Canada. It says:

> Only a few years ago the ironmasters of this continent would hardly look at an iron ore if it contained less than sixty-two per cent of metallic content. Now ore of fifty per cent is gladly received. We are, and will continue to be, industrially handicapped until our iron industry is developed sufficiently to meet the demands of our country and render us independent of outside sources for the all-important metal. What we need is not conservation of iron ore resources, but vigorous development of our iron industry.

I have no doubt the Commission had in mind the very large amount of steel products imported from the United States every year when they made this report. We find that, in 1913, over $146,000,000 worth of steel products were imported into Canada from the United States, and about $156,000,000 in 1917. Could we not reasonably assume that, with the necessary assistance given to our iron ore mining industry in due time all of these steel products could be made in Canadian rolling mills from Canadian ore and the money circulated among Canadian workmen? Our steel plants are all working at the present time to their full capacity; they are turning out shell steel of the finest quality for our own use and that of our Allies. I am convinced that after the war is over the demand

11 p.m.

for steel products for the railroads and building trades of this and other countries will be great, and if we get our iron and steel industry on a sound basis now, utilizing our Canadian ore, it will prove to be one of the bulwarks on which we can depend while passing through the period of reconstruction.

Now a word with reference to the newsprint industry, which was introduced into the discussion here the other evening. It is a well known fact that the press, and particularly the large dailies, have been carrying on a persistent campaign against the manufacturers of newsprint paper in an attempt to show that the manufacturers were charging exorbitant prices and making abnormal profits on their output. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) took occasion to dwell at some length on the iniquities of the manufacturers, and quoted from a very cleverly prepared brief to show the excessive dividends they were receiving on their common stock. And some of these manufacturing companies, he said, had common stock which represented no actual cash investment. He also told the House that some seven officials representing the manufacturers in Canada and the United States, were convicted and fined in New York for conspiring to increase prices, and that the publishers had requested the Government to investigate conditions existing in Canada. Right here I want to say that I compliment the Government on the immediate action taken to investigate this matter when it was brought to their attention. I want to say further that the members in this House will stand

solidly behind the Government in checking every attempt that may be made in this country to form combines. A commissioner was appointed to investigate thoroughly the cost of the manufacture of newsprint in Canada, and while his final report has not yet been made known, an interim report was submitted, in which we are told that the commissioner suggested that the fixed price of $50 per ton previously paid to the manufacturers of newsprint be increased to $57 per ton. I presume, in fact I have no doubt, that the commissioner had authority to summon the manufacturers and their agents before him to be examined under oath, and that they had to present their books of account showing the cost of manufacture. And after these had been presented and had been examined by the commissioner, to a certain extent at any rate, he was apparently convinced that the price paid the newsprint manufacturers was not sufficient, and suggested that it be increased from $50 to $57 per ton. In the face of that fact, I think the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Springfield against the newsprint manufacturers falls to the ground. I hold no brief for the newsprint manufacturers. The reason for the attack on the newsprint manufacturers is quite obvious. It is a well known fact that the publishers of the large daily newspapers in this country for some time have cut the subscription price of their paper to the ground for the purpose of increasing circulation and thereby commanding a larger advertising patronage at remunerative rates, and now they expect the newsprint manufacturer to pay the shot. Manufacturers are asking that the price of newsprint be fixed at $60 a ton, which is an advance of less than fifty per cent over the price that they were charging prior to the outbreak of war. When we consider that the price of pulpwood, which was $6 a cord before the war, has increased to $10, and in some instances $12, and when we consider that wages have increased at least seventy-five per cent, we must come to the conclusion that the price asked by the newsprint manufacturers is not exorbitant.

While our national debt has increased very largely since the outbreak of war, it is encouraging to note that the greater portion of it is held by the Canadian people themselves. This shows conclusively that people who cannot take part in the conflict on the field of battle are loyally carrying out the pledge given to the first contingent when they went away and repeated many times since, that we are prepared to stand behind them to the last dollar. The methods proposed for the increasing of our revenue will, I believe, meet with the approval of the people. The increased business and income taxes will place the burden on the shoulders of those best able to bear it, and the taxing of automobiles, player pianos, phonographs, talking machines, and even tobacco and tea, will meet with the hearty popular approval.

Just a word with regard to taxing the alien enemy. I hesitate to introduce this subject, because it has to be treated with the greatest care. Anything we may do in the way of taxing or conscripting the alien enemy in Canada may be communicated to the enemy country and meet with reprisals there on our own prisoners; consequently, we have to be careful in whatever method we may adopt. Nevertheless, we have alien enemies in our midst. They came here before war was declared, and they came largely at our invitation. They were satisfied to accept whatever wages were prevailing at that time, and, to my mind, they should be satisfied to take to-day the wages that were prevailing at that time for the class of work they are doing, and the difference between the wages prevailing at that time for the class of work they were prepared to do and those prevailing to-day for the work they are doing should be turned over to the public treasury to help carry on the war. This increase in wage is due entirely to war conditions. I believe that the plan can be worked out by insisting that every manufacturer and employer of alien labour report to the Government once a month, showing the number of alien enemies on his pay roll, and stating the standard wage paid for that class of work prior to the war and the standard wage paid for it to-day. Let the employer of labour pay the alien enemy according to the standard before the war, and remit the difference to the Minister of Finance for war purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I regret to have to call the hon. member to order. I had hoped that his remarks were merely by way of reference to the subject of alien enemies, but as that subject has already been debated and disposed of by the House, it is not in order for him to deal with it further.

Mr. SIMPSON: I regret that I exceeded the limit of the rules, but as the matter has direct reference to methods of taxation,

I thought that I was in order. However, I congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance on the splendid Budget that he has presented to the House. I think that the methods of taxation proposed will meet with the hearty approval of the people.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in tendering my congratulations to the Acting Minister of Finance (Hon. A. K. Maclean) on his able performance of an unpleasant duty, a duty thrust upon him by the exigencies of present conditions. When I think of the past and my pleasant relations with the Acting Minister of Finance, my memory takes me back to the years from 1896 to 1911, when he appeared on various platforms in the good old county of Lunenburg and advocated the Liberal policies of lower tariffs, of thrift and of economy; and my heart was filled with sadness as on Tuesday I heard him assume the burdens laid upon him on account of the absence of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) and make the statement of the present financial condition of the country.

While we rejoice that the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) has recovered his health, we cannot look with equanimity upon his resuming his duties as Finance Minister of this country. The financial affairs of Canada would be safer in the hands of the Acting Minister of Finance. Owing to the crying need for reform, economy and efficiency in the administration of our finances, I suggest that a commission composed of three practical business men, men of large affairs and successful in various fields of activity, be appointed to guide and advise the Finance Department and the Government regarding the financial affairs of the country. This is only a suggestion which, as a new member, I submit in all humility, but I feel strongly that some action is necessary to protect the citizens of Canada.

Before I take up a discussion of the Budget I wish to refer to a statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bristol), who came to the rescue of his friend, Sir Joseph Flavelle, Baronet, and made certain statements which the facts will not sustain. He said that Sir Joseph Flavelle was on the same footing as other buyers and sellers of bacon to the British Government. Such was not the case. Sir Joseph Flavelle had a contract with the British Government under which his bacon was taken off his hands at his buying price, plus a certain profit, plus whatever advance the market price might make. This advantage no other company had. He also had the privilege of sending all his bacon in British transports free of freight, as he was permitted to deliver at Montreal instead of London, which no other company could do. As to his standing, the moment the O'Connor and the Henderson reports were published, the British Government cancelled their special contract with him, refused to do any further business with his agent at London, and are now doing all their buying direct, and not through the agency of Sir Joseph Flavelle.

The Acting Finance Minister informed us that the expenditure was $173,000,000 on current account, which included the interest on the war debt, $45,000,000, and $7,000,000 for pensions. If you deduct these two latter amounts and add $12,000,000 interest on debt before the war, that leaves an expenditure of $133,000,000, which is excessive, and my memory harks back to the night when I listened to the Prime Minister in the town of Lunenburg in 1911, telling the citizens of that town that it was a criminal waste of public money to spend $70,000,000, and that if he were elected to power, he would reduce it by $10,000,000. He also on that occasion promised free medicine to the shore fishermen, but that promise has not been kept, nor do the fishermen want free medicine. With regard to the $7,000,000 for pensions, I wish to say that every right-thinking man in Canada is willing and anxious to make life easy for those who have fought for our country, and every effort should be made to do the right thing by them. But if we are to judge from the two returns brought down in the House a few days ago, the administration of the pensions is not built on a sound foundation. I need not elaborate on any of those returns, but there was a case where a colonel who had seen the sun shine over France for only fourteen days who is now back in this country and I am told he is receiving a pension of about $780, and he has also been promoted to a seat in the Senate and will draw a salary of $2,500 a year for the rest of his life. Does the Government intend to appoint any private or corporal or sergeant to the Senate of Canada? Why should they not be appointed just as much as a colonel who was over in France for only fourteen days? Why should those gentlemen draw these large amounts whereas the ordinary private soldier receives only from $2.50 to $48 per month? It is necessary for the Government immediately to organize this department properly, and to place at the

head of it not a fourth-rate politician, not a ward heeler, not a political major, but the best business man obtainable and a man with a strong personality. If this is not done, we shall find ourselve in the position of the United States after the Civil War with regard to pensions.

We are told that the war expenditure in 1917-18 was $345,000,000, and that altogether, since the war started, the large sum of $878,000,000 has been expended. The motto of the Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, is every dollar necessary for war, but not a dollar for graft. There is no doubt about it that the expenditure on war account has not been satisfactory to the general public. Case after case might be cited where expenditures were abnormal and excessive, but I will only refer the Minister of Militia and Defence to an article published last year in one of the Government organs, the Halifax Chronicle, which dealt with conditions at Halifax in the Militia Department. Conditions have not improved since then. Practically every doctor in the city, with a few notable exceptions, has donned the khaki, and they are still attending to their private practice. The same thing applies to some of the gentlemen of the cloth, and others too numerous to mention. A similar state of affairs exists in the Naval Department at Halifax, though not as glaring. There is need for economy there. We have a cruiser which is known as H.M.C.S. Niobe. Perhaps this ship of war is better known to the general public as one of the "Laurier tin-pot navy," as our Conservative friends were in the habit of calling it in the election of 1911. This cruiser served a very good purpose last year, after the late minister of elections, Hon. Robert Rogers, came back from the Old Country and hatched the goose egg known as the Conscription Act on the way over. A number of young men from the province of Nova Scotia who, for reasons sufficiently known to themselves did not want to volunteer and join the army or come under the new Act felt that perhaps a position on board the Niobe would suit them better than anything else. The result was that the wires were kept hot between Nova Scotia and Ottawa, and through the influence of some of the members for Nova Scotia, these young men, not sons of Liberals, not sons of Quebecers, but sons of good Tory fathers, got jobs aboard the Niobe as oilers and wipers and so forth. To-day those young men are still aboard the Niobe. They remind me of a story I read in the Good Book which I hope we all read, but perhaps not as often as we should do. That story is to be found in the 19th chapter of Deuteronomy. In the olden times, the chosen people founded a nation, and they set apart three cities for a certain purpose. If any one got into trouble or committed some misdemeanour, he could flee to one of those cities and find refuge there. It seems to me that we should change the name of H.M.C.S. Niobe. She has been an ever present help in time of need and a shelter in time of storm for the sons of some of our Conservative friends in Nova Scotia, and I think that the Admiral of the Fleet, or the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne)—I am sorry he is not here—should change the name of H.M.C.S. Niobe to H.M.C.S. City of Refuge.

The people of this country, Mr. Speaker, will demand that proper safeguards be taken by the Government to see that for every dollar spent value is given. With regard to the general expenditure, I would like to speak of one item in which extravagance is apparent. I refer to the matter of advertising by the various departments of the Government. When the Liberals were in power from 1896 to 1911, a large amount of money was spent in advertising various matters in newspapers. The method of that party was to send copy to Liberal newspapers, and only Liberal newspapers were paid for such work. The same system applied during the regime of the Conservative party from 1911-17, except perhaps that the Tories went one better than the Grits, and now and again you would see advertisements entirely relating to a matter in the Northwest provinces or British Columbia published in a two-by-four Conservative paper in some small town on the Atlantic coast. But what a change has taken place since the present Government came into power. Of course, I understand that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and the work done by the newspapers of this country in boosting so-called Union Government, deserved financial recognition, in addition to the large amount received by them for advertising the Victory Loan. But there is absolutely no justification for the present state of affairs. Nearly every newspaper in Canada is to-day receiving patronage from the Government in the shape of advertising, and in a great many cases the large amount expended is unnecessary, and not justifiable, and I strongly protest in the name of the Canadian people against such a waste of public money.

I was wondering whether this synchronized —to use a word used some time ago by the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White)—

with the sudden high regard of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) for the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). The Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) admits that we have practically no immigration at the present time, but he holds out the hope that after the war the tide of immigration will flow to our shores. My humble opinion is that the European nations will not allow their depleted populations to leave those countries, and I have no such fond hopes as have the Acting Minister of Finance and the Minister of Immigration. Whether such will be the case or not, I have no hesitation in saying that in the meantime such an aggressive member of the Government as the Minister of Immigration is reported to be should devote his energy and ability to another department instead of the Government making new appointments at great cost to the country.

When the Acting Minister of Finance referred to the exchange rates between the United States and Canada, my mind was carried back to the 1911 election when that gentleman, in eloquent terms, advocated reciprocity with our great neighbour to the south, and had the views of the acting minister and the Liberal party been upheld at that time, such an impetus would have been given to our export business to that country that no such conditions as exist to-day would have to be dealt with by the Government and the business men of Canada. Give us free food as advocated by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Joseph Read), and soon the balance of trade will be equalized in a great measure.

The Acting Minister of Finance spoke of the Victory Loan. As he truly said, the people of Canada are to be congratulated on the spontaneous response which came from every province in the Dominion. Money poured into the public treasury, proving conclusively that the people of Canada realized the responsibilities and were determined to provide sufficient funds to carry the war to a successful conclusion. The only criticism I have to make is that owing to the fact that the affairs of the country were not carried on in an economical manner by the late Government, and because our credit was so impaired, it was necessary for them to pay 5½ per cent interest for the money, they borrowed at a time when other nations were borrowing at 4 and 4½ per cent. It goes to show that something was rotten in Denmark when the Government had to pay such a large interest for that loan. Other amounts were borrowed previously by the Government, and where did they find the money? From no less a nation than the United States, a nation about which we were told in 1911 that the Jews should have no dealings with the Samaritans, or, to quote the battle cry of the opponents of reciprocity, "We want no truck or trade with the Yankees." And we witnessed the humiliating spectacle of the Finance Minister, that member of the noble band of eighteen going with his hat in his hand to the financiers of the United States begging for funds to carry on the business of the country. And did they pass him by on the other side? Nay, they bound up his wounds, and sent him on his way rejoicing.

The Acting Minister of Finance has told us that other great loans will be required in the near future, and that they will have to be raised in this country. He informed us that to do this we must produce wealth, and more wealth, and produce in greater quantities than ever before. This is not the age of miracles. To produce, we need producers, and the people of this country expect a lead from the Government. But no such lead has been forthcoming, and no stable policy has been enunciated by the leaders of the party in power. Some people are even unkind enough to say that, far from encouraging business, they are actually hindering it.

I read a few days ago in a great family journal, one of the organs of this Government in the city of Halifax, the following:

> In an interview yesterday a local fish dealer summed up the situation as follows: Fish merchants in Halifax in the course of their legitimate business are having the hardest time in their history. All kinds of vexatious technicalities in the first place are put up to them by the Government. The Food Control authorities seem to delight in asking for statistics hard to prepare and so intricate as to require an experienced bookkeeper to tabulate, and when the schedule is complete no living man has any specific information of any value to himself or any person else.

It might be well to change the name of the food controller by altering just one letter. One month the Government tell the people they must produce; they tell them they must build ships, and the people make their plans to help this country by carrying out their wishes and invest millions of dollars in farm implements to produce greater crops, and in building ships with which to catch fish, and in purchasing fishing gear to carry on that great industry. The Government even go farther and exempt the farmer and the fishermen from military service and convey, if not in the spoken

word, by their actions, that the producers shall not be called upon for military service. Then suddenly, as a bolt from the blue, in a "moment of weakness" that order is countermanded, and a few days ago the fiat went forth in the shape of one of the famous Orders in Council taking practically every farmer and fisherman of a certain age. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the Tory organs in the country to understand that I am not in favour of producers doing their bit in this great struggle. They have been doing their bit, they are doing their bit, and they will continue so to do. But it will be said the demand for additional troops is paramount. What a time to wake up to that fact!

We are all anxious and willing, Mr. Speaker, to do everything in our power to help the Allied nations win this war. We mean to win the war, whether it is by providing men, ships or food supplies, and we are willing and anxious to strain every nerve to do everything possible to bring to a successful conclusion a fight which we all believe is in the interests of democracy, truth and righteousness. But I hold that that Order in Council is ill advised and will be ruinous to certain industries. If these men were to be enlisted, they should have been taken before they had made all arrangements to carry on their business for this season. I am not a farmer, and others have dealt with this phase of the question. The Minister of Militia evidently realized that the Order in Council had gone too far because a few days ago he found it necessary to make a further explanation with reference to the farming interests, but he did not make any reference to the great fishing industry of this country, and I am rather surprised that two members of the Cabinet, the right hon. Prime Minister and the Acting Finance Minister, coming as they do from Maritime constituencies, did not realize the gravity of the situation.

Let us for a moment see what would happen to the great fishing industry if that Order in Council is enforced,—but first it might be well to give the House a few figures on the value of that industry. The total number of vessels engaged last year in the fisheries of Canada was 1,965, and their value $5,267,724. The number of boats was 40,105, and their value $4,829,793. The value of nets and seines was $4,485,269, and the value of other fishing material $14,-146,176. The total capital invested in Canada in the fishing industry last year was $28,728,962. The total number of persons employed in canneries and fish houses was 25,680; the number of men in vessels 9,192; the number of men in boats 60,432; the total number of fishermen 69,624, and the total number of persons engaged in the fishing industry 95,304. The total value of the fisheries for Canada last year was $29,208,-378.

I would point out it is not the large corporations that are engaged in this industry of so much value to the country, but the fishermen themselves own their vessels and boats and fishing gear, and it seems to me the Government should carefully consider before taking any drastic measures that would interfere with an industry of so much importance to the country, and in which so much money has been invested.

The number and value of fishing vessels, boats, nets, etc., in the province of Prince Edward Island for the year 1916-17 was as follows:

	Number.	Value.
Sailing and gasolene vessels	21	$ 14,800
Boats (sail)	445	13,195
Boats (gasolene)	1,688	285,050
Carrying smacks	11	2,300
Gill-nets, seines, trap and smelt nets, etc.	5,649	45,728
Trawls	972	10,475
Hand lines	1,993	1,753
Lobster traps	354,667	369,560
Lobster canneries	198	182,300
Clam canneries	8	1,000
Freezers and ice-houses	6	2,400
Smoke and fish-houses	368	23,637
Fishing piers and wharves	40	225,950
		$1,178,148

Number of men employed on vessels	77
" " boats	3,370
" " carrying smacks	18
Number of persons employed in fish-houses, freezers, canneries, etc.	2,770
	6,235

The figures for the province of New Brunswick are as follows:

	Number.	Value.
Steam fishing vessels (tonnage 16)	1	$ 2,500
Sailing and gasolene vessels	398	356,700
Boats (sail and row)	7,157	239,575
" (gasolene)	2,002	561,850
Carrying smacks	80	54,100
Gill-nets, seines, trap and smelt-nets, etc.	60,915	655,545
Weirs	518	517,400
Trawls	859	17,339
Hand lines	10,119	7,680
Eel traps	.....	.....
Rods and lines	.....	.....
Lobster traps	236,506	297,204
" canneries	161	141,950
Sardine canneries	7	399,000
Clam canneries	7	24,900
Freezers and ice-houses	223	319,550
Smoke and fish-houses	1,357	486,710

	Number.	Value.
Fishing piers and wharves..	428	$241,200
Pile-drivers and scows.. ..	617	53,010
Lodges used by fishermen..	.....	.....
Toals..		$4,376,213

Number of men employed on vessels..	1,495
" " boats ..	12,730
" " carrying smacks..	169
Number of persons employed in fish-houses, freezers, canneries, etc..	6,127
Totals..	20,521

Now I come to my own province of Nova Scotia, which is very largely engaged in this great industry:

	Number.	Value.
Steam fishing vessels (tonnage 528)	12	$ 167,950
Sailing and gasolene vessels	585	2,250,283
Boats (sail)	8,028	269,090
" (gasolene)	5,075	1,207,687
Carrying smacks	220	115,425
Gil nets, seines, trap and smelt nets, etc	68,673	779,576
Weirs	207	42,570
Trawls	17,913	201,510
Hand lines	32,592	28,831
Lobster traps	822,672	854,538
" canneries	216	278,300
Clam "	4	1,200
Freezers and ice-houses	384	697,193
Smoke and fish-houses	5,292	611,638
Fishing piers and wharves..	1,837	1,155,852
Totals	.....	$8,661,643

Number of men employed on vessels..	4,678
Number of men employed on boats....	17,042
Number of men employed carrying smacks	406
Number of persons employed in fish-houses, freezers, canneries, etc	6,556
Total	28,682

In my own county, and I am perhaps more particularly interested in that than in any other part of the province, the fishing industry will be seriously affected by the last Order in Council, as indeed it will be throughout the whole province. The fishing industry is a peculiar one. It differs perhaps from any other industry by reason of the fact that the fishermen have to commence so early to get ready for the fishing operations of the coming season. Vessel fishermen have to make arrangements as early as December of the previous year, or perhaps in January of this year, to engage their nets or trawls and to build or repair their vessels and boats. These men, depending on the legislation passed last year, and, having been exempted by the tribunals, made arrangements in December and January to carry on the industry this year. The consequence is that at the present time millions of dollars owned by these fishermen, and not by large corporations or the big interests, have been placed in jeopardy. The money was expended by the fishermen themselves upon boats, rope, twine and other gear. They have spent millions of dollars in order to enable them to prosecute the fishing industry this season. In Lunenburg alone there are about 150 fishing vessels. Early in March the fishermen started to get ready. They bought their new cables—and I would like to mention here that since this Government came into office rope for cables has increased from fifteen to thirty-nine and a half cents per pound. It is necessary for the fishermen to buy three hundred and ten fathoms for each vessel, and the cable weighs sixteen pounds to the fathom. The acting Minister of Finance can figure out what it will cost to buy a cable for a fishing vessel this season. Then, the fishermen have bought their salt and provisions, have hired their men and have gone fishing. If this Order in Council is enforced, these men who had been exempted, can be taken from the vessels. What will happen? You cannot fish with these vessels on the deep sea with old men. It is a young man's business. Young men ranging from sixteen to twenty-five are mostly engaged on these vessels fishing in the North bay and on the Grand banks. If the young men are taken off these vessels, it will mean ruination to the fishermen whose money is invested in this industry. The same thing applies to the boat fisherman. As this branch of the industry is carried on around the coast of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, you will usually find that there are three men fishing in a boat. One of them is an old man, the father of a family, one a boy of perhaps twelve or fourteen years of age, whilst the third is a young man, practically the only one who can handle the boat. The Conscription Act will take that young man away and leave the old man and the boy, and that will be the end of the fishing industry. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Acting Minister of Finance, men who come from Nova Scotia and who should know something about the fishing industry, before bringing in that Order in Council, should at least have consulted the business men of that province.

We are told to build ships. How can we build ships if you take away the men? And how can you transport supplies without ships? You cannot build ships with old men. It is quite true that you can use a few old men in the shipyards, but you cannot use old men to lift the heavy pieces

of timber and put them in place when they are building ships. One of the most urgent requirements in Canada to-day is increased food production and greater shipbuilding activity. A large amount of money has been invested in the establishment of new shipyards and in the building of ships. I would like to read what the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries has to say on this subject. He is a gentleman of intelligence who understands this question, and I think that what he says should have a great deal of weight with this House and with the country. He says:

> In last year's report the question of shipbuilding in general in relation to the war was taken up, tables were furnished of the number, tonnage, and speed of the ocean freight carriers of the principal maritime nations, and an account given of methods adopted in a number of foreign countries to stimulate and aid shipbuilding by means of bounties, subsidies, or the free entry of shipbuilding materials.
>
> As the war has progressed, and an ever-increasing amount of the ocean tonnage of the allied nations (now including the United States) and of the neutral nations has been sunk since Germany's declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare, the need of shipbuilding activity throughout the world to supply the wastage has become of paramount importance.

This has been thoroughly realized, I think, in Canada. A little further on he says:

> In Canada, since the beginning of the war, the number of privately owned shipyards has been about doubled, a description of some of these yards was given in last year's report; and later, in the present one, will be found an account of the new yards established, and also one of the enlargements and improvements made to existing yards, with a view to meeting the demands for increased tonnage.
>
> Apart from the introduction of the larger yards, there has been in the Maritime Provinces generally, and in Nova Scotia in particular, a revival of the wooden shipbuilding trade, particularly in the form of small schooners with or without auxiliary power; these are quickly and cheaply built, and at anything approaching the present abnormally high freight rates should pay handsomely.

He states also:

> It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of shipbuilding as a national undertaking to a country that has, like Canada, an extensive coast line both east and west, superb inland communication by lakes and rivers, and whose export trade is chiefly overseas.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that last year there were built the following steel vessels: On the Atlantic coast, ten steamers with a gross tonnage of 20,560 tons; on the Great Lakes, eleven steamers with a gross tonnage of 31,936 tons; and on the Pacific coast, nine steamers with a gross tonnage of 42,000 tons. The number and tonnage of wooden vessels were: On the Atlantic Coast, five with a gross tonnage of 3,540 tons; on the Great Lakes, one with a gross tonnage of 40 tons; and on the Pacific coast, sixteen with a gross tonnage of 19,729 tons. In addition, there were in course of construction on March 31, 1917, fifty-three schooners of a gross tonnage of 17,496 tons. These are wooden vessels averaging about 300 tons net, and most of them are being built in different parts of Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Nova Scotia, having taken this Government and the Government of the Old Country at their word, how are they going to man these ships and sail them? How are they going to carry food to foreign countries, if the only men who can be used as sailors are conscripted under the Order in Council recently passed by this Government. It has been flung in our teeth by some of the press—notably by a paper published in the city of Halifax, one of the Government organs—that the fishermen and sailors of Lunenburg county were slackers and cowards. I want to state here that the fishermen and sailors of that county are nothing of the kind, I think the members of this House will agree with me that men who leave their homes on the 15th of March, when the ice is on the coast, and the March winds and gales are blowing, and go out and anchor one hundred and fifty miles from land, and every morning at daylight start off in the dories and haul their trawls, and continue that occupation for perhaps a month before they see land again—men who pursue that occupation all through the summer fogs and during the August and September gales, before returning home, cannot be called slackers or cowards.

And after these men return from the fishing grounds what do we find them doing? They go freighting in their vessels; and for a period of nearly four years, since this war started, there have been about five hundred fishermen from Lunenburg county going down to the sea in ships; taking fish to Portugal, Spain, Italy, the West Indies and Brazil, carrying food to the Allied nations and thus helping to win the war. Do you mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that a man who faces the deadly submarine at sea in a small vessel of one hundred tons is either a coward or a slacker? I say no, I say he is discharging, when engaged in that hazardous occupation his full duty to his country.

In the remarks made by the Acting Minister of Finance with respect to taxation, he deplored the fact that $15,000,000 of revenue would be lost by the enactment of prohibition during the war. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the expression "during the war." Let us hope that the Government will take steps in the near future to amend the prohibition law so that prohibition will remain for ever and ever, amen. I am not a so-called temperance crank, nor am I a teetotaller, but I believe that permanent prohibition would be a good stroke of business. I cannot agree with the Acting Finance Minister in his statement that the $15,000,000 would be lost to the country. On the contrary the large amount of money heretofore expended upon spirituous liquors will, under prohibition, be expended upon various commodities dutiable at about 30 per cent, or will go into the savings bank accounts and the health and prosperity of the people will be greatly improved by the abolition of this traffic.

I also take issue with the Acting Finance Minister with regard to the tax on the business community. I do not think that the business of this country should be overtaxed. Whilst I feel that the tax imposed on war profits should be much larger I do not think it is wise to unduly tax business concerns that are engaged in the development of the industries of the country. If you do you will kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Business men will tighten their purse strings and will curtail their industrial activities, and will invest their money in Government bonds or other securities instead of taking the risk which attends investment in ordinary commercial enterprises. It will be noticed by reference to Hansard of last year that the Finance Minister said these taxes would not be imposed in the future, but I take it that announcement was only a "scrap of paper."

I have carefully studied the income tax proposals, Mr. Speaker, as brought down, and I have no hesitation in saying that the man of small salary is required to contribute more in proportion than the man of large means or the millionaire. To my mind those proposals bear too heavily on the man of moderate means. Has my hon. friend, who in days of yore advocated the cause of the common people so eloquently, fallen from grace? Has he partaken of the forbidden fruit, or is he only submitting a schedule made up by one of the eighteen wise men of 1911? "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

[Mr. Duff.]

I was more than surprised when the Acting Finance Minister submitted extra taxation on the poor man's necessities, tea, coffee, and tobacco. In this time of stress and strain when the labouring men of the country are keyed up to the highest pitch, when they are doing their bit in increasing production, when they have their noses to the grindstone and are compelled to economize and save owing to the excessive prices which the big interests compel them to pay for everything they use, eat and wear, at a time when they are giving their sons for the cause of the Empire and Canada, I say that the Government is not protecting the common people as they should, and the time is not far distant when the voice of the people will be heard in protest with no uncertain sound.

We were told, Mr. Speaker, that no changes would be made in the tariff. In fact, the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) informs us that a pact was made by the Union members not to advocate any changes in the tariff. Is not this a combine? I would suggest that the Minister of Labour be called in to smash this combine along the lines of success he achieved in smashing the combine of the three cobblers in a certain city in Ontario. But you will notice by the schedules submitted by the Acting Finance Minister that he has changed the tariff in some commodities. Why not reduce the tariff on farming implements, which are so necessary for greater production?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that whilst I criticized the Government on their Budget, and their shortcomings, we will back them up in every honest effort to carry on the present great struggle in which we are all interested, and will do everything possible to help bring the war to a successful conclusion. Let us all work together for the common good. Let us have a united country, a country free from bickering and petty strife, a country united in a common cause, but free to exercise our right of free speech and with liberty to worship at whatever altar our consciences and our early training dictate. Let us say as Ruth said to Naomi, "Whither thou goest I will go, your people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

On the motion of Mr. M. Steele (South Perth) the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Monday, May 6, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED.

John Alexander Stewart, Esq., member for the electoral division of Lanark, introduced by Sir Robert Borden and the Hon. J. D. Reid.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved leave to introduce Bill No. 72, to amend chapter No. 39 of the Statutes of 1917. He said: One of the provisions of the War-time Elections Act was that polling day should be the twenty-eighth day after nomination day. That provision was inserted by reason of the enactment in regard to military voters. As the Military Voters Act does not apply to by-elections, it is not desirable that there should be an interval of four weeks instead of one week between nomination day and polling day, in the case of by-elections. The purpose of this amendment is to provide that paragraph D of section 2 of the War-time Elections Act shall apply only to a general election.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT VOTE—PAIRS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to a question of privilege. I find in the Renfrew Mercury, of Friday, May 3, the following:

> The editor of the Mercury, happening to pick up in Toronto a copy of Hansard recording the votes in the Commons on the amended Military Service Act, was somewhat astonished to find that the M.P. for South Renfrew had failed to record himself on that issue.

I beg leave to state to the House that on that occasion I was paired with the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer), who was desirous of leaving for home on one of the night trains. At his special request and in order to accommodate that hon. member and with the permission and approval of the Liberal whip, I agreed to pair my vote and that was distinctly understood between myself and the Liberal whip. I wish to go on record as having been paired on that occasion, and if the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora were in the House I am sure he would corroborate my statement. Had I not been paired I would have voted against the main motion, as I had voted for the amendment exempting farmers.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SEEDING OPERATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle): I ask the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) if the sons of farmers are to be left on the farm for seeding purposes. I understood that the minister, when questioned from both sides of the House on Friday, gave us to understand that the sons of farmers were to be allowed to stay on the farm until a later date. In our district—Military District No. 3—they are already called; they were called immediately after the boys in the cities had been called. The boys have been ordered to report on the eighth, ninth and tenth of this month. I would like to know if further orders will be given to the registrar to allow these boys to remain at their occupations on the farm for some time yet.

Major-General MEWBURN: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the statement I made in the House last week was very clear. I said that the registrars had been requested to send out notices to those in urban centres before they sent notices to the farmers. I stated that I believed that in some instances this direction had not been carried out in its entirety. There was no date specified at which the farmers' sons were to be called. I announced on Friday that arrangements had subsequently been made by which these men must report as notified, and then on giving proper notification to the commanding officer of the battalion, that they desired to go back to complete their seeding, they would be given at least two weeks' leave of absence for that purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood the statement which my hon. friend made the other day as he has just made again; is that the boys will have to report on being notified but that they will be given an extension of time for seeding. It has been represented to me in numerous letters that at this time of the year when every hour counts in seeding operations it is most detrimental to call these boys away for two or three days at a time as it means so much time is lost.

Major-General MEWBURN: I quite appreciate that and our desire is to save the boys delay as much as possible, but it is necessary for them to report so that the commanding officer of the district will not

treat them as deserters. Arrangments have been made by which, when they get their notices, they will get transportation to the points at which they have to report to the commanding officer. The commanding officers were instructed by telegram on Friday to see, that those who get leave of absence shall be supplied with transportation back. It will cause some delay but we are trying to expedite matters in every way possible.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would it not be possible to notify these young men without having the country put to the cost of their transportation to and from divisional headquarters?

Major-General MEWBURN: We are endeavouring to do that now.

TORONTO, NIAGARA AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—THIRD READING.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (N. Perth) moved the third reading of Bill No. 37, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): I promised when this Bill came up for third reading to furnish some information with respect to it. The question was raised as to whether the title to the right of way was in the name of this company. I took the matter up with the officials of the Canadian Northern railway, and I will read a letter which I have received from Mr. F. H. Phippen, General Counsel for the Canadian Northern railway system:

Toronto, May 4, 1918.

Hon. J. D. Reid,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—

In answer to your enquiry with regard to the titles covering the right of way and terminals on the proposed line from Toronto to the Niagara fontier, I beg to advise you as follows:

(1.) The titles to the right of way acquired between Toronto and Hamilton are in the name of Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway and Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.

(2.) The titles to the right of way acquired through Hamilton are in the name of Toronto Niagara and Western Railway, Toronto Dwellings Limited and Canadian Northern System Terminals Limited.

(3.) The titles to the right of way acquired through St. Catharines are in the name of Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway and Toronto Dwellings Limited.

All the Capital Stock of the above companies is owned by the Canadian Northern Railway System.

Yours very truly,

F. H. Phippen,
General Counsel.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

I was in Toronto on Saturday, and I took the matter up with Mr. Tilley, counsel for the Government in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway arbitration, and he assured me that the titles to the right of way in connection with this road are all vested in the Canadian Northern Railway system through the subsidiary companies, as already mentioned. I asked why some part of it was in the name of the Toronto Dwellings, Limited, and the Canadian Northern Railway officials told me that at the time it was decided to purchase this right of way, they thought it would be better to take out the title under the name of another company, so that it would not be known that the Canadian Northern system was purchasing this right of way, otherwise the price of property in that locality might advance. However, at the time the charter was taken out for the Toronto Dwellings, Limited, the stock was immediately transferred to the Canadian Northern Railway system and it is therefore a part of that system.

Another question was raised as to whether bonds had been issued on this right of way. The answer to that is:

No bonds have been issued. Capital stock issued—

That is, of the Toronto, Niagara and Western railway.

—$125,000. This is all held by the Canadian Northern Railway system who have advanced the necessary moneys for the purchase of the right of way between Toronto and Niagara.

Then the question was raised as to whether the poles of the Electrical Development Company were located on this right of way. I made inquiries as to that, and the answer given to me by the Canadian Northern Railway officials was that no poles are located on that right of way. The answer they gave me in writing was:

At certain points between West Toronto and Bronte, where it was an advantage to the railway company on account of bridge crossings to occupy land owned by the power company, arrangements were made for an exchange of locations, but no poles or lines of the power company are on the right of way to be occupied by the railway.

The question was further asked as to whether any leases on any part of the right of way owned by the Toronto, Niagara and Western railway have been given. To that I have this answer:

No leases have been given by the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway for right to put poles and string wires. The Electrical Development Company has no lease for right to place poles on this property.

The expenditure made under the charter up to the present time is $1,577,876.

The larger part of that expenditure is for property that the company has purchased in the city of Toronto, in the city of Hamilton, and between Toronto and Hamilton. The House will see that the Canadian Northern Railway system owns this right of way absolutely, and that there are no incumbrances in any way, shape, or form against it. No leases have been given, and the property therefore belongs to the people of Canada through their ownership of the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): The explanation of the minister is satisfactory, but I would like to have some additional information. Did I understand from the minister that the right of way from Toronto to Hamilton is owned by the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company?

Hon. Mr. REID: The right of way is owned entirely by the Canadian Northern Railway system, through the subsidiary companies, as stated in the information which I have just read. Let me repeat, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that the titles to the right of way acquired through Hamilton are in the name of the Toronto, Niagara and Western railway, Toronto Dwellings, Limited, and Canadian Northern System Terminals, Limited. The titles to the right of way acquired through St. Catharines are in the name of the Toronto, Niagara and Western railway, and Toronto Dwellings, Limited. All the capital stock of all the above companies is owned by the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. CURRIE: That does not clear the situation at all. The facts are simply these: The Electrical Development Company, or the holding company, the Toronto Power Company, owns the right of way from Toronto to Hamilton. They also own the right of way from Hamilton to the Falls with the exception of a piece of land in Hamilton, a piece of land in St. Catharines and a piece of land in Toronto. The rest of that right of way is entirely owned by the Electrical Development Company, or Toronto Power Company, and these companies are not owned by the Canadian Northern, but by the Toronto Street Railway Company. My information, which I think is absolutely correct, is that the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company has leased a right of way from Toronto to Hamilton from the Electrical Development Company or Toronto Power Company. They have expended over a million dollars and they have only sold $100,000 worth of stock. I think that before we put this Bill through the Minister of Railways should tell us, for instance, how much of this liability is going to be taken over by the Government and how much is the rental to be paid annually for the right of way from Toronto to Niagara Falls, and whether the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, whose charter we are now renewing, has an agreement with the Electrical Development Company, to pay so much a year for the right of way? I have never yet heard how much that amounts to. I would therefore ask the minister how much he expects he will have to pay annually for the lease of this right of way, and whether, instead of acquiring an asset, we are assuming a huge liability. The Canadian Northern interests control the Toronto Street railway, but that is a different corporation altogether from the Canadian Northern. All this right of way from Toronto to Niagara is owned really by the Toronto Power Company through the Electrical Development Company or the Toronto Street Railway Company, and they own the land from Toronto to Hamilton, and lease it to this company. What is the rental per annum, and what liability are we taking over by renewing this charter? I am safe in saying that in renewing this charter and continuing these obligations the country will be mulcted for at least half a million dollars of rental a year. I would like to know if the minister knows how much this railway company is obligated to pay annually to the Electrical Development Company, a subsidiary of the Mackenzie and Mann interests, and how much liability is assumed if we carry out this agreement? This company which we are virtually rechartering has no railway right of way, no tracks or anything else, and for a number of years it has rented a right of way over this ground owned by the Electrical Development Company. I think the minister himself will acknowledge that his information is not correct when he says that the whole right of way from Toronto to Hamilton is owned by this new company. I think he has been misinformed in that regard. The letter is very skilfully written. It says that this company owns a piece of land in the city of Hamilton, also in Toronto and in St. Catharines, and that the title to all this land is in the Canadian Northern Railway Company. As a matter of fact, the title of that strip of land, the land through Hamilton, is not owned by

this railway company, but is owned by a company of Sir Henry Pellatt's, known as the Toronto Dwelling Company. It is believed that the stock of that company is all held by the Canadian Northern, and probably that is correct. The fact remains, however, that this company is obligated to the Toronto Power Company for the annual lease of the land between Toronto and Hamilton.

Mr. J. D. REID: The statement I made disproves that statement altogether. It is absolutely wrong. The letter I have received, as I stated, came from the accountant for the Government of the Canadian Northern in Toronto. The Canadian Northern system owns this right of way absolutely. The Electrical Development Company have a right of way alongside this road. There is nothing in the statement made by the hon. member for Simcoe.

Mr. CURRIE: I can assure the minister of what I know are facts, and the titles examined in the registry office show exactly the condition of affairs as stated by me. If there is any right of way between Toronto and Hamilton owned by this company, it has been recently purchased. The Toronto Power Company own a strip of land one hundred feet wide running from Hamilton to Toronto. I am not a betting man, but I would be safe in betting any amount of money that not one inch of that land outside of the corporation limits of either Toronto or Hamilton is owned by anybody except the Toronto Power Company's subsidiary, the Electrical Development Company, but this railway company has a lease of it. I want the minister to state to the House whether this company owns title to those lands, or has a lease for this land, and if there is any liability for the annual rental for it. Before we pass the third reading, I want to be assured that this company, which we are taking over has not to pay a large sum annually for the lease of the land between Toronto and Hamilton.

Mr. J. D. REID: I may say that they have not to pay one dollar. There is no lease.

Mr. CAHILL: I am not quite clear on the question as to whether or not we have a right of way from Toronto to St. Catherines or only a right of way in a part of Toronto. Have we a right of way between Hamilton and Toronto? That letter does not say so.

[Mr. Currie.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that we are not in committee, and the minister has already spoken.

Mr. CURRIE: There are some questions to be put on this Bill which should be answered.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. CURRIE: I move that the Bill be not read the third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, the hon. member has exhausted his right to speak. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time.

On the motion of Mr. Morphy that the said Bill do now pass and its title be as on the Order Paper:

Mr. CURRIE: Before that motion is passed, I move that it be not now passed, and that its title be not as on the Order Paper, but that it be referred back to committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order.

Mr. CURRIE: I have the right to speak on any motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may move to change the title of the Bill but he cannot move at this stage to recommit it.

Mr. CURRIE: I move, if some hon. gentleman will second it, that the title of this Bill be struck out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Before the Bill passes, I would like to know if this railway is one of the assets which is to be transferred to the Dominion under the Act of last session?

Mr. J. D. REID: This company is a subsidiary of the Canadian Northern, and the stock is owned and controlled by the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It comes to the people of Canada now?

Mr. J. D. REID: Oh, yes.

Motion that the Bill pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

OIL DEPOSITS DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the Government any knowledge of proposals made to the British Government looking to the development of the oil industry in the British Islands or other parts of the Empire in view of the present dependence of the Empire on foreign sources of supply for this essential to commerce and defence?

2. Does the report of the Economic and Development Commission, appointed in the first year of the war, to prepare for the problems facing the country after the war, contain any proposals for the discovery and development of oil deposits in Canada, outside the areas at present drawn upon?

3. Will the Government lay on the Table of the House all correspondence and information as to the participation of members of the Government, and particularly the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in any discussions in England during the period of the war, bearing upon the advisability of pooling the resources of the Empire as a defence against an attempted post-war economic domination by Germany?

4. Is the Government aware that Canada is now almost entirely depending for its oil supply upon a subsidiary company of the Standard Oil Company, a foreign corporation, which has recently increased its capital, under a Dominion charter to fifty million dollars, with the likelihood that it may obtain control of any deposits of oil that may be discovered in Canada?

5. Does the Government propose to take any steps to assure to the people of Canada the control of deposits of oil which may be discovered in any of the provinces?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The Government has general knowledge of the efforts made by the British Government to conserve the oil producing resources within the Empire primarily for the supply of the necessities of the Empire itself, and in particular has arranged for such supervision of the development of the oil industry in Canada as will effect that end.

2. No.

3. Such information as is possible will be laid on the table of the House with regard to the official participation of the members of the Government in any conferences concerning best use of the resources of the Empire in connection with the present war, or conditions that may be encountered in post-war adjustments.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

BATE, McMAHON & CO.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What was the amount of cheque No. 14341, paid to Bate, McMahon & Company of Ottawa, in 1916-17?

2. Was said cheque duly authorized and paid?

3. What was the consideration for said cheque?

4. Is the firm of Bate, McMahon & Company authorized to do Insurance business?

5. Was the amount of said cheque refunded to the Government?

6. If not, why?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. $816.38.

2. Yes.

3. Reimbursement to Messrs. Bate, McMahon for outlay on account of payment of Employers' Liability Premium, for insurance against accidents to employees engaged in construction work at Sewell and Calgary camps, in terms of contract with Department of Militia and Defence.

4. No information.

5. No.

6. The matter of the refund of this payment is under consideration.

ST. CHARLES RIVER PROPERTY.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Did the Government take proceedings to expropriate the property owned by Belanger, on the St. Charles River?

2. How much is asked for said property?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to stop the present works? If so, will it give up the expropriation of this property?

4. Has the Government been informed that this property is not necessary for the works undertaken?

5. What amount does the owner ask for the property which it is proposed to expropriate?

6. Is the Government aware of the fact that such property is covered with water at high tide?

7. Has the Government paid any sum on account of the price of said property?

Hon. J .D. REID:

1. Yes, expropriated on December 22, 1915.

2 and 5. On November 12, 1914, Mr. Belanger offered to accept 23 cents per foot for the property but afterwards asked for a petition of right which was granted, and in which 35 cents per foot was claimed for part of the property and 50 cents for another part.

3. (a) For the time being; (b) No.

4. No.

6. Part of the property is covered by water at high tide.

7. No.

EMPLOYMENT AT VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government been informed that in the spring of 1912, men were hired to go to Victoria, British Columbia, and work there as lumbermen, carpenters, painters, etc., at the rate of $3, $4, and $5 per diem, travelling expenses prepaid and lodgings gratuitously provided for?

2. Has the Government been made aware of the fact that, when the said workmen and mechanics had reached Victoria, all travelling expenses were deducted from their wages; that they were paid only $2 and $2.50 per day, and that they had to pay for their lodgings?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to pay for these men's travelling expenses so as to enable them to return home?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS: We have no information touching the subject matter of this question except as set forth in the question itself. If the hon. member will put his question in a more definite form, giving us reasonable particulars, we will try to get the information he desires.

Question stands.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—MOUNT ROYAL CITY.

Mr. KAY:

What steps, if any, have been taken to secure for the public, the Canadian Northern assets involved in the real estate enterprise known as Mount Royal City, at the western portal of the Canadian Northern Railway tunnel through the mountain at Montreal?

Hon. J. D. REID: All interests of the Canadian Northern Railway Company are the property of the company and the stock of the company has been taken over by the Government under Cap. 24 Statutes of Canada, 1917.

SOUTHAM PRESS, LIMITED.

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the item "Southam Press, Limited, $44,207.98" in the Return brought down on April 30, 1918, as showing the publicity costs of the Victory Loan—

1. What services were rendered by Southam Press, Limited, in return for the payments to them of the said sum of $44,207.98?

2. Where were the said services rendered?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. All work performed by the Southam Press, Limited, 19 Duncan Street, Toronto. Particular as follows:

To 20,000 labels for mailing	$ 40.50
To 1,550 gummed address labels "Please Rush"	9.50
To printing 2,172,450 copies "Questions and answers," 6 pages, 118,850 being in French and shipping same to various points throughout Canada	6,952.48
To printing and sending out postcards	52.00
To 7,000 envelopes and time engaged in inserting 525,000 Victory Loan buttons in envelopes	219.50
To checking and arranging lists supplied by Mr. Stephenson and time engaged in placing same in envelopes supplied by the Government, also twine, wrapping paper and pulp board and time mailing circulars	3,450.00
To printing 2,193,750 circulars, "All about it," 6 pages	$10,567.46
To supplying 1,980,100 envelopes together with printing on same "A letter to you from the Minister of Finance"414,055 being in French.	12,234.08
To printing 1,980,100 copies letter of "Minister of Finance," 414,055 being in French	6,322.92
To printing 26,600 application forms for loan	47.00
To printing 1,085,400 postcards "Baby Poster," 3 colours one side, black reverse.	2,170.80
To printing 1,647,000 telegraph blanks for the different telegraph companies "Victory is the only road to Peace and Safety" "Buy Victory Bonds".	1,261.17
To express charges paid by company on shipments of printed matter to various points	531.07
To 4,000 letter heads for Publicity Committee	22.60
To 4,000 No. 10 envelopes with printing in corner	43.40
To 250 printed folders for vouchers	8.20
To printing 6 cards 26¼ x 22	6.50
To printing 2,000 cards 8½ x 11	12.75
To printing 400 bulletins of instructions, 8½ x 17	18.65
To printing various circulars	
1,700 copies circular No. 1	
1,900 " " " 2	
1,800 " " " 3	
2,000 " " " 4	
2,000 " " " 5	227.40
2,080 " " " 6	
2,000 " " " 7	
2,070 " " " 8	
1,550 " " " 9	
Total	$44,207.98

REGISTRATION, EAST PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Who is appointed Registrar under the Act for man-power registration in East Peterborough?

2. Who recommended the appointee?

Mr. F. B. McCURDY:

1. Mr. R. B. Rogers, Peterborough, Ont.

2. The Superintendent of Registration for the district.

DONALD HUNT.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is a person named Donald Hunt in the office of the President of the Privy Council?

2. If not, is the name Donald Hunt used as a pen name by a person actually employed in the said office when signing communications to the public press eulogizing the President of the Privy Council?

3. If the said name is so used, what are the duties and the salary of the person using it?

4. Was the article published in the Toronto Globe, of April 26, 1918, under the heading of "Record of Important Deeds by Canada's War Committee," and stated to be contributed by Donald Hunt, actually written and sent to the Toronto Globe by Mr. Main Johnson, the Private Secretary of the President of the Privy Council?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. The Government has no knowledge of the matter.

MRS. HAMILTON.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is there a Mrs. Hamilton employed in the Post Office Department?
2. If so, what are her duties and salary?
3. Would the performance of her duties call her to Halifax at any time within the past twelve months?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

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

POST OFFICE SITE AT GRAND' MERE.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Did the Government purchase, in or about 1912, a property for the purpose of erecting a post office building at Grand' Mère?
2. If so, what was the purchase price, and why was the building not constructed?
3. For what purpose has said property been utilized by the Government since 1912?
4. Has any rent or other revenue been derived from the property by the Government?
5. Did the Government pay the municipal and school taxes in 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
6. If so, how much has been paid by the Government each year for (a) municipal taxes, (b) school taxes?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. (a) $15,000, (b) part of the property was under lease when purchased and the lease did not expire until April 1, 1915. After that date, in view of conditions since the outbreak of the war, the erection of such buildings was indefinitely postponed.

3. Was under lease to different parties.

4. Yes.

5. Taxes were paid for the years 1913 and 1914.

6. (a) 1913, $60; 1914, $110, interest $5.84 and water $48.42, total, $224.26; (b) nil.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Did the Auditor General furnish itemized accounts of his own expenditure while overseas in 1916?
2. If so, what was the total amount of such accounts?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. $1,537.03.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

*Mr. PARENT:

Has the Government the intention of ignoring the Military Service Act which authorizes the conscription of one hundred thousand men and cause more men to enlist without Parliament being consulted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The answer to this question is in the negative.

CANADIAN AVIATION FUND.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Government received from the Canadian Aviation Fund, a new request for one squadron of training machines to be offered to the British Government?
2. If so, what decision has been arrived at in the matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. The subject will be taken up in the immediate future with the proper authority.

FRENCH TREATY.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Government been officially notified that France intended to abrogate her treaty of commerce with Canada in April, 1919?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to negotiate a new treaty with France?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

MR. W. F. O'CONNOR.

* Mr. GAUVREAU:

Referring to the question answered by the Government on April 29th regarding the remuneration or salary paid to W. F. O'Connor for the twelve months prior to April 15, 1918, to which the Government replied that Mr. O'Connor had received, as Law Secretary $5,000, as Cost of Living Commissioner $2,000, and as General Returning Officer nil.

1. Did the Government not pay to Mr. O'Connor on the very next day, namely, April 16, 1918, $2,000 for services rendered as General Returning Officer?
2. For the twelve months prior to April 17, 1918, has not the Government paid Mr. W. F. O'Connor for services rendered, $9,000?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes, for services rendered and to be rendered.

2. No. Mr. O'Connor's services in the Labour Department ceased on April 4.

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. Which constitutes the ultimate authority for the appointment and payment of those employed in the public service, the people, as represented by the House of Commons, or the Government only?
2. Has the public, through its representatives duly elected, the right to be consulted regarding such appointments?
3. Does the Government make any appointment to the public service without recognizing the right of constituencies directly affected to be consulted through the members of Parliament representing those constituencies?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The people of Canada as represented in their Parliament.

2 and 3. The Government exercises executive authority with respect to appointments, subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and the Order in Council of 13th February, 1918, as extended by subsequent Orders in Council. For such exercise of executive authority the Government is responsible to Parliament. Under the provisions of the Civil Service Acts and of the Orders in Council above mentioned, and of the Civil Service Bill now before Parliament when it becomes law, the members of the Government and members of Parliament are relieved of the exercise of patronage as set forth in the several provisions alluded to. In respect of appointments such as deputy ministers, etc., which do not come within the provisions above alluded to, and in respect of all matters of public interest, the Government is glad to have the views of members of Parliament and is desirous of consulting them whenever opportunity offers.

L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM RETURNING OFFICER.

Mr. SEGUIN:

Aside from the amount of four hundred dollars already received by Dr. Louis Azarie Foisy, of L'Epiphanie, for his services as returning officer in the County of L'Assomption-Montcalm, according to the information supplied by the minister on the 1st of May instant, how much is still due to this officer in connection with his services during that election?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The amount due has not been determined, as the returning officer has not yet furnished proper vouchers in support of his claims.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What was the amount paid for sending cablegrams by each department of the Government for the year ending March 31, 1918?
2. What has been paid by each of the several departments for sending telegrams and telephone messages?
3. Does the Government or any department thereof receive a special rate, or is the full commercial rate paid in connection with sending cablegrams, telegrams and telephone messages?
4. If not, is it the intention of the Government to endeavour to arrange for a special rate?

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the item "Composition, Stereotype Mats shipping charges, etc., $20,360.34," contained in the return of amounts paid for Victory Loan advertising,—

1. To whom was the said sum of $20,360.34 paid?
2. Was the said sum or any portion thereof paid under contract?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

3. If so, with whom was the contract made, and what are the particulars thereof?

Mr. READ (Prince)—:

1. What amount has been paid by the Government to each of the following newspapers: Charlottetown Guardian, Charlottetown Examiner, Island Patriot, Summerside Journal Agriculturist, Pioneer and Farmer, Charlottetown Herald, Charlottetown Watchman, from the 1st of August, 1914, to the 1st of January, 1918?
2. What portion of the amount so paid was for advertising in connection with the war?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

What were the gross earnings of the National Transcontinental Railway for the year ending 31st March, 1918; how much was earned between Moncton and Quebec, between Quebec and Cochrane Junction, between Cochrane Junction and Winnipeg, and between Lake Superior Junction and Fort William, and what amount has been paid by that railway to the Canadian Pacific for terminal charges at Quebec?

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Government notified the civil servants who have enlisted with the first contingent with the understanding that they would receive their salary besides their soldier's pay, that they would now only receive their soldier's pay?
2. How many civil servants enlisted under that agreement?
3. What is the total amount involved by the proposed reduction?

THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means (resumed from May 3.)

Lieut.-General Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House owing to the fact that I am suffering from a rather severe cold, but it may turn out for the best, after all, in that my remarks will necessarily be curtailed.

At the outset I wish to compliment the Acting Minister of Finance (Hon. A. K. Maclean) on the plain, unadulterated, and modest financial statement which he has submitted. On the occasion of its delivery I remarked that it was the first intelligible Budget speech that I had heard for a good many years. Those of us who were members of the last Parliament will remember that about a year ago I felt called upon to express in the House my views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean) as financial critic of the Opposition. I have pleasure now in saying that his constructiveness in formulating an intelligible Budget has been very successful. The plain, simple manner in which the financial state-

ment was presented has satisfied the House and, I think, the country as a whole. I therefore have pleasure in expressing my appreciation of the work of the Acting Minister of Finance.

If I may be permitted, Sir, I should like to place on Hansard a few ideas concerning democracy and the right of Parliament and the public to free speech, as far as that is consistent with the carrying on of this war to a successful issue. Undoubtedly the liberties of England, which have spread to other lands, are largely due to the fact that from time immemorial Englishmen have claimed the right of free speech in Parliament and in the press. True democracy is open, frank, free trust in the people, bogus democracy, or autocracy, fears the people, suppresses the facts and suppresses the people as far as it may. Autocracy is mistrustful; autocracy imposes restrictions and repression. Chloroform is a splendid anesthetic, but it is a mighty poor food, and even as an anesthetic it must be carefully administered. I therefore deprecate anything like the imposition of chloroform methods in connection with public affairs, whether those of the country generally or those pertaining more particularly to the war.

We hear over and over again in the press the cry of the autocrat, or the imbecile—for the two are very often the same—that in war democracy fails; that democracy cannot meet the situation caused by war. I have been a careful reader of history and a student of matters connected with the war, and I have yet to see the situation presented during this conflict, whether in Britain, Canada or France, that could not be successfully met by the application of the old methods of responsible government to which we have so long been accustomed. No situation can arise that calls for autocratic methods which are not in harmony with the principle of responsible government. We have had a recent illustration in Canada. On a certain occasion a certain gentleman in a certain place wanted to give utterance to certain ideas. Every restriction that gentle autocracy could devise was placed upon him, without success. Free speech and free action have settled and calmed the great Dominion of Canada to a greater degree than any one could believe possible, and they have most successfully alleviated the situation. Repression is always the policy and the practice of weak and incompetent men. The freedom of the press must be maintained; the press must be given the opportunity of selling itself, or not, as it chooses. The press must be left free. As the poet says:

> If the ways to hell are free,
> We leave them free to Heaven.

I think, therefore, that the press should be left absolutely free and untrammelled, each newspaper being allowed to conduct itself in its own way, as far as possible consistent with the rights of the people in this great war. Recently it has been my privilege again and again to see some censored articles that have been prevented from going before the people. Really, one would scarcely believe it possible that men of such narrow vision could be found as to repress and cut out section after section of articles that have been published again and again in England. If you talk with any one coming from England you will find that things are known there concerning our forces and concerning everything that is going on which are religiously suppressed in this great Dominion. I do not know who the censors are; I assume that they are men of great breadth of judgment, soundness of conception, and so on. I do not know whether they are inspired by some of these new councils and committees that are being formed; I know nothing about that, and care less; but I do say that the repression and censoring of articles that should find their way into the public press should be stopped. We knew that we got a trimming at Cambrai; what was the use of trying to hide it? We knew that we got a trimming at St. Quentin; what was the use of trying to hide it? Let us, like men, roll up our sleeves and say to the enemy: It was your turn then; we will meet the situation and in a very short time the tables will be turned; our boys will be on the attack and the German hordes will be rolling back over the very ground on which they advanced a short time ago. That is the spirit that should prevail among the people.

We had a secret session of Parliament here; I ask every hon. gentleman who was present at that secret session whether one word was uttered which might not fairly and squarely have been published broadcast in the newspapers the day before or the day after the meeting? Not a word. To my mind, this eternal fear of trusting the people is laughable. Who are the people? Who are we? Who are the Government, that they seek for one instant to muffle public sentiment or prevent the people from knowing what is going on? The Government is composed of magnificent honour-

able gentlemen; I have not a word to say against them, but I do think that two or three good Cabinets could be formed out of the material found in the members of Parliament gathered around this Government. There is scarcely a township or county council in Canada could not furnish material just as good—I say this with all due respect—as that which is found in those who are carrying on the affairs of this country. There is method in my madness; what I want to impress on the House is that we should trust the people. If some of the people I have mentioned could not make a better showing than some members of the Government, God pity them. Let us, therefore, be careful that, in seeking to establish democracy in Germany, we do not establish autocracy in Canada.

Some few months ago a general election was held in Canada. In the election campaign the one great issue that was set before the people was: "Strain every effort to win the war and to preserve the priceless gem of liberty, and do it quickly." We supported the Government and demanded prompt action with efficiency rather than slow deliberate action without full efficiency. That was seven months ago. In 1915, within seven months from the organization of the first Canadian expeditionary force, 33,000 men from Canada had crossed over to Great Britain, and between 15,000 and 20,000 of them had crossed to France and Belgium, and had immortalized themselves by winning one of the greatest victories in the world. These men, who were termed by gentlemen of repressive tendencies as untrained, undisciplined soldiers, when they were confronted in that battle with from ten to twenty times their number of Germans, showed the world what democracy could do. It is my prayer and, I believe, it is the prayer of the Allied forces, that the remnant of that gallant band shall yet tread the soil of Germany as conquerors and victors in this great struggle. Seven months ago the Military Service Act was brought in. Comment is needless.

This is a new House, composed of new men, independent thinkers, men not yet circumscribed by so-called party discipline. True discipline in educational as well as in military matters, means, as I have always maintained, freedom of thought and action, instruction, development, polish, capability, strength of character, and resolution. These are the characteristics of discipline, according to the proper interpretation of the term. The so-called discipline is merely repression. The

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

members of this House are not yet influenced as the party whips mildly crack the lash, but they are strong, capable men, resolute of purpose to help this Government and if necessary, to compel this Government to live up to its pre-election promises in regard to winning the war, and to go as far and as fast in that regard as the Government chooses to go. We are behind the Government's back until the finish. The people at large impel hon. members, while they in turn, in firm, kindly ways, will inspire the Government to action. The aim which actuates this House is to help to win the war; to help to smash the enemy; to help to maintain pure and unsullied the freedom our ancestors won and which they have handed down to us; to help to overthrow and root out every vestige of tyranny to be found in Germany, aye, or in Canada,—and, let it be done quickly. Action is the word. I know I voice the sentiments of my colleagues when I urge the Government to full, energetic, effective and whole-hearted action, and I have said, we are behind them as far and as fast as they choose to go along those lines. The true people of Canada, worthy of the fullest trust and confidence, stand behind us and them. Let chloroform methods, therefore, disappear from the public life of this country, and let true democratic principles prevail.

There are immediately before the people of Canada four great problems. There is another problem which I look on as an after-the-war problem, of which my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Calder) has charge, and which I regard as only second in importance to the furnishing of men. These four problems are food, money, inspiration, and men, and in these the problems of producing and saving in producing and of spending and saving in spending, are simple. With the production of food I shall not detain the House, as that matter is in good hands. Production has been hampered by the cost of agricultural implements, not so much on account of the duty as on account of the long term notes and high cost of financing these articles. As regards the saving of food, it may be noted that at the beginning of the war, it cost a great deal of money to dispose of camp refuse. We set to work, however, and turned what had formerly been a great source of expense into a source of revenue, and I have every reason to believe that the Minister of Militia has been carrying out the plan laid down in the early days of the war. All the garbage of the camps was

turned into a source of revenue. Hundreds of hogs, and in some camps, thousands of hogs were fed and sold, and in that way the country reaped large sums of money. I would respectfully suggest that if the Food Controller wants some simple lines upon which to act, he might consult General Langton, who is now Paymaster General at headquarters, and Colonel Mullin, of Winnipeg, who has had a good deal of experience in this matter. At the start, the quantity of rations issued to the men was here and there a little too great. This excess was claimed by those people as their own property and was disposed of in ways which we did not consider to be to advantage of the people of Canada who were footing the bills. Accordingly, we formed plans which we put into operation, and I have it on the authority of the Paymaster General who has recently retired, that up to that period we had saved upwards of $2,000,000 on little odds and ends in connection with rationing alone. The same policy was carried out on the other side, and by saving in little things in our food production, we saved very large sums of money to the Dominion of Canada. I believe all these plans, perhaps with improvements, are being carried on by my successor.

Let us next take up the question of raising money, and saving it while we are raising it. I regret exceedingly that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) is absent. We miss his genial smile and presence. I regret his illness very much, but there are conflicting reports regarding it. The House was one day officially informed that the Minister of Finance was ill. The next day the press agencies of California offered to the press of Canada a message of a thousand words comprising an interview which had supposedly taken place with the Minister of Finance and proving that he was not ill, but that he was in the best of health. That report was confirmed by travellers and others who had the pleasure of meeting the Minister of Finance in California. The House was subsequently informed that it was the purpose of the Minister of Finance to return to Canada, but he was importuned not to return to this country until his health was fully restored, but to go to Washington. There has been considerable comment throughout the country on these statements. I do not wish to enter into them, but there is nothing that the public like more than to be fully trusted, and nothing that they dislike more than to find themselves sidetracked. I shall not use any stronger terms. One is impelled to ask this question: Is the real aim in this regard to help the boys at the front to win the war, or to help certain directors to retain peaceful possession and control of munitions and money raised by this Government?

At the outbreak of the war in 1914, times were hard; depression was found on every side; dinner pails were empty, and poverty stalked through the homes of the land. The Minister of Finance declared that he could not finance for more than 20,000 men, and objected to sending 33,000 men overseas. He was reasoned with and urged to raise sufficient revenue, and finally we got the 33,000 men across. I shall not enter into the details of this, because they are all well known to hon. members and to the people of this country. Lord Kitchener, early in the war, cabled me for 200,000 shells, asking me to get them made in the United States of America. I shall not enter into this matter further than to point out that at once the idea of raising revenue and making the country prosperous presented itself to us, and the shells were accordingly made in Canada. The only member of the Government whom I consulted on this matter was the Prime Minister, and in all fairness to him I must say that on that and every other occasion I got every assistance and backing from him. It was impossible to get these two hundred thousand shells made in Canada at first, because our manufacturers and financiers lacked confidence, and it took a week or more to get the thing under way. But I knew that if once the thing were started, money would come into this country; we should have plenty of money in the banks for carrying on the war and for any other purposes for which we might require it, and the dinner pails would be filled. The plan was that I was to act as Lord Kitchener's direct agent. The Shell Committee was set up, who were to make contracts for shells with me, as the representative of the British Government. Several questions came up; for instance, whether we should use basic or acid steel; then there were the questions of copper and zinc and explosives and of procuring fish and other supplies in this country. But these are all old stories. Suffice it to say that in a very short period thereafter we had money in Canada in every bank, and in the pocket of every man and woman throughout the length and breadth of this land. We had a period of prosperity such as we had never experienced before. Upwards of one billion and a half of money was deposited in the

banks in this country at three per cent or less.

A good deal has been said about profiteering in connection with the manufacture of munitions. I have made a careful analysis, but other hon. gentlemen in this House are better posted, having gone into the matter more in detail. Briefly, the record is as follows: Twenty-five per cent of those who entered into the manufacture of munitions completely failed and lost their money, and I have yet to find any person express the slightest bit of sympathy for any of these poor beggars who put up their own money—not the Government's money as was done in Great Britain and the United States, but their own money—and then failed in the manufacture of munitions. Fifty per cent came out a little more than even, and about twenty-five per cent, owing in some instances to good work and in others to slight encouragement from the Munitions Board and elsewhere, succeeded in making money.

Upwards of a year ago the United States entered the war. Then they wanted shells, and our own industries not being very buoyant at the time, I personally took steps with a view to having the United States get a proportion of their shells and other munitions of war made in Canada, but the Chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board declined at that time to permit American munitions to be made in this country. I had this in view: We were making munitions for Great Britain; large sums of money were being raised in Canada for making munitions, not for the Canadian Government alone, but for the British Government as well. The British Government could have had these supplies made in England, but so long as we could raise the money in this country they turned the work over to us. At that time we had an adverse trade balance against the United States, we owing them, roughly, four hundred million dollars, and I felt that we could pay that off and restore the equilibrium of exchange, and make money for Canada, if we could make shells and munitions of war for the American Government; and I still hold that view. But as I have said, Canadian manufacturers were not permitted at that time to manufacture munitions for the United States. Later on, it is true that after considerable agitation arrangements were made whereby these munitions were made in Canada, but in the meantime a number of our fellows, wearying of doing nothing in Canada and despairing of this arrangement ever being brought about, established their plants in the United States, and to-day our manufacturers have plants in the United States at Buffalo, Batavia, and twenty other places I could name, where Canadian capital is being employed in making munitions for the United States Government. In my opinion, these munitions should have been made by the factories of our own country. Then the balance of trade would have been in our favour, and we should not have had to pay from two to two and a quarter per cent exchange when sending money to the United States. I am not saddling responsibility for this directly on the Government, but I say it would have been money saved for this country. So much for that.

Money has been lost or wasted in Canada in the following, among other, ways: The National Service Commission was time and money frittered away and wasted. I have discussed that matter before in other sessions, and shall not take it up again to-day. The Canadian Home Defence Force was also time and money frittered away. The Military Service Act has cost the individuals of this country affected by it many many hundreds of thousands of dollars. I know one young man who has had to spend upwards of fifty dollars, through no fault of his own, in running back and forth to tribunals and for medical examinations. The Act has not only been an annoyance to the people of Canada, but a tremendous bill of expense as well. I might interject here that when the Act was introduced I appealed to the Government, both privately and on the floor of the House, to enforce the Militia Act, as it would much better fill the bill. We could have called out three or four hundred thousand men for training in Canada, and out of that number who would have been training in Canada last fall we could have secured at least two hundred thousand volunteers for the front; and if they would not volunteer, we could have sent them to the front under the Militia Act just as we are sending them to-day. Under that Act we could also have conscripted other men for any useful employment in the Dominion. I am satisfied that if that Act had been applied, there would have been no trouble and everything would have gone on harmoniously. Many of these boys object to being called conscripts, but after a week or two they are just as keen as the lads who volunteered early in the war, and I am satisfied that with a few amendments to the Militia Act, and a few regulations here and there, we could easily have got two hundred thousand men more than we

have to-day, and I know they would have been much better trained. However, that is past, and I do not want to raise ghosts.

I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not present, because another place where I think a great deal of money has been wasted is on the so-called Dominion Police officers running up and down the country, riding on the trains, and arresting everybody except the men they should arrest. I have again and again submitted a list of the people in the county I have the honour to represent who should be taken, but not one of them has been approached yet. On the other hand, I could name fifty decent fellows whom the Act does not affect at all who have been bagged and put to all sorts of inconvenience and trouble, kept waiting hours and sometimes days by the so-called Dominion Police officers rambling up and down the country. These officers should be put to some useful occupation; sawing wood would be very congenial.

Another place where money has been deliberately wasted, in my opinion, is on the War Lecture Bureau. I do not know yet what its purpose is, or how it is composed, or who was responsible for selecting its head. But I realize this, that ninety-nine per cent of the people in the county I represent can deliver just as good lectures as the men who are sent there to lecture to them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Better.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I believe that the Bureau has been established, not to educate the people on great national subjects, or to maintain the spirit of our people, but along lines congenial to the hon. gentleman who has been instrumental in setting this thing up, and he has certainly added insult to injury so far as I am concerned by placing at the head of the Bureau a man who year in and year out has persistently blackguarded, maligned and lied about me in every imaginable way.

If the hon. gentleman thinks I am going to permit any fiddling concern like that to go up and down the country robbing the people, all I can say is that he is reckoning without his host. I shall expose them on every occasion. I look upon it merely as a four-flushing performance and as under-estimating the intelligence of the people. There is not a line they send out in these circulars that cannot be sent out by the newspapers, and the information can be better placed before the people through the medium of the Press than by these lecture bureaus which are performing up and down the country. I am sorry to think that the Government could be so hoodwinked and I cannot understand what was the strange, unseen, hidden hand pressure that these gentlemen were able to put upon the Government of the day to induce them to permit this sort of thing and to impose upon the people and on the treasury of the country. There is nothing like talking out in meeting and having the facts put clearly. I know what the sentiment of the country is and I feel satisfied that in what I have said I have only expressed the sentiments of the people.

Furthermore, we are to have a Registration Board, or something of that kind, the only difference between the registration now proposed and under the National Service Board being that whereas this is compulsory the other was not. In a widely scattered country like the Dominion of Canada any such registration as that which is proposed is doomed to a miserable failure. The records will show in a very short time that the whole thing is a farce, that it cannot accomplish any useful purpose that might not be accomplished by taking up the voter's lists or consulting the assessment rolls in any township or municipality in Canada. It can all be done in that way, but, if we are only to get lists of men and little girls who are willing to go out on a farm—why it's piffle. In a great country like this, thousands of miles in extent, you are going to ask a man who saws wood here if he will go and work some place else and you are going to get some little girl in the Civil Service to give up her job, go some place else, put on a pair of breeches and pick berries. The thing is ridiculous and I wonder that any man with an ounce of common sense in his head ever thought of such a thing or allowed it to be undertaken. What is the malign influence, what is the hidden hand which this gentleman seems to exercise in connection with this war lecture bureau and this registration business?

Another waste of money is in having two Militia Departments. We have one Militia Department here presided over by a mighty good fellow. We have in England another Militia Department. I asked a question in this House last year and I received a deliberate mis-statement in reply, regarding the number of people employed at Argyle House. I knew it was a falsehood at the time, but I let it pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman is not in order in saying that the Government furnished him with a deliberate

mis-statement and that remark should be withdrawn.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did I say that the Government furnished me with a deliberate mis-statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: I so understood the hon. gentleman.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I said I was furnished.

Mr. SPEAKER: By whom?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not say. At all events, the facts were not made public, and I am in a position to say now that two weeks before the answer, such as it was, was given in the House there was a great cleaning out. There was a hurried clearing out of the fellows in order to reduce the number of men who had been hanging around Argyle House and kindred places at that time. The quibble—I can say that—and I do not charge any one here with being guilty of quibbling—was this: they limited the answer to a number of people employed in Argyle House, but it should have included the number employed in four or five other buildings, I understand, in the immediate locality. If half of that army of employees had been behind Gough when the line broke at St. Quentin the German attack might have been checked. We have a great many men in England, some hundred odd thousands, and, according to the returns which we get, there are only fifteen thousand or sixteen thousand fit to keep up the strength of the men in the trenches. The money is going to pay for the service of the hundred thousand men we have in England and for those who are doing very little work, whereas the same work is being done and duplicated here. This work should be and could be done here. Under the old system General Carson and thirty men did the work in England which is now being done by hundreds of men and minister surrounded by his retinue. I shall not say anything with regard to the way in which the work was done in those times, but if a comparison be made between then and now it will be entirely in favour of the old system.

I desire to say a word about that magnificent young officer, General Turner, who was put in command in England. When that happened I wrote him and warned him that he was committing military suicide. I pointed out to him that it would be utterly impossible for any man to carry on the work of his command circumscribed as he was and with such a minister as he had. There was loaded upon him without his consent an officer who had no more conception of a democratic army than a hen has of logic. That is the way that poor Turner has been driven from pillar to post. General Turner was one of the best officers that ever entered the field and one who always kept in view the necessity of saving the lives of his men. He would carry out his plans in such a way as to minimize the loss of life. He first looked after the lives of his boys. He would not send his men up against machine guns as some officers do with reckless disregard for life. No body of men can stand up against machine gun fire; it will mow them down by thousands. Two machine guns brought down eighteen hundred British soldiers at the Battle of Neuve Chapelle before the position was finally captured. The idea of rushing men up against machine guns may look nice in the papers but General Turner had too much regard for his men to have them butchered in that way. I notified the British Government when I was Minister of Militia and Defence protesting against sending our Canadian boys up against machine gun positions without any protection in the way of shields and I said that if they continued to do so it would be my duty to provide them with a bunch of Texas steers because they would afford the German machine gunners the same amusement and practice as our gallant lads would, and would make just as good targets for the machine guns as would our men. General Turner would have made a magnificent corps commander in the field if he had been put in command of one or two Corps when the Dominion had the honour and credit of sending her brave boys to the front. But, he is held in London and as a result the career of a gallant soldier is blighted. The minister, under whom this has been going on has no reputation of his own to blight.

There is another reason why a great deal of money was lost last winter and that was because of the absence of motive power on our railways. The whole trouble last winter was not the want of coal but the want of motive power to haul the coal. The daily consumption of coal per locomotive on our railways is usually about four or five tons, but last winter they burned double that quantity and they could not haul more than half a train. If they had spent money to get motive power on the railways traffic would have moved more quickly over the

different lines. The Government should get the advanced idea rather than the repressive idea.

The question of loans is a very interesting subject of discussion. In this matter not only millions but tens of millions of the money of the people of Canada might have been saved. With your permission, Sir, I shall read an extract published, I think it was in 1915, in The Courier, a standard publication in the city of Toronto, and I shall assume responsibility for the statements in it because I have the whole thing in detail. However, I shall not weary the House with those statements to a greater extent than is set forth in the article in the Courier, although I have an analysis of all the loans. This refers to the best loan of the lot, one for $45,000,000, made in the United States in 1915, I think:

Did the Hon. Mr. White Succeed in Wall Street?

The Story of the Getting of Forty-five Million Dollars from Shrewd United States Investors.

Did Mr. White score a triumph, or was the triumph scored by Morgans and their associates? Will Canada lose ten million dollars by this transaction?

When the Canadian Government borrows money and agrees to pay a certain rate of interest, that transaction affects every borrower, public or private, in the Dominion. For example, if the Canadian Government will pay only 3½ per cent., the Provinces will probably be able to borrow at 3¾ or 4 per cent., the municipalities at 4 or 4¼ per cent., and private borrowers at 4½ or 5 per cent. The Dominion Government, according to history, can always borrow a little more cheaply than the Provinces, while the Provinces borrow a little cheaper than the cities, and the cities a little less than the private borrower.

Incidentally I may say that I took up a paper the other day and saw where the city of Victoria, B.C., is to-day paying seven per cent interest, and some other city more than seven per cent interest, on loans.

Hence, every transaction by the Dominion Government affects the Provinces, the municipalities and the private borrowers. The Canadian Minister of Finance sets the rate at which all borrowers shall pay. If the minister is careless or extravagant, and pays an excessive rate of interest, he forces all other borrowers to pay a higher rate. If he is frugal and a good borrower, he helps all other borrowers to get money cheaply.

To take an extreme case. Supposing we had a lazy, small-headed bungling Minister of Finance at Ottawa who borrowed money on a large scale at seven per cent interest. The Provinces would be compelled to compete with him, and might have to pay 7½ per cent. Then the municipalities would have to compete with the Dominion and the Provinces in the money markets, and would have to pay 8 per cent. Private borrowers, say railways, traction companies, manufacturers, and so on, would be forced by competition to pay 9 per cent. Thus we see that every loan of a big nature must be made on terms which are set by the Dominion Minister of Finance.

Why We Went to New York.

With these circumstances in mind, let us examine the latest exploit of the Hon. Thomas White, Canadian Minister of Finance. He is getting all the money for war expenditures from London. The British Government has agreed to help him in this respect. He has no difficulties so far as war expenditures are concerned. But if he has not enough money to pay for other expenditures, such as canals, post-offices, armouries, docks, dredging and other public services. He must borrow elsewhere.

Now, Hon. Thomas White needed forty-five million dollars to meet the deficit of the year 1915. Whether there ought to be a deficit or whether there ought not to be a deficit is not a matter to be discussed here. There is a deficit and that deficit must be met. Therefore the Hon. Thomas White arranged with the Bank of Montreal, J. P. Morgan & Co., Brown Brothers & Co., First National Bank and National City Bank of New York to raise the necessary forty-five million.

There can be no objection to our going to New York to borrow. It is practically the only market open to us, though the Dominion had never gone there before. The Provinces and the municipalities have been going there since the war broke out. They have borrowed over a hundred millions in that city during the past twelve months, and they also got their money at reasonable rates. Moreover, Canada is buying so much more from the United States than we are selling to that country that it was difficult to pay for all we wanted. The rate of exchange was therefore against us. A big borowing like Mr. White contemplated would help to restore the balance. That is, the Dominion Government would get its money not in cash, but in credits due American firms by Canadian creditors. Thus it would be beneficial all around and prevent the necessity of sending $45,000,000 in gold to New York to pay our debts there.

How the Rate was Decided.

So far so good. The next point for Hon. Thomas White to consider was "What rate of interest shall I offer the New York bankers?" In deciding this he had several points to keep in mind. In the first place, the New York bankers were anxious to see Mr. White borrow there. They were willing to make the loan. They are interested in seeing United States firms continue to sell largely in Canada, which they could not do if Canada has no money to pay for goods. It was just as vital to the United States to lend us that money as it was for Canada to get that money. Each party to the bargain was interested. Hence Mr. White must have known that the situation favoured a low rate of interest.

In the second place, Mr. White knew that the Ontario Government was borowing there at five per cent. interest, and that the city of Toronto had got money there at five per cent. He would know, therefore, that he should be able to borrow in New York at 4½ or 4¾ per cent.

In the third place he had to consider what other countries were doing. Great Britain has just raised over three billions of dollars at 4½ per cent. But this interest is subject to in-

come tax, so that the borrower would be netting between 4 and 4¼ per cent. If the income tax goes up in the near future, the man who lends to the British Government will not net more than 4 per cent. Having examined this situation, Mr. White would have to decide whether the interest on his New York borrowings would be subject to any taxes. He did this and decided that they would not. It was announced that these interest payments would be "free from taxes imposed by the Dominion of Canada, including any income tax." Not only did Mr. White promise not to tax these interest payments himself, but he will not let any one else tax them. Thus whatever interest the United States investor got would be "net." As the British Government was paying about 4 per cent. net the Dominion Government should pay about 4½ per cent. net.

The Generous Terms Offered.

These are the preliminary figures. Now let us see what Hon. Thomas White actually did. He agreed to take $45,000,000 from the New York bankers, and give 5 per cent. gold notes as follows:

$25,000,000 .....Due August 1st, 1916
$20,000,000 .....Due August 1st, 1917

He agreed to pay the interest half-yearly on February 1st and August 1st. He agreed to pay the interest in United States gold in New York City. He agreed that these notes should be convertible, at the option of the holder, at any time prior to three months before maturity, into twenty-year five per cent bonds of the Dominion of Canada, par for par, to be free from any right of prior redemption. Further he agreed to take this loan at the following prices:

The one year note at 100, and interest.

The two year notes at 99½ and interest.

Finally, he agreed to pay the New York bankers ¾ of one per cent commission on the proceeds.

This was all he agreed to do. Yet when one figures it out, no other bonuses were necessary. Five per cent. interest for the gold bonds of the finest British Dominion, no taxes, half-yearly interest, payable interest and principal in gold, convertible into twenty-year bonds at option—what more could the keenest Yankee want? And he didn't want any more. As a matter of fact, that forty-five million loan was taken up in five minutes. The books opened, the investors yelled "We take it" and the books closed. It was the swiftest sale of bonds ever made in the history of the world.

It was easy money for the bankers. Their commission amounted to $336,750, and they earned it in five minutes. Of course, that wasn't much among five of them, but it would buy quite a few dinners at the Waldorf. It would pay the rent of the five institutions for two or three months at least.

Then the vital question comes, "Why did the United States investor grab that issue as if he were getting gold dollars for ninety cents?" The only possible answer is that the Hon. Thomas White agreed to pay five per cent when he could have get the money for 4½ per cent. There cannot possibly be any other answer.

Now, let us see what Canada lost. The interest on $25,000,000 for one year at five per cent and on $20,000,000 for two years at the same rate is $3,250,000. The interest at 4½ per cent would be $2,925,000. Mr. White, therefore, cost Canada $325,000 by a mistake in judgment.

There seems to be no possible defence. He knew that the credit of the Dominion was better than that of the Provinces or the city of Toronto, and that those authorities had borrowed at five per cent. He knew that Great Britain had just borrowed at about four per cent net. He knew that the United States bankers have more money than they know what to do with, and that they realize that they must lend to Canada to keep up their sales in this country. All these facts were known to every financial writer and every financial broker in Canada, and hence should have been known to the Minister of Finance. All these facts were public facts.

Then Why Did Mr. White Promise to Pay Such a High Rate?—What Will be the General Effect?

Finally, think what this means to Canada. Suppose the Provinces and the municipalities want to borrow another hundred millions in New York during the next year, what will happen? The bankers of New York, having found Mr. White an easy victim, will hold up the smaller borrowers. They will demand 5½ per cent as sure as fate. Think of the loss that will mean?

Figure it out for yourselves. The various borrowers want a hundred millions for an average of five years. They pay 5½ per cent. instead of five per cent. What will it amount to? The answer is, two and a half million dollars.

But there is another way to look at it. Mr. White decides to pay five per cent and he invites tenders. J. P. Morgan & Co. offer to buy the bonds at 99¾, another firm offers 101, another offers 102½, and another offers 104¾. Who will get it? The firm that offered 104¾ of course. In that case, instead of getting $44,563,250 for his forty-five million dollars' worth of bonds, Mr. White would have got about $47,250,000, or nearly three millions more than he actually got.

There are financial men who believe rightly or wrongly, that Mr. White could have got two and a half millions more for his bonds than he did get. The test of their belief will be the selling price of these bonds three months hence. If they were then selling at 104, or thereabouts, then these men will be right.

The financiers who claim that Mr. White lost two and a half million dollars have no animus against him. But the fact remains, that the financial world, rightly or wrongly, is laughing. Canada cannot afford in these days to be laughed at.

I have the figures here representing analyses of other loans, made since that time, and, if possible, each succeeding one is worse than its predecessor.

The rate of interest charged is very high and Canada, in consequence has suffered. Every municipality has to pay pretty heavily. As I stated a few minutes ago, Victoria has to pay seven per cent and can scarcely get the money even at that high rate.

There is another matter in connection with which we have lost many millions of dollars, and I would ask the special attention of the Acting Finance Minister

to this in the hope that it will be a guide to him for the future. In his speech the other night he stated that bonds of other issues to the extent of $150,000,000 were transferred on the Victory Loan. Am I right in that understanding?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Those, of course, do not count in the $400,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is right.

Sir SAM HUGHES: These, of course, are not included in that $400,000,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nevertheless these $150,000,000 were former issues of bonds that were transferred and came in under the higher rate of interest and better terms of the Victory Loan. Am I right there?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I chanced to be in New York city one day, and in conversation with a gentleman he asked me: "Why not buy some Canadian bonds of the previous issue, you can get them as low as 91 to 93, and you can take them up and plant them in this new loan at 97½ and make money?" I told him I would be delighted to do it if he would loan me the money, that as I had only enough to pay my hotel bill I could not indulge in the experiment. What did happen was this: Bonds to the extent of $150,000,000 were so bought up, and many of them, selling at that time from 91½ to 93, were taken up and turned over; and I would venture to say that the average gain on each was at least 4 per cent. Six millions of dollars went into the pockets of brokers and speculators because of that little transfer clause in the Victory Loan. I would suggest to the Acting Minister of Finance that he should make it impossible in future loans for a graft of $6,000,000 to be made out of the people of Canada. The brokers and stock gamblers of this country netted $6,000,000 by a little turn or trick in the placing of the last Victory Loan. Moreover, Sir, the man who invests his money in business takes his risks before the public. He has to pay an income tax on every dollar of profit above a certain per cent, whereas the man who acquired these bonds by speculation on the market is free from that tax, and can profit to the full extent. That is not fair to the honest purchaser in the Dominion of Canada, and I would like some one, sometime, to give me an explanation of why this sort of thing was permitted. I trust the Acting Finance Minister will see to it that no such game is ever perpetrated again.

Speaking of the Victory Loan, you can ask any banker, bank clerk, or any one handling these bonds, if any purchaser could understand the terms and conditions set out on the application forms. Unless they were paid up in full, the people have to come for them. Some have been lost in transmission. An army of clerks is required, and I understand that a new building is to be put up somewhere in Ottawa to handle this loan, when the whole thing could have been done for nothing. I was in Paris in 1915-16, when a loan was being offered there. There was a row of officers at desks where the loan was being offered. A man would come in, ask for a fifty or one hundred franc bond, would whack up his money, the clerk would make out the bond, keeping a duplicate, and the original would be handed to the man when countersigned by the inspecting officer, and that was the end of it. There was no such paraphernalia such as we had in the Victory Loan. I know, as a matter of fact, how the bank clerks all over the Dominion worked, and worked for nothing. There was an allowance given by the Finance Department to the banks, but not for the work of these clerks, who worked at their regular business in the day time, and put in hours every night to help out this Victory Loan, and they got scarcely a "thank you" for their services.

Then there were bonuses paid to the brokers of upwards of $5,000,000. Does it not seem strange, Sir, that the returns from these brokers are not all in yet? I asked the Acting Minister of Finance the other day what brokers had handled this loan. He was trying to remember the pretexts that the President of the Privy Council puts up: he could not remember who these brokers were. The contract was farmed out to them, and they got many honest, enthusiastic people throughout the country to get out and canvass for the loan. I am satisfied that if a tithe of the energy had been used in other ways, the results would have been more satisfactory, although we raised, by offering the bonds at 5½ to 6 per cent, $400,000,000 out of a surplus of a billion and a half, not counting the money put away in old teapots and stockings. These people should have jumped at taking these bonds as an investment, but we find only $400,000,000 coming forward out of a billion and a half to take advantage of this high rate of interest on the Victory Loan.

Then there has been a loss in connection with separation allowances of a million dollars. That, however, has gone to a good place; it has gone to the wives and widows of the soldiers who went to the front.

Then there has been a loss in connection with exchange on the United States. We have a balance of trade of $400,000,000 against us with the United States. The rate of exchange is 2 1-8. By the exercise of ordinary common sense on the part of the Imperial Munitions Board or the Government, the exchange situation could have been turned into an asset, if we had encouraged the United States to come into Canada and get their munitions early in the game, as they wanted to do. But our munitions makers went to the United States instead and located at Buffalo, Pittsburg, Batavia and other places. I shall not enter into that question further at this stage, although there is another story in connection with it.

We could save time in training men. Time is money. We are wasting money in this respect as things are going now, but I do not blame any one here for that. I have already pointed out the loss in connection with the exemption from interest on Government bonds. I trust that in future the Finance Minister will see that the finances of the country are placed on a common-sense basis, and that the people are not put at the mercy of the bond sellers and brokers of Canada.

Now, as to the raising of men. Men have been raised in the past, not by chance but by system. In the time during which I had the honour to be Minister of Militia we were ahead of our programme right along until the spring of 1916, when recruiting was held up. I pointed out, and said so, that we should apply the Militia Act in the fall of 1916. However, I will not discuss that question. I believe the Government is doing its best to meet the situation, and I am free to admit it has been a difficult one. More important than the raising of men is the saving of men. It costs $3,000 to train a man up to a point of efficiency, and it is necessary to save our men to the greatest extent possible. There are times when it is necessary to sacrifice both men and money. Generalship is too often measured by the number of one's own casualties rather than by the number of the enemy's dead. It is always more congenial, Sir, to your humble servant to bury a dead enemy than a dead friend. Moreover, Sir, I have always stood for the protection of our men both positively and negatively. I had the honour, Sir, of first proposing the trench warfare two years before the war, as the Prime Minister is well aware, and on the very night war was declared, as on occasions both since and before that date.

Suggestions as to trenches, trench mortars, dug outs, trench plates, trench and field shields and many other simple and effective methods of saving the lives of our boys and of overcoming the enemy were furnished by me in this war. Some were adopted, and some were not. At Lens and Passchendaele upwards of 40,000 Canadians went down—fully three divisions. What was the object? What were the aims? One thing is certain: these things prevented the formation of the fifth and sixth divisions. In 1915, when British and Canadian troops were being wasted in foolish attempts to rush soldiers in line over open ground against machine guns and wire entanglements, I pointed out to the British Government the folly of such action. I am happy to say that it was stopped, and that methods to prevent machine gun execution were adopted, although they have not yet been anything like successful. Mind conquers matter. Machine guns can be readily overcome. Without some definite object in sight, no Canadian soldier's life should be sacrificed. The force must have good officers. There must be even-handed justice, no undue or ulterior influence in promotions, either in England or at the front. Fair play for all must be the word.

It is our duty to stop this talk of peace and this talk of when the war will end. It is our duty to realize that the war will end only when Germany is trimmed to a finish. It is our duty to exert every nerve, to roll up every sleeve, in order to accomplish that object. We must accept our rebuffs like men, fill up our ranks, and go on once more. The free democracies of England, France and United States, and their colonies will teach autocracies the world over that the trained freeman is superior every time; that democracy must triumph and autocracy in the end be overthrown.

Mr. D. C. ROSS (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman seriatim through the various arguments that he made, or to refer in detail to his philosophical dispositions concerning the relative merits of autocracy and democracy. Every member of this House is fully seized of those merits or demerits, as the case may be. But when he was describing the demerits of auto-

cracy and the merits of democracy, I was reminded of the description given by an eminent English statesman of the tenets of the Liberal and Conservative parties. As I remember it, his statement was that Conservatism was distrust of the people tempered by fear, and Liberalism trust of the people tempered by prudence.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who gave this definition?

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Gladstone, I think. That definition fits in so well with what the hon. gentleman was ascribing to autocracy and democracy that I wondered if he would accept it as a proper description of the standing of the two parties in this House. I agree with what my hon. friend said when he took exception to the autocratic methods of this Government in legislating by Order in Council. Every true democrat in this country will concur in that. Indeed, many hon. gentlemen now sitting to the right of the Speaker, if they would speak their minds frankly, would condemn the Government for many of the steps they have taken by Order in Council during the last six months.

The speech of the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam. Hughes) was really a treat, as his speeches generally are. One was struck very forcibly with the love that must have prevailed between the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) who is not now in his place; it must have exceeded the love of Damon for Pythias. One was struck also with the delightful unanimity that must have prevailed in the old Cabinet when the member for Victoria was a member of it. He charges this Government with more crimes and misdeeds than any member of this House has so far ventured to attribute to it—and I have no doubt that he is telling the truth. He says that their loans were bad and extravagantly made; that the interest was too high; that the lecture bureau was not right; indeed, that everything was bad.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The lecture bureau was a Liberal organization, I understand.

Mr. ROSS: I understand that it was part of the Unionist campaign, and that its object was to cause the people to believe that the Union Government was the only Government that this country ever had or should have. I agree with my hon. friend that members of this Parliament could be chosen who would make up a Government probably more able than the present Administration. I cannot see that the Government have adopted any policies of exceptional value since they came into office; I cannot see that they have even lived up to all their promises. What puzzles me is this: if the Government are as bad as the member for Victoria would have us believe they are, why in the world is he sitting on the right side of the Speaker? Why did he support them in the last election?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman is puttting words into my mouth; I did not find fault with the Government. In order to show that there were many able men on this side, fit for any Government, I pointed out that many gentlemen here were eminently qualified to govern, even as members of this Government are.

Mr. ROSS: I accept what my hon. friend says, but as I remember his remarks he said that from any township or county council in Canada men could be chosen who would form as good a government as the men on the Treasury benches. I do not know that that is very flattering to members of county councils. I know many members of the county council in Middlesex, men of eminence and pre-eminence, who could give members of this Government a few pointers as to how the affairs of the country should be run. However, I am willing to accept my hon. friend's view of the matter.

I was very much pleased the other night as I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). I know that he is a radical among radicals, and I admire him for it; I belong to that category myself. I agree absolutely with most of the conclusions he arrived at concerning the railway situation. I take exception to the action of the Government in increasing freight rates; it was improvident, extravagant, uncalled for; it placed an undue burden upon the producing people, and no good can come from it.

Let us take the figures which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) gave to the House. He pointed out that the increase of 15 per cent in the railway rates would mean an imposition of $45,000,000 in additional freight rates on the people of this country. He pointed out, moreover, that the increase in freight rates would cost the consumer from $45,000,000 to $50,000,000 in the amounts added to the prices of commodities affected by that increase. In other words, he pointed out, and, I think, he properly and accurately pointed out, that the people of this country, by this increase of 15 per cent in freight rates, were to be subjected to a tax of $100,000,000.

That was not a good business arrangement. The justification urged by the Government, namely, that they have taxed the Canadian Pacific the small sum of $7,000,000, does not meet the case. What are the facts? The railways of Canada, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, have been paid for time and again by the people of this country. We suppose that the Canadian Northern and some of the other raliways are at the present time owned by the people of Canada. We know we have been putting into their coffers millions upon milions of dollars in land and in money. We know we are still putting money into their coffers, and we are to be asked this session to put more money into their coffers. I cannot understand the inaction of the Government at the present time. It looks to me as if they were trying to steer clear of the whole question. I cannot understand why this Canadian Northern matter has not been brought before the House at an earlier date in the session. I do not understand why the Government had not urged the arbitrators, who are inquiring into the value of the Canadian Northern railway stock, to make their finding earlier, so that on the floor of the House the members who are sent here to represent the people can thresh this thing out and thus avoid further action by Order in Council.

If the members of the House saw, as I did the other day, the report of Lord Shaughnessy in regard to the Canadian Pacific, I am sure they were very much struck with that report. Lord Shaughnessy says that the Canadian Pacific has assets aggregating $818,000,000, that is for railway property. He says, moreover that, apart from that, the Canadian Pacific has extraneous assets—I suppose land, and companies such as steamship companies—aggregating $253,000,000. What is this country doing?

What is this House doing? What is this Government doing? They are allowing this little institution, with assets over $1,000,000,000, to impose a tax on the people of this country, in the way of additional freight rates, of 15 per cent. This company will receive from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 in the way of profits out of that tax. This company has immense assets and it is paying immense dividends. Those assets were made by the people of Canada, and yet the people of Canada are asked to put into the treasury of the company $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, and the Government says, forsooth: We will take back from the Canadian Pacific $7,000,000 to relieve the taxpayers. That is an absurd, improvident bargain, one that this Government should never have made.

How is this increase in the freight rates going to affect the farmer? The farmer at this time is a very important factor in the winning of the war. Probably he is the most important factor after the man at the front, if not as important. This increase is going to make the farmer pay both going and coming. This Government has seen fit by Order in Council to fix the price of wheat to the farmers at $2.21 per bushel at Fort William or Montreal, as the case may be. Then the Government says: We shall raise the freight rates 15 per cent. That means that the freight rates are taken out of the price of the farmer's grain, and he is, therefore, deprived of that amount of money for his grain. How does the increase affect the manufacturer? The Government has not put its unholy hand on the manufacturer. That would never do. The Government never seems to touch its friends. It does not give the farmer free agricultural implements. It does not put a limitation on the price of binders, stating that they shall be sold for $200; but it allows then to be sold for $250. The farmer has to pay the price of the binder plus the freight on it, because the manufacturer adds the freight to the price. You have the farmer, therefore, losing both ways. He pays the extra freight rate on his binder, and he pays the extra freight rate on his grain. A much more sensible way to have arranged this matter would have been for the Government, if they must wait until the report of the Canadian Northern arbitrators has been received, to pay any deficits that may be incurred in the running of those railways which they say they own. In that way they would save to the people the $30,000,000 which the Canadian Pacific would get, and if there is a small deficit it can be taken out of the public treasury and the Government can in this way economize in this time of stress and strain.

That brings me to another question which also touches the farmer. That is the question of production and free agricultural implements. Since I have been in this House, I have had occasion more than once to vote for free agricultural implements. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) say that there was an agreement, implied or expressed, that the members for the West were going to lay aside all tariff issues during this session, and probably during this Par-

liament. I was pleased on the other hand to learn from the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) that, as far as he was concerned, no such agreement existed. I do not think, in this free, democratic country, members of this House should come to Parliament bound by agreements of any kind. They should come here free to vote in the public interest, and whether a party has to stand or fall, it should stand or fall by that gauge of battle alone. If at the present time production is very important; if it is as important as we believe it to be; if it is as important as this Government said it was six months ago and as, I think, they will still say to-day; if production is so important that they allowed tractors to come into this country free in order to increase production; if production is so important that advertisements for farm labourers have appeared in almost every journal in this country, I contend that the sole rule by which hon. members of this House should be guided in their action on a question of this kind is this: Are free agricultural implements going to help increase production; and is producing more going to help to win the war?

At the last election we on this side of the House submitted to insults, charges and attacks which we did not deserve. We were told that we were disloyal; we were told that we were not true to the Empire; we were told that we did not want to fight for the Empire, simply because we urged upon our people what had been urged upon us by the Government, namely, the necessity of production. All through my riding and in other ridings, that was the charge that was levied against us. Some of the men who levied those charges against us are in this House. Those men who are manufacturers of agricultural implements have at the present time a fine opportunity of standing by the reasons they contended at that time led them to join the Union Government, and the same may be said of the men from the West.

The Union Government, they said was to win the war. Now, if we can prove, and I think we can, that free agricultural implements are going to help production, and so help win the war, these gentlemen should not let their pockets or their politics stand in the way of their patriotism, but be manly enough to say, "We will give the farmer that relief, forgetting our own interests in the interests of the nation at large, so that we may help win the war." I do not think this Government is giving the farmer a fair chance. I represent an agricultural riding. I have tried to be absolutely honest in my actions in connection with this war, I voted for the Military Service Act. I told my people on the hustings I was prepared to stand by the sending of one hundred thousand men to the front. I thought that probably the exigencies of the case demanded that they should be sent. I also told them I had spoken in the House in favour of exemption for farmers, and I still stand for that. But this Government, all along the line, are not giving the farmer and the agriculturist a fair show.

I have already cited the freight rates case, and will now give an instance in connection with the horse trade in this country. Every man who knows anything about farming in this country knows that horse raising is one of our greatest industries, and that the easier a farmer can sell his horses the more prosperous he will be, and the better able to help in a greater production. But since the war began, this Government seems to have only trifled with the horse industry in Canada. I put a question on the Order Paper the other day asking how many horses the Government had bought in Canada last year, and I was told that $212,000 had been spent on horses bought in Canada, for use in camps in Canada, as the Prime Minister afterwards explained. But on looking through the estimates of the Militia Department I see that for the year ending March 31, 1917, $3,400,000 was set aside for purchasing remounts for use on the continent, and I find in the estimates this year an item of $3,000,000 more for the same purpose. Now what are are facts? As far as I can get them, they are these: very few of the horses that have been bought with that amount of money have been bought in Canada. Why is this? Our horses are well known to be the best in the world on account of being the best hoofed, owing to the limestone in the soil, and they have as good legs as any horses in the world, which is a most desirable thing for horses used in war. The Government cannot say we did not have the horses in this country, for in the western part of Ontario horses are a drug on the market; many people are simply clamouring for an opportunity to sell their horses. But this Government, which pretends to look after the interests of the farmers and of production, arranges with the British War Office for a Remount Commission to come out here, and they take our $3,400,000 and use it for buying American horses. Train loads of American horses are passing through Sarnia and Windsor every day, as

my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) will confirm, while our Canadian horses are left on our farmers' hands.

I have in my hand the monthly bulletin of Agricultural Statistics, and it shows conclusively the growth of the horse trade in this country. The figures, in round numbers, are as follows: In 1912 we had 2,692,000 horses in Canada; in 1913, 2,800,000; 1914, 2,900,000; 1915, 2,996,000; 1916, 3,258,000, and in 1917, 3,412,000. That proves conclusively, to my mind, that there are thousands of horses in this country that could be spared, and that our farmers have been neglected so far as the purchase of their horses is concerned. I think this Government, including the new Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), would be better employed in giving some of their attention to the farming interests of this country, and particularly the horse industry, than in devoting it to matters of minor importance. There is this also to be taken into account: If the horses are left on the farmer's hands, he has to feed them during the winter at great expense, and the more feed he needs for his horses, the less there is for his cattle, and the less he has to sell; so his stocks are thereby depleted.

I should like to point out another matter in which the farmers have been treated unfairly by this Government under the Order in Council method. The Government fixed the price of wheat at $2.21 Montreal and Port Arthur, and since then the Food Board have passed an order prohibiting the shipment of bran and shorts from the West to the East. The result is that at a time when the farmer is being urged to increase production and to raise cattle, he is unable to do so because he cannot get bran and shorts for feed. I think the shipment of bran and shorts should not have been prohibited by Order in Council or in any other way. I know the farmers of Western Ontario are suffering very greatly on account of being unable to get bran and shorts for feed for their cattle, and how in the world the Government can expect the farmers to raise more cattle, without the means of feeding them, I do not know. That is another way in which our farmers are being treated unfairly by this Government.

Before dealing with the Budget proposals, there is one other matter I shall mention. This Government was elected—that was their claim, anyway—so to guide the destinies of this country that the war might be won. Its platform, as I understood it, was equality of sacrifice in the conscription of men, and equality of sacrifice in the conscription of wealth, as far as that was possible. It was to be a 50-50 proposition; not one of those 50-50 propositions such as the Cabinet amounts to, which is in reality on a 75-25 basis, but a real 50-50 proposition. The men who could fight were to be taken, and the men of wealth were to be made to contribute to the exchequer of this country in order to carry on the war. The Government gave another pledge, and that was that men who were necessary to production on the farms should be exempted. Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, I do not think the Government has kept these pledges. It has not kept its pledge to the farmers in regard to exemption where necessary for agricultural production. It has not kept its pledge to the common people, that men of great wealth shall sacrifice their wealth for the common cause. The Government claim that military exigencies compel them to depart from their pledge of exemption to the farmers. But a pledge is a pledge, and it should be kept. Germany gave the same excuse when she invaded Belgium; she said that military exigencies made it necessary to invade Belgium, and she must hack her way through. I appeal to this Government to keep their pledge to the agriculturists of this country in so far as is necessary to provide that our boys at the front and our Allies shall be fed.

No person can doubt the importance of that. Australia is so far away and shipping is so scarce that, although there is any quantity of produce, it cannot be brought to England. We must be the bread basket of the army and anything this Government does to reduce production is going to have a very detrimental effect on the winning of the war. Did the Government make this pledge to the people, and especially the farmers, of this country?

We know what took place in Western Ontario. There are men sitting in this House who would not be sitting here if certain promises had not been made to the farmers, and there are men out of this House who would have been here, and who deserve to be here, if these promises had not been made. I know as a matter of fact that one Oliver Hazelwood, a so-styled captain, I think, sat down in the Tecumseh House at London and sent everywhere throughout the country thousands of telegrams stating that the farmers would be exempted. I know that the agricultural representative of this Government did the same thing. I saw telegrams and letters sent all through the country stating that farmers would be exempted

and these were submitted to the exemption tribunals as evidence in support of claims for exemption. It would be interesting to know who paid for these telegrams. I find in the accounts of last fiscal year, up to the thirty-first March, an item of $437,000 for cablegrams, telegrams, etc. I would ask the Acting Minister of Finance (Hon. A. K. Maclean) if he could tell me whether, in the accounts for the year ended March 31, 1918, items will appear that will show that the Government paid for these telegrams that were sent out by Oliver Hazelwood to the farmers of this country for the purpose of winning the election, or any other purpose whatever. Were the people of this country paying the election expenses of the Union Government? I would like to ask another question in regard to telegrams. The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) pointed out how extravagant this Government was in regard to some things. I know that to be true, and I would therefore like to know, as a matter of fact, who paid for these telegrams. It has been stated that when a ship was about leaving with fifteen hundred invalided soldiers the officer in command would say to each of the boys: "Would you like to send word to your people at home that you are about to sail for Canada?" They would say: "Certainly, we would like to send home to our people that we are coming."

Therefore a cablegram would be sent in the name of each man and at the end of the cablegram the person sending it would put these words: "Be sure to vote for Union Government." I would like to know if that officer did that under instructions from the agents of this Government across the sea, I would like to know who paid for these cablegrams and I would also like to know if the people of Canada paid the election expenses of the Union Government in 1917.

I want to point out to the House and to the Acting Minister of Finance that this Government is losing the confidence of the people because it has made pledges to them that it has not kept. This Government made a pledge to the farmers in my neighbourhood who were depositors in the Farmers' Bank which they have never kept. Although they can give $25,000,000, or $45,000,000 to Mackenzie and Mann, and that class of people, they cannot give $1,250,000 to the depositors of the Farmers' Bank although they pledged themselves to do it. The Prime Minister himself pledged the Government to do it.

The hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) not very long ago, four or five years ago, but long enough ago to enable him to implement the promise, said that he was going to start in this country a system of rural credits. It is true that the war intervened and that it would be rather hard to do so but there could be no greater boon to the country than a system of rural credits all over Canada. Yet, that promise has not been implemented.

The last promise and pledge made for the purpose of winning the election in 1917, that men actually engaged in farm labour bona fide, and whose farms cannot be run without their work, would be exempted, has also been broken. This Government is losing the confidence of the people by these various breaches of faith. Somebody has said that you are commercializing——

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Christianity.

Mr. ROSS: —that you are commercializing religious virtues or pretended virtues, but it would seem to me that both Christianity and humanized statesmanship demand that you should keep your pledges. A pledge is a pledge and this Government should adhere to it to the letter. What is going to be the result? We are needing large sums of money to carry on this war. The hon. the Acting Minister of Finance says: "We would have to borrow $280,000,000 to carry on the war. We will have to get it from the people of the country because there is no other place we can get it; we cannot sell our securities in the United States; we cannot get the money from Great Britain but we have to go to the plain people of Canada and get $280,000,000 to run this country and carry on this war. The minister will get some from the banks but in the end he will have to go to the people in the small towns and villages and on the farms and ask them to loan the Government $280,000,000. The Acting Minister of Finance is going to have some trouble to convince the farming people of this country, and the people in the towns and villages, that this Government can be trusted with $280,000,000 to carry on this war after these various breaches of faith. I would not preach that doctrine among them because I want to see them give their money and I know they cannot get any better security, but what I have mentioned is going to have a very bad effect on the next loan that the acting minister has to float. There is going to be an absence of confidence and of faith. There is only

one way this Government can get back into such a position that their war-like operations, in so far as loans are concerned can be successful—They have got to restore their pledge, wherever the breaking of that pledge is going to hurt production; they have got to say that the only son of a widow shall not have to go to war; they have got to say that a man who is on a farm, and the sole proprietor in his own name of one hundred acres, and who is doing the work on that farm, shall not be taken away so that the work on that farm will cease to be carried on, when he is between the age of twenty and twenty-two; they have got to say that the man between twenty and twenty-two, who, while not the sole proprietor of the farm which he occupies, is the only help of his crippled and aged father, shall be left to carry on production. It is only in this way that the present Government can posibly hope to regain the confidence of the Canadian people which they have lost in such a marked degree during the last four or five days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us return to the question of equality of sacrifice, and to what I was speaking about in connection with the sacrifice of wealth. My contention is this: You are asking that the only son on the farm shall be taken away, and you are asking that the son of a widow shall be taken away, although the old Militia Act, severe and all as it was, did not contain any such requirement. You are asking that every boy between the ages of twenty and twenty-two shall be taken from the farms and placed in military service, except during seeding, which is in actual operation at the present time. Now, what sacrifice is this? A mother gives up her son, a father gives up a son, a sister gives up her brother. These young men risk their lives, they risk their limbs and they risk their liberty. You compel them by force to undergo that risk, you compel them to fight for Canada. My contention is that you should try, as far as you can, to equalize that sacrifice by, in the case of the wealthy man, extracting from him sufficient of his income to make him feel it. From my point of view the Income Tax which has been introduced by the Acting Finance Minister does not do that at all, or does not approach doing it. It will have to be increased very much indeed in order to do that. What do we find? We find that a man who has an income of $3,000, under the new Income Tax pays $20; the man who has an income of $6,000 pays $140; the man who has an income of $10,000 pays $392; the man who has an income of $20,000 pays $1,382; the man who has an income of $75,000 pays $11,000. My contention is that the sacrifice does not consist in the amount that a man pays when he has more than an abundance left him. What sacrifice is there in a man who has an income of $10,000 paying $392 compared with the sacrifice of a widow who is giving up her only son, her sole means of support? What comparison is there between that sacrifice and the sacrifice of a father who is giving up a son? I maintain that the Income Tax introduced by the Acting Minister of Finance should be very much more drastic, and I agree with the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) in that regard. I would say that the taxation should start at $3,000 income and that the taxes provided for in the schedule should be doubled.

I would like to go further—although this may not seem practicable, but I think it is because you have already adopted the principle with regard to man service by providing that if a family has already a son at the front who has been disabled or killed the remaining son shall be exempt. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of a family having no sons at the front the income tax which that family pays, where it is over $3,000, should be double the amount which is paid by a family who has a son at the front. You may say: Maybe there is no son in that family. Very well, my reply is, there are daughters who are being protected by the sons of other men and women that are being sent to the front, and that protection should be paid for. If the head of that family cannot fight he should be willing to pay for the protection of his wife and his daughters. The principle which the Government have embodied in their resolution with respect to service at the front, I wish to see carried out with respect to the Income Tax. It is not a hard principle to put into force, it is not impracticable when you consider it, because when the Government are finding out, in connection with the requirements of the Military Service Act, whether a man has a son at the front or not, the same information can be utilized in connection with Income Tax if the departments are co-ordinated. In that way there is no difficulty about the matter whatever.

There is another point I wish to allude to: I believe this Government are borrowing too much and not imposing sufficient taxes on the people at the present time to provide for the expenditure. What are

my reasons for saying that? We have in this country wealthy men who are making money out of munitions, out of food, out of bacon, out of shoes, and out of gasoline; people are making millions and millions of dollars out of all these things, and instead of increasing the taxes which these men pay we are borrowing millions and millions of dollars. What does that mean? It simply means that posterity is going to pay this debt that is being incurred. It simply means that when the 400,000 men or thereabouts, that are fighting our battles at the present time and doing their duty, return to Canada, after having fought and bled for us, they will be required to pay taxes which they should not pay at all. It seems to me that those of us at home, who have not gone to the front, should bear our share of the burden to a greater degree, and that more money should be raised by taxation, as is done in England, and that there should be less money borrowed.

These are some suggestions in regard to the Budget, but there is one further suggestion and I make it with some hesitation. I doubt whether it will be acceptable to the people, but at the same time I think it is right. The first principle of good taxation is to make those pay who can pay. Another principle is to tax luxuries. A tax of ten per cent has been placed on automobiles. That is all right as far as it goes, but the Government seems to lean towards loans rather than taxation. It would seem as though it were easier for them to raise money by loans than to raise money by taxation at the present time. But that is not the point. What we should consider is, what is the best method of financing. I contend that raising money by taxation, to largely finance the war, as they are doing in England, is the best method to pursue. There is another thing the Government should consider: They are talking about taxing luxuries but so far they have not done so. They have gone after the poor man. They want him to pay eight cents more on his pack of cards; they have already taxed his entrance to the moving picture shows, and now they are going to tax the films; they have put a tax on tobacco, and they have taxed tea and coffee. They have taxed all these things affecting the table, or the comfort, of the poor man. But what are the Government going to do with the gentleman who rides down the street in a sixty horse power Packard or Wolseley, or some other type of car, clothes himself in purple and fine linen, and dines sumptuously every day? You are not touching his income to any extent. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that at this time no man in this democratic country should be allowed to have an income of over $50,000 a year.

An hon. MEMBER: Less than that.

Mr. ROSS: That is enough for any man in these days of stress and strain. You say to the man who is going to buy a motor car: "You have to pay 10 per cent on the price of that car.' If a car costs $1,500, there is a tax of $150 and the buyer consequently puts his price at $1,650. That is a pretty large tax. If that car is bought after the 30th April, that is the tax that must be paid. What happens in the case of a man who buys a car before the 30th April? Is he not just as much entitled to pay for his luxury as the man who chances to buy a car after the 30th April? Should not the first man's luxury be taxed just as much as the others? It seems to me that is the logical and only fair way. A man buys a car on the 15th April, and the tax has raised the price after the 30th April from $1,500 to $1,650. Instead of being fined, that man is made more wealthy, he can sell his car and make perhaps $75 on the sale. He is not hurt by the tax one bit. A very just method in this country would be to impose a small tax, a very small tax, on the poor man's car, say a twenty horse-power car, and as the horse-power increases an increasing tax should be imposed. That is what is done in England. A man pays so much for the license of a small car, and as the horse-power increases the license fee is increased. I would say that on a car of twenty horse-power in our country there should be almost a nominal fee. This would not hurt any person very much, because the license fee, at least in the province of Ontario, is paid to the province, and the money is used by the Provincial Government to provide roads in the counties from which these taxes come. If there is to be a war tax on luxuries, it seems to me that would be a proper tax for the Minister of Finance to consider.

I may say, in closing, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing which the Minister of Finance and the Government might do, which would almost reconcile the people who use cars to the imposition of a tax such as I have suggested. The Government will have to come to it before long as they did in England and the United States. My suggestion is to regulate the prices of foodstuffs and other necessities used in the daily life of the people. The Government

must come to it sooner or later. They should bestir themselves to look into the gasolene question, for instance, and to investigate under the Combines Act or the Enquiries Act, exorbitant prices charged by those who sell gasolene. Such action would meet with the commendation of the whole people. Gasolene is a necessity to-day. It is used on every farm in Ontario, either for a gasolene engine to cut silage or straw or feed, to pump water or drive a tractor. It is a necessity, we all know that. The Minister of Labour knows that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The farmer uses it to milk his cows.

Mr. ROSS: Yes, in some cases. What are the facts? We know there is practically but one company selling gasolene. We know the price the people pay in Canada is much in excess of what the consumers in the United States pay. There is practically no duty on gasolene except the 7½ per cent war tax. I submit that it should be the duty of the Minister of Labour to look into this question which seriously affects the people of this country, and, as was done in the United States a few years ago, have a commission issue to inquire into what profits are being made by the companies, and whether they are just and fair. It is common knowledge that the stock of these gasolene companies is quoted at 400 per cent, and that they are cutting melons all the time. It is common knowledge that they have increased their capitalization by $150,000,000. And it does not matter who is the president of these companies, whether a friend of the Government or not, it is the duty of the Government to protect the people. Four or five years ago I wrote a letter to the Minister of Labour in regard to this subject. At that time, this matter was troubling the people of the United States; prices there had become excessive. The price here was far more excessive than it was there. The reply of the minister was such as we usually get from him across the floor of the House; the reply of the Minister of Labour was a copy of the Combines Investigation Act. I think I know that Act as well as he does. Just as we often get a smile from him across the floor in answer to our questions, his reply in that case was equally useful. We have a War Measures Act, and the Government and the Minister of Labour are free to act. I think the Government would do well to look into the Department of Labour. I think the Government would do well to look now into the Department of Labour and give it a shaking up. Probably if the Minister of Labour could be relieved of his duties, and a man who has given faithful service to the country, like Mr. O'Connor, placed in his stead, we would have a far better administration of the affairs of that department. I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman is just quite big enough for the job. I may be wronging him, but I believe that is the impression among the people all over the country, and it certainly is the opinion of the press.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the Government press.

Mr. ROSS: The Government press at that. We have great problems before us. We have 220,000 labouring men at the front fighting for us, who are coming back to this country to help reconstruct it and build it up. I submit that if there is one department of the Government which should be strong, and able to meet the needs of the workers, it is the Department of Labour. It not only has to deal with the labouring man himself, but with his food and necessities. I therefore submit, in all kindliness, to the Government that one of the most useful things they could do, just as soon as this House prorogues, or sooner, is to look carefully into the Department of Labour and see that men are not dismissed at the whim of a mere young girl in the department, and that affairs are run in the best interests of the country.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, since this war began I have not been in the habit of criticising the actions of the Government. When the question of conscription was before the House last session, I gave my views upon that subject, and I have left the operation of the Military Service Act to the Government, and have tried to do my little share towards the winning of the war as I best saw fit. This afternoon I do not intend to criticise the Government. I will not even be as harsh as the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who invited the Minister of Labour, Mr. Crothers, to resign his portfolio. As to that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the minister's own judgment, if he has judgment, should prompt the action. If he has not judgment, then his personal pride, after the manner in which the newspapers of the government of which he is a member have been speaking of him, should tempt him, at least, to preserve his self-respect. If neither of these can affect him, then I leave his case to my hon. friend the

Prime Minister to deal with as he best sees fit.

The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) said in the course of his remarks that there were four things absolutely necessary to be done if we wanted to win the war. The first is food, the second, wealth; the third, inspiration; the fourth, men. Of wealth and inspiration I will not make mention to-day; I shall deal only with the questions respecting food and men.

I have listened to the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) for several years in this House, and I have read the speeches he has delivered out of the House. His addresses are inspiring, and the remarks which he made this afternoon are no exception. Just what caused him to accept the Prime Minister's invitation to resign has always been somewhat of a mystery to me, but I have no doubt that if he continues to give such lectures on inspiration as he gave us this afternoon, when he made certain references to the Minister of Finance, perhaps we will, through inspiration, some day ascertain the cause of the course which he took on that occasion.

I wish first to bring to the attention of the House—as seriously, I hope, as it has been brought to the attention of the country by those in authority to speak—the absorbing question of food production. We have had messages from our own Government, from France, from Italy, from England, that food, and still more food, is necessary. It seems to me that at this moment the question of men is secondary to the question of food. It is time for the Government to consider how many men they can send overseas next year, the year after, and perhaps the year after that—because he is a great prophet who can foretell when this war will end. The Government should consider the matter seriously, rather than act upon sentiment, because they will be held strictly to account by public opinion in this country, in Great Britain and in all the allied countries, if they fail in what they have set out to attain—and they most certainly will fail if they proceed as extravagantly as they have proceeded thus far. Does the Government know how many men are at present available for service overseas? I challenge them to tell me how many men are available, having due regard to the number necessary for food production.

I wish to give a few figures which I have taken from the Canada Year Book of 1916-17, and from other sources. I approach this question from the point of view not of what England is or may be able to do, but of what Canada is able to do and must do. The population of England, according to the last census, 1911, was 36,000,000 in round figures. One month before the war the population of the United Kingdom was estimated at 46,098,249. These people are on a small island, and are doing what they can to meet the need for men at the front and for food production. Steps have been taken there to push food production to the limit, while our Government has been inactive in that respect.

The population of Canada, according to the last census, was something over 7,000,000. I will not tire the House by giving the odd figures. The school population was 1,226,000. In 1913 over 400,000 immigrants came to this country; in 1916, 48,000, and in 1917-18, 68,000, the latter coming almost entirely from the United States and Great Britain. It is safe to say, therefore, that we have lost an average immigration of 350,000, which would leave the population of the country at 5,628,000. Then, 511,000 men are over 60 years of age, 500,000 are cripples and invalids, and 2,358,000 are females. If we deduct these figures, we have a remaining male population of 2,258,000. The rural population is about one-half of the total, and the alien population, according to the last census, was 212,000. The total male population of Canada between the ages of 18 and 45, including aliens, cripples and invalids, is 1,720,000; 717,000 people are employed in agricultural work. What was our population able to do for Great Britain immediately before the war? I commend this to the very serious attention of the members of the House. We were able to send to Great Britain $63,000,000 worth of grain, $5,839,000 worth of meat, and $30,000,000 worth of dairy products, a total of $99,365,0000. The Government say they are obliged to take young men from the farms for military service. Remember that that means taking men from a population of 1,720,000—and I am not taking into account men who have already enlisted and have gone overseas. I am not taking into account the men who may be in other parts of the Empire rendering service; I am simply taking into account what the male population of this country was in 1911, and I am giving the figures of the agriculturalists of this country, and of what they could produce. That production is infinitesimally small to-day for Great Britain; that production is practically nothing for the Allies, and the Government has realized that by calling upon the people of this country to produce and

produce more. As late as April 10, Lord Rhondda sent to the Canada Food Board at Ottawa a cable message in which he made this statement:

> The Canadian farmer and Canadian farmhand now have the opportunity to make an effective reply to the enemy's present onslaught, by bending their undivided energies to the increased production of those food supplies, for which we depend to such vital extent upon your great Dominion.

We are being constantly asked by the Government and by the Allies to develop our land, not only to work the land at present developed, but to develop at present undeveloped land. This is not a small country. We have still 1,000,000 square miles of undeveloped territory, a great deal of which would at the present moment be fit for cultivation. But you absolutely require men to cultivate it. We have a great deal of agricultural land now under cultivation, and what is the cry that we hear from all sides. It is not the cry of the man who is not willing to do his utmost towards the winning of the war, but the cry of the farmer throughout the land, of the man who has contributed towards the winning of the war more than any other class of men in this country, and he says: It is impossible for me to go on producing unless you give me men and more men. The Government answers that cry by saying: We will not give you the men; we will take from your farms the men who are necessary for production. Then the farmer says to the Government: Will you at least give me an opportunity to bring in my agricultural implements free of duty? Will you at least give me a chance to replace the farm hand by machinery? What is the answer of the Government? We will take your men, and we will not give you any aid in bringing agricultural implements into this country. These are not idle words. These are the words that have been uttered by the ministers to delegations coming to Ottawa. Last week it was a delegation from Ontario of three hundred men. We are told by to-day's papers that next week there will come to Ottawa a delegation of 2,000 men from Ontario, all with one cry. If you take our sons off the farms, how are we going to work the farms?

It is common sense, it seems to me, and the Government ought to be able to realize it, that if you take the farm help from the farms you cannot produce. What are the cries for more production? I do not want to weary the House by reading more than is necessary but I have been following this question, as I am sure every hon. gentleman in this House has been doing, ever since the war began, and I find that from the very beginning of the war the cry has been: It is useless to send soldiers unless you can feed them; send us men, it is true, but send us food. The two essentials come concurrently even at the most hysterical moment for the Government. Away back in January of this year, I find that Mr. W. J. Black, Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture, said:

> The active assistance of the people now living in the towns and cities of Canada who have had farming experience will have to be secured to carry on farm work during the coming summer if this country is to do its duty in food production.

Mark well, there was not then the question of taking away the farmers' sons, and the Commissioner of Agriculture makes the statement as far back as January that even the townspeople will have to come back to the farms if we are to go on producing. Why do I say that it was not then a question of taking the farmers' sons? The people had before them this statement in big headlines in all the papers throughout the country:

> Exemption of farmers.
>
> General Mewburn, Minister of Militia, has issued the following statement from the Government. All farmers coming within class A called out for military service under the provisions of the Military Service Act, who are actually employed on the farms for the production of foodstuffs for Canada and her Allies and whose services are necessary for the work of the farm, will be exempted from military service. If their claim for exemption is not allowed by a tribunal, an immediate appeal should be made.

I want my hon. friends opposite to listen to those words coming from the Minister of Militia of this country:

> If their claim for exemption is not allowed by a tribunal, an immediate appeal should be made.

Yet we hear in certain parts of this country as respects certain other parts of the country that too many appeals have been made. Why, they were made at the request of the Minister of Militia. The statement goes on:

> Arrangements are being made to extend the time for such appeals.

The statement goes on to say:

> If a farmer so called out for military service, who is now engaged in the production of foodstuffs, should be drafted into the army, General Mewburn feels it will be his duty to relieve him from military service on the condition that he returns to the farm and continues to be so employed.

I am quoting from a Government organ, published and distributed in the county which I represent. There were sundry other statements. My eye falls upon this one:

If you want the boys of the First Contingent to get a furlough of three months soon, vote for Union Government that is making preparation to send overseas 20,000 men by the new year.

And there are certain other things that I do not wish to read because there is now in this House and in this country a spirit which will, I hope, tend to the betterment of conditions respecting the different races in Canada. I shall, therefore, not read more of the Union campaign literature that was distributed in my county. I wish, Sir, to go on with the argument I am making. There were published by the Union Government certain circulars. I hold in my hand one dated March 18, just last month, where the Government of Ontario is telling the people:

To-day the shadow of hunger, famine, disease and death hangs over the Allies.

I am not saying anything, nor do I want to convey outside of the confines of my own country any of the conditions which might not be optimistic, which exist in this country. I am simply quoting what the Government of the country have been bringing before the people of Canada. This circular goes on to say:

Upon the 1918 crop from Canada and the United States depends the fate of the democratic peoples of the world.

That is pretty strong language. It goes on:

If that crop is sufficient the Allies can be fed. If that crop is not sufficient the Allies may have to accept a German peace. At all costs production must be maintained. That is why farmers and farmers' sons are being exempted from military service. Working on a farm is equivalent to service in the second line trenches.

I quote this, not to make an argument in favour of the Opposition as against the Government, but because I believe it is the imperative duty of the Government in the present crisis to follow the advice which they have given throughout the length and breadth of this land.

I have said that the Government, instead of aiding the agricultural classes to increase production, have been placing taxes upon the machinery bought by the farmers. They have been taking the boys from the farms contrary to any requests from England, because England never made a request that these lads should be taken off the land. Why, England is placing her young men on the farm and is actively engaged, as I shall show in a minute, in producing as much as her soil is capable of. France is doing likewise; she has taken men out of the army and put them on the soil. So the Government cannot tell me they have received any message from overseas that they must cease farm production in order that the farmers' sons may go to fight.

The Government has refused to take off the duty on agricultural implements. A short time ago the Hon. A. L. Sifton, Minister of Customs in this Government, published a statement pointing out that during the past fiscal year agricultural implements in this country paid import duties aggregating $2,120,000, divided as follows: Separators, $353,000; parts of separators, $124,000; tractors, $896,000; binders, $89,000; ploughs, $373,000; other farm machinery and parts, $260,000. May I not ask, if we are to produce and produce more, why cannot the Government forsake a few men in this country, a paltry dozen perhaps, who happen to be interested in keeping up the price of agricultural implements? Let them listen to the appeal of the farmers throughout Canada, and to the appeals made by France, and to the appeals made by England and all the Allies, and take off the duties even if they do it only as a war measure. They have power to do this under the War Measures Act. Let them do it as a war measure, then; let them follow the example of England.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to point out to the Government that they had failed in taking sufficient means to find out how many men we had in this country who might be available to fill up the ranks at the front. The second point I had attempted to make was that there was an urgent need for increased production and that the Government had not taken any steps to meet in an efficient manner the demand for food. I had said that there was a cry from the farmers from one end of Canada to the other for a reduction in the Customs duties upon agricultural implements. To that cry the Government has so far turned a deaf ear.

With regard to the taking of measures to find out just how many more men were available, if this war is to continue beyond the present moment, the Government have done absolutely nothing. It is true that the Government have informed us that in the month of June next they will begin to make a registration of the man and woman power of this country. Here I would like to interject the remark that the women of Canada, since the beginning of the war, have taken a noble part. To the women of Canada is due all the conservation of food that has taken place. The women of Canada have been active in helping the Allies in every way possible. They have not sought any one point upon the battle field, but they have extended a helping hand, by way of the Red Cross, by way of contributions to the soldiers' comforts, by way of contributions to the Patriotic fund, by way of every possible contribution to the soldiers at all points on the battle front, and they have only asked that the soldiers for whom they have been working shall be soldiers who are fighting the battle for liberty, freedom and higher civilization.

With regard to the need for food production, we have statements from different authorities. For instance, we have Lord Rhondda, who, up to a few days ago, was food controller for Great Britain, writing:

> The Allied larder is dangerously empty, but we are carrying on in a resolute belief that we can rely on the people of North America to prevent our food supplies from becoming so diminished as to imperil the issue for which we are all fighting.

We have a statement from Sir William Goode, Secretary of the British Ministry of Food, to the following effect:

> Few people have yet grasped the fundamental fact that Great Britain still relies on the United States and Canada for 65% of her essential food stuffs. Unless we can get this food, or nearly all of it, we shall peter out.

Dr. J. W. Robertson, chairman of the Advisory Council of the Canada Food Board, says:

> Unless we can get more food now, we shall go under, and 1,000,000 people will starve. This is my conviction, and I know as much about the situation, perhaps, as any one.

The Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) said:

> I cannot emphasize too strongly the absolutely urgent necessity for increased food production. The issue of the war may depend on the quantity of the food produced in Canada and the United States.

Mr. Herbert Hoover, the United States Food Administrator, says:

> The cereal exports to the Allies from this continent are 45,000,000 bush. short of the amounts promised, while most exports are also very far behind the quantities which it had been planned to send, and upon which the Allies were counting.

We have other statements from prominent men but I do not want to take up the time of the House in quoting them. I would like to point out to the Government that in Western Canada the farmers, whose co-operation in such matters naturally the Government would ask, drew up a platform wherein is to be found a resolution reading as follows:

> And whereas agriculture—the basic industry upon which the success of all other industries primarily depends—is almost stagnant throughout Canada as shown by the declining rural population in both eastern and western Canada, due largely to the greatly increased cost of agricultural implements and machinery, clothing, boots and shoes, building material and practically everything the farmer has to buy, caused by the Protective Tariff, so that it is becoming impossible for farmers generally to carry on farming operations profitably;
>
> Therefore be it resolved, that the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911, which still remains on the United States statutes books, be accepted by the parliament of Canada.

I may say, in justice to the Government, that that reciprocity agreement, in many points, has been adopted by them, and instead now of crying out: No truck or trade with the Yankees, the Government go so far as to try to be financed by the United States, and are at the present moment, if the report be correct, on a begging mission to the United States for some of Great Britain's credit. The farmers' platform continues:

> That all foodstuff not included in the Reciprocity Agreement be placed on the free list.
>
> That agricultural implements, farm machinery, vehicles, fertilizer, coal, lumber, cement, illuminating, fuel and lubricating oils be placed upon the free list.
>
> That the customs tariff on all the necessaries of life be materially reduced.
>
> That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.

On that platform the Government say that they will take no action. However, to complete the case, that I undertook to make out this afternoon, I want to quote from a report of the former Food Controller, the Hon. W. J. Hanna, published on January 14, 1918.

> What I endeavoured to make plain, was that there was something even more important than reducing the cost of living in Canada, though that was one objective. What that supreme consideration was is the winning of the war, and the requirements for that purpose are summed up in a statement made by me;

"Far greater than the necessity of production for home supply is that for the supply of Great Britain and her Allies.

Great Britain is producing more of food stuffs than for many years, but the supply is, of course, wholly inadequate for her population and her armies.

Belgium is practically all in the hands of Germany, so also is a considerable portion of France, Serbia, Roumania and Russian Poland, and now a portion of Italy are in the hands of the enemy.

The productive power of our Allies is lessened by the number of inhabitants in arms.

The situation in France and Italy from a food point of view is serious, and that is what makes the demand in Canada and the United States for conservation of resources and increased production so imperative. To feed the Allies is the paramount duty of North America. It is far greater than the necessity of production for home supply or the cost of living. Unless the war is won nothing matters.

Now, Sir, among our own papers at home we have Government organs giving their views upon the subject, and I shall not quote from any Grit press. I take it, for instance, that The Citizen of Ottawa is a Government organ, and in an editorial in that paper I find these words:

The Canada Food Board is getting down to essentials. Mr. Charles A. Dunning, Director of Food Production, is reported to have recommended to the Federal Government that the customs tax against agricultural implements should be taken off. It has long been one of the absurdities of the Canadian fiscal system that while the farmers are urged to increase their productive efforts, they are taxed heavily when they invest in the farm implements that are absolutely necessary for production.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have sufficiently made plain that the Allied countries are calling upon us for increased food production. I hope, also, that I have made plain to this House the absolute necessity that lies upon every man in this country to increase, and to go on increasing, production. Have I made plain that we cannot go on producing more and still more food, helping to feed the Allied countries, helping to feed the soldiers who are upon the battlefields of Europe, fighting the fight of liberty —if we continue conscripting labour from the farms without providing adequate help to take the place of those young men? I do not say this in any carping spirit, or with the slightest idea of attacking the Government. I am quite ready to give the Government credit for everything they have done, but I want to point out that when the Government received a mandate from the people to perform their part in the winning of this war they assumed the gravest responsibility that has ever devolved upon any Government in the world. It becomes the imperative duty of the Prime Minister, of his colleagues, and of every man in this House, to contribute towards the carrying on of a programme that is essential towards the winning of the war. For that reason, and for that reason alone, I have tried to bring before the House the fact that we must produce more, that we must bend and bow to this cry that comes from abroad for more food and still more food. There is something worse than being killed upon the battlefield, there is something far more painful. There is the fact that the soldiers at the front may be starving, and I say it with all the feeling that can animate me, that the Government will not fulfil its duty towards the boys in the trenches, and will not fulfil its duty towards the Empire, if they do not exercise every effort, and do not assume all the power that may be necessary to see that we produce more and still more food.

What have the Government done towards increasing production in this country? Have they done anything? Yes, I shall be answered, they have issued a few pamphlets, in this form or some other form, telling the people of Canada that they should not put sugar icing between their cakes, and should see that their garbage is not wasted. Is that what is going to save the Allies? What direct or efficient action have the Government taken up to the present moment in aiding the farmers of this country to achieve the desired results? Canada has not done anything, and if my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) were here, I would point to him and say, "Now is the time to take a leaf out of the history of England and follow what England is doing; now is the time to take a leaf out of the history of France and follow the example of France." Here is what England is doing for increased production: The English Government did not content itself with issuing pamphlets, but it formed a general agricultural committee and sub-executive committees.

These sub-committees,—

and I am quoting from the Labour Gazette of this Government—

—consist of from four to seven members experienced in agriculture, who are expected to meet weekly or at least fortnightly. They report to the county committee any land which is not producing its full quota of food and suggest the necessary action. They also report on the labour shortage, and assist farmers to obtain seed and manures, and the use of horses and implements. In short the business of the sub-committee is to help the farmers in every possible way.

That is what England is doing. What is Canada doing for the farmers? I said it was well to take a leaf out of the history of France at the present moment. Turning to The Economist of March 30, 1918, I find this:

> Elaborate measures have been proposed by M. Boret, Minister of Agriculture and Supplies, with the view of intensifying agricultural development. The first of three Bills introduced refers to special cultivation of land that has been abandoned. The ordinary tillers of the land may lack necessary means for cultivation, and in this case a communal committee will assist them, or arrange for some one better placed to render assistance for cultivating the land. In the event of disagreement, the committee is to be given rights to deal with the land as they think best. In the event of the ordinary cultivator having disappeared, and the land being unoccupied, and the communal committee not being able to settle the situation, the Bill arranges for the direct collaboration of the State. There are penalties both in the way of fines and imprisonment in the event of deliberate persistent obstruction. The second Bill aims at facilitating the acquisition of mechanical tractors by agriculturists themselves and by the motor culture agents. It proposes the alteration of the existing law so as to enable small units or individuals to be given grants not to exceed half the total value of their purchases for the object of buying mechanical tractors. Further, it is arranged that the Minister of Agriculture shall have special facilities for the purpose of such machinery, and will be authorized to lend it out to those able to make good use of it. Lastly, the third Bill provides for the civil mobilization of men between the ages of 15 and 50 resident in France, whether of French, Allied, or neutral nationality. Lists of persons between these ages are to be drawn up, but students and men following useful professions and men unsuitable for agricultural work are to be excluded from the lists.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Government to show them the right way to take action to increase agricultural production. I am not blaming them for not having done it up to the present; I am not saying that they should have done it. I believe, Sir, that they should have done it. I believe it is impossible for any hon. gentleman, even the most humble of the Cabinet, to plead ignorance, because this action on the part of England has been in the Government publications for months past. Unless the Government do not read their own publications they cannot plead ignorance. Let us for a moment forget to copy the United States of America in everything. In the United States there are some good things, but there are many superficial things. I have always believed the judgment of Canadians to be sounder than that of the average American, and our form of Government to be better. If the Government will only awake to the fact that we are at war, if they will only try to do something effective, I believe that their combined judgment is at least as good as the individual judgment of any state legislature in the United States. With this matter before them now they should take some action, or else stop preaching increased production. They ought at least, in charity to the Canadian farmers and to the people of Canada, send this message to England: We have failed; we are unable to carry out your wishes; we are unable to keep up with the situation that faces us. That would be a charitable message to send; because we are at a critical moment of the war, and if the Government is unable to cope with the situation it should resign. If my right. hon. friend the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) cannot face the situation with any element of success, let him resign, and let His Excellency the Governor General call upon some other Canadian, seated upon the treasury benches perhaps, or some man who had not yet been tried and who sits behind the Government, to form a new Government, and see what action he can take to cope with the present situation. In an army, if a general does not succeed he is immediately set aside; if his successor does not succeed, he also is set aside. We have seen it right here in this country. We have seen General Hughes take up a question at a moment when it was difficult to handle and do certain things, and if any one on this side of the House undertook to criticise General Hughes the Prime Minister at once got up and said: "Hands off the General." Then other members sitting behind the Government benches got up in turn, saying "Hands off the General; he is doing wonders." And there the poor General sits leading his lonely life to-day, but still charitable enough to tell the Government wherein, in his judgment, they have failed, and wherein are their weaknesses. He does not try to make any great storm about what he did, or even to tell the people what he would do if he were minister again. He contents himself with saying that the Minister of Finance has wasted the money of the country this way and that way through war bonds—Victory Loans—in different other ways, and he does not say it in a critical spirit, he does not want to attack the Minister of Finance, he is too loyal a man to do that; he simply wants to do it in a kindly spirit in order that the successor of the Minister of Finance may not fall into the faults into which the present minister fell.

I have concluded what I have to say. I believe that the Government ought to be in a position to tell the great delegation of two thousand people from Ontario who will interview it next week just what they propose to do. The country is tired of the old argument used by the Government that they are going to take a registration of man and woman power next June. When June comes along they will all be off to the seaside. The people will not be content with that. A registration of man power has already been taken in this country. And registration of woman power—the idea! I ask any hon. gentleman on the opposite side: Do you mean to tell me seriously that any young girl in this country who has never been trained to work upon a farm can get out and do the work that the young men on the farms are doing to-day? Do you mean to tell me that the Government will undertake to ask your daughter, Sir, or the daughters of hon. gentlemen in this House, to leave their homes and place them out on the farms throughout the country? Do you think they will do that? Will any minister of the Government get up and say that he will send his daughter out to work upon a farm away from home? I do not think that that is going to be very practical. I believe that the women are willing to do the best they can; I know they are doing the most they can; but they will never aid in increasing production to the extent that Great Britain and the Allies are asking to-day. The Prime Minister asks us to have pity upon the Government. We are ready to have pity upon the Government. We will aid the Government in everything they do tending towards the winning of the war. But let me put it to hon. gentlemen seated opposite, and especially to those who came into the House as Liberals supporting the Union Government: Is it to be expected that gentlemen seated upon this side of the House must do absolutely nothing but vote tremendous sums of money for any purpose towards the winning of the war, when they have in their possession returns such as were brought down respecting the Order in Council recently passed providing for a staff and salaries in the Food Controller's office? In turning over the pages we find that hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent in salaries; we find that people are taken from the Toronto Evening Telegram and from the Famous Players Film Service and given salaries of $3,500, and that men from the Toronto Daily News receive appointments at $4,000. We find men taken from the T. Eaton Co. appointed at salaries of $2,000 and $2,600. And such entries appear on page after page of the return. Is it to be expected that the Opposition must simply vote sums of money and not criticise the Government? Sir, I could go on turning these pages over to the end of the evening's sitting, and show where thousands of dollars are being wasted.

We shall not occupy the time of the House in criticism of every detail; but can you ask us to support every one of these measures? We are willing to assist in all measures necessary to the winning of the war. I think I speak for every hon. gentleman on this side of the House when I say that we will give our general aid; that we will do everything we can with a view to seeing that Canada does her full share and that she comes out of the war with honour —for when peace comes we wish it to be said of us that we acted according to our best judgment.

We have been condemned on account of the Naval Policy of the Laurier Government—a policy adopted to-day by the Union Government; condemned because we wanted to trade with United States—a policy adopted to-day by the Union Government; condemned because we advocated food production—a policy to-day forced upon the Union Government; condemned because we asked that the people be heard on the question of conscription—and thousands from Ontario are asking to-day for that very thing. When you bring in new measures affecting the farmers' sons, the men of Ontario say: Hold; wait until we have had a say.

But I leave the consideration of this subject to others who will follow me. I wish it to be distinctly understood that what I have said has been actuated by no harsh or mean intent; I have presented my views in the kindliest spirit, with the firm desire of offering to the Government some suggestions the adoption of which would, to my mind, aid in the winning of the war.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this discussion has engaged our attention for five days. Having regard to conditions in this country as well as in Europe, I believe that we are not warranted in encouraging protracted debates. We have a large task on hand which demands our whole time and attention, and there can be no justification for spending time here on trifles. I should not have risen to say one word but for some of the personal expressions to which my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) gave utterance. I assure the hon.

gentleman, who in his closing remarks affirmed that all his utterances were of the kindliest character, that the men best qualified to appreciate the quantity and the quality of the work that has been done in the Labour Department during the last six and a half years are the wage earners and working men, whose approval and confidence I have enjoyed during that period in greater degree than have been bestowed upon any of my predecessors. So long as I enjoy that approval and confidence, I shall give little concern to the featherweight opinions expressed by my hon. friend and by the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), or by any of the press supporting them.

Last week the member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) occupied half a day largely in a rehearsal of the alleged principles of the Liberal party, which have been repeated in this House hundreds of times during the last forty years. I shall not attempt to follow him in all his wanderings, but I wish to call attention to one criticism that he made of the Labour Department, that it did not administer impartially the Order in Council passed early in November, 1916. He said, as reported on page 1442 of Hansard:

> These are the things which I complain about, and I think the Minister of Labour should explain to the country why he is so vigilant and active in going after the small things when the big things are left to go as they please.

The hon. gentleman referred to a letter which I wrote to a shoemaker in the county of Kent—on which letter the member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) seems to have secured his election last December. The member for Cape Breton North and Victoria enjoyed an exalted position on the Bench for a number of years and I have no doubt that he discharged the onerous duties of that office with marked ability and fairness. I do not know why he descended from that position to that of an advocate. While he was on the Bench I am sure that in addressing a jury he would never think of presenting only one side of a case; if he desired to be fair—as I have no doubt he did at that time—he would present both sides of the case and all the material facts concerning it. However, he has descended to the position of an advocate and to it he has rigidly adhered ever since he became a member of this House. On no occasion was his rigidity in that respect more marked than in his reference to the work of the Labour Department the other night.

Members who had seats in the last Parliament are familiar with the Order in Council passed on November 10, 1916, authorizing inquiries and investigations under oath, concerning food, fuel and clothing, and placing the Administration of that Order under the Department of Labour. But those who were not in the previous Parliament will perhaps be glad to have me read a few of the provisions of that Order in Council. Section 2 is in these words:

> No person shall conspire, combine, agree or arrange with any other person.
> (a) to limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any necessary of life;

"Necessary of life" is defined in this Order in Council as including food, fuel and clothing:

> (b) to restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any necessary of life; or
> (c) to prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any necessary of life, or to enhance the price thereof.

Section 3 says:

> 3. (1) No person shall accumulate or shall withhold from sale any necessary of life beyond an amount thereof reasonably required for the use or consumption of his household or for the ordinary purposes of his business;
> (2) Every person who shall at any time hold any necessary of life beyond an amount thereof reasonably required as aforesaid, and every person who shall hold for the purpose of sale, whether as manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, retailer or otherwise, any stock-in-trade of any necessary of life, shall offer for the sale the said excess amount, or the said stock-in-trade, as the case may be, at prices not higher than are reasonable and just.

Section 9 provides:

> 9. (1) Any person who contravenes or fails to observe any of the provisions of these regulations shall be guilty of an indictable offence and liable upon indictment or upon summary conviction under Part XV of the Criminal Code to a penalty not exceeding five thousand dollars, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding two years, or to both fine and imprisonment as specified.

This is section 4, which places the administration of the Order in Council in the hands of the Minister of Labour:

> 4. The Minister of Labour may, by notice in writing under his hand or that of his Deputy, require any person who operates, controls or manages any cold storage plant, packing house, cannery, factory, mine, warehouse, or other premises in which or in any part of which any necessary of life is prepared, manufactured, produced or held by such person for himself or for another, or who in any manner deals in any necessary of life, to make and render unto such minister, within a time set in such notice, and such person shall make and render unto such minister precisely as required by him, a written return under oath an affirmation showing in details—

Amongst the particulars the person is required to show are these:

Such other information concerning any necessary of life as the minister may require, including a full disclosure of all existing contracts or agreements which such person, or his principal or agent, may have at any time entered into, with any other person, touching or concerning the sale or resale prices of any necessary of life, for the period of time during which any necessary of life should be held, as bailee or otherwise, before sale or resale, or limiting the quantity of any necessary of life which should be sold to any one buyer or combination of buyers or within any limited district.

On the passage of that Order in Council and the placing of its administration in the Department of Labour, we proceeded under section 4 to prepare suitable questionnaires concerning coal and different foodstuffs. We did not commence by dealing with clothing. We sent those questionnaires out to some 400 of the principal dealers in coal throughout the country, and we received from them monthly returns under oath showing the quantity of coal that they bought during the month, the price paid for it, the quantity they sold, and the price at which they sold it. We were authorized, under that Order in Council, if those answers were not completely satisfactory, to send out an examiner with authority to inspect their books and examine witnesses under oath.

We also submitted a series of these questionnaires to 110 cold storage concerns in Canada, and we received from them statements of the quantities of supplies that they get in every month, what they pay for them, the quantities they sell and the prices at which they are sold. That inquiry went back for five years up to the time we started to operate under the Order in Council, and after that we got monthly returns from those concerns. My hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr McKenzie) says that we have done nothing; that we have attacked the little fellows and have done nothing to the big fellows. What has resulted to some of the big fellows through the action that we have taken under that Order in Council? I have already said that we submitted those questionnaires to 110 cold storage plants in Canada, and as a direct result of the information we got through those questions, and from a report we issued based on this information, we have to-day the packers of Canada paying to this Government a large portion of their profits. Yet my hon. friend from Cape Breton North says that we have not attacked the big concerns at all. The packers under the last Order in Council are entitled to retain only 11 per cent of their profits on their capital, and they have to pay the balance into the treasury of this country.

I am going to call the attention of the House to a few cases. I remember very well a case of a large and wealthy sugar refiner who had refused to supply a retail merchant with sugar unless he would keep up the price fixed by the sugar manufacturer. I have here the whole correspondence touching the matter. I shall not read the whole of it, but I shall read to the House enough to satisfy hon. members that we have not devoted our whole attention under that Order in Council to what may be considered the "little fellows." This first letter was written by an officer of the sugar manufacturer to the retail merchant:

May 23, 1916.

Dear Sir:

We have yours of recent date. Now we might as well be frank with you and advise that we cannot send on the sugar that you request as our representative stated to you when he was in last that our good customers in your vicinity were complaining about you cutting prices and of course have written complaining rather harshly. Of course we wish to do all the business we can and we think by cutting your prices you have hindered your cause a great deal. However, this is all we have to say at the present time and regret that we cannot send on sugar as ordered.

He communicated with me, and on the 8th of December, 1916, I wrote to the company in the following words:

I have information, which seems reliable, that you are refusing to supply sugar to dealers except upon the terms that they re-sell at a price to be fixed by you. I am enclosing a copy of an Order in Council recently passed, which will probably satisfy you that the attitude you take in this regard is a violation of the provisions of that Order and renders you liable to prosecution thereunder. I hope, therefore, that you will at once notify any persons to whom you refused to supply sugar except on the terms as to the price of re-sale that you withdraw from that attitude, and that you will supply them what sugar they require, regardless of that condition.

I think that I should say to you frankly that we should not, and will not, permit any such conditions to attach to any such sale.

He was not very long in changing his attitude, as will appear by the following extract from his letter in reply:

We assure you we are very sorry this letter was written, and further assure that it will not occur again, as we have notified all our selling force to this effect. If you are at all dissatisfied with our explanation, which we are trying to make as frankly as possible, we would be quite agreeable to come to Ottawa and explain it further, or if you would prefer, we will be very glad to have an inspector look over our books and files.

I got a letter from the retail merchant afterwards, saying they had sent him all the sugar he was able to pay for.

I have also a lot of correspondence here concerning bread. I think I should be strictly accurate in saying that we have received hundreds of complaints concerning bread, milk, and other articles. In every case I have taken the matter up, forwarded a copy of this Order in Council, and the party against whom the complaint was made has receded from his position. So our efforts have not been confined, as my hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) says, "to a few shoemakers." In that case we received complaints that the shoemakers had entered into an agreement to charge a certain price for their work. Following our usual practice when a complaint of this sort comes into our office, we wrote them enclosing a copy of the Order in Council, and I am glad to say that they also have receded from the position they had taken. So we have not been idle in enforcing this Order in Council, and we have not confined our efforts to small men, as the House will realize after what I have said about the packers of this country, the bakers of bread, the vendors of milk, and so on. I rose to refer to only one or two matters. I would not feel justified, whatever others may feel, in taking up one minute of the time of this House in discussing matters that are but trifles when compared to the great task before us of saving this country and the liberties of mankind.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): I agree that it is hardly necessary for my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) to take up any of the time of this House in making explanations in connection with the work of his department, except that some of the new members of the House are not familiar with the story that the rest of us have heard told over and over again by the minister in sessions of the last Parliament. I congratulate my hon. friend on having an exceptionally good memory, for he has followed the speech he made several times in the last Parliament almost word for word. He always used to refer to the coal question, to the questionnaires his department sent out and the answers received to those questionnaires, and to the sugar manufacturers.

Mr. CROTHERS: I would remind my hon. friend that when a man is dealing in truth he does not have to change his statements every day.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. COPP: Quite so, but if he tells the whole truth it is not necessary for him to repeat it time after time as my hon. friend has done. But I am not going to criticise my hon. friend for taking up the time he did in making his explanation, because it is the privilege of every member to take, within reason, the time he desires to express his views on the different public questions that arise from time to time, and it is for that reason I take this opportunity of saving a few words, as a representative of a portion of the province of New Brunswick, on the subject now before the House. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) I might add, might have done better if he had just quoted the volume and page number of Hansard containing his speech on these matters last session.

In ordinary times and under ordinary conditions the annual Budget of the Minister of Finance with its statement of the revenues and expenditure of the past year and its estimate of the expenditure for the ensuing year is not of very deep interest. It affords, however, an opportunity for hon. members of this House to express their views on almost any matter that may be of interest to their several constituencies or to the Dominion as a whole. But the Budget during the last three years of this terrible conflict now waging in Europe has been of more than ordinary interest to the members of this House and the country as a whole. This Parliament meets under very changed conditions. The people of this Dominion since Confederation have been divided into two great political parties—the high-protection party, and the low-tariff party, or tariff for revenue only, with a general grading down of the tariff, as the situation warrants, almost to a free trade basis. To show that my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was true to his pre-election pledges in 1896, he had two of his distinguished and representative colleagues in his Government, in the years 1910-11 enter into negotiations with our American neighbours the result of which was a reciprocity agreement. If that agreement had been carried into effect it would have practically established free trade in food products at least between these two great countries. But that agreement was fought persistently and viciously in this Parliament during the session of 1911 and when the Government of that day appealed to the country on the twenty-first of September of that year they were defeated, not on that issue, but on other issues. By the defeat of the Government that measure, which would

have been of incalculable benefit to the people of Canada, was annulled and became of no effect. The people of Canada were debarred from learning by actual experience, the very great advantages which would have accrued to them had that reciprocity pact been carried into effect.

The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) the other night, in discussing some matters before this House, referred to my right hon. leader and criticised him because he did not carry into effect his pre-election promises when he came into office in 1896. It seemed to me that my hon. friend was seeking for excuses to explain his own political meanderings and ramblings rather than establishing any charge against my right hon. friend.

Those of us who had the privilege of seats in this House during the historic session of last year cannot fail to be impressed with the situation as we see it in Canada to-day. Quite a number of hon. gentlemen who occupied seats on this side of the House and gave loyal support to the party lead by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) saw fit, conscientiously I have no doubt, to withdraw their support from the Liberal party on the stand which our leader took upon the question of the Military Service Act, better known as conscription. I have no fault to find with the hon. gentlemen who took that view. As a matter of fact, they were strong conscriptionists themselves. They have proved their faith in conscription by allowing themselves to be conscripted without question or murmur to different positions in the service of this Dominion. When my right hon. friend, the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) attempted to form what is known as his Union Government, he wended his way to Toronto and there met my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). That hon. gentleman had, early in the campaign apparently realized the duty devolving upon him to support the Military Service Act or conscription measure. He fell a willing sacrifice to conscription himself and said: While I have urged young men to go to the front, and while I believe we should force young men to go to fight the battles of the country, I am quite willing to go to the front benches of the Treasury, occupy a seat there and fight the people's battles, but of course I must have a salary of $7,000 per year, and have all the perquisites attaching to the position. It is also stated that the hon. gentleman insisted on his particular friends in the city of Toronto being provided for and getting good jobs in the Government services and I have no doubt that condition has been carried out. He willingly and patriotically came forward and said, "Here I am; take me." The next gentleman that the right hon. gentleman appealed to was the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) who, after making due apology and repentance for his action at the celebrated Winnipeg convention last summer, enlisted and was at once made chief recruiting officer in the safety first election Union battalion, better known as the Union Government. After he had accepted the position of returning officer, he had little trouble in persuading the hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) that it was his duty to get into uniform and training. True, there was not actual front trench work then but it was necessary to have a man properly trained for service after the war when immigrants would again flow into Canada and he fell a willing sacrifice.

In the meantime, the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), realizing that colossal mistakes had been made in the past, decided it was not in the public interest to longer continue to hide their lights under a bushel, and chose the Departments of Militia and Defence and Marine and Fisheries respectively to be the candlesticks upon which they would place the light they had to illuminate the dark political and mismanaged recesses of these departments.

Little trouble had so far been experienced, but the Maritime Provinces had to be reckoned with and the name of the present the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), who had the reputation of a dangerous foe and who had undoubtedly locked within his breast and desk reams of most damaging information against the different departments of the Government, as was proved by the results of the investigation of the affairs of the Militia Department by a Royal Commission the year previous, was added to the list of new ministers. This doughty erstwhile Government opponent, whose patriotic offer to go to the front in the early days of the war had been refused for reasons one can only guess, was pressed into service, and he in the interests of his country at this time decided, if not to completely bury the hatchet and forget the past shortcomings of the Government, to at least place them in cold storage for a time—not that their value would be enhanced, but

that they might be preserved for personal use or the country's benefit in future.

The only obstacle in the way of the hon. gentleman's entry into the Union Government was that he preferred the Department of Public Works to that of Marine and Fisheries. This was overcome by the occupant of that office being forced to realize that he was best fitted to reorganize and conduct the Department of Marine and Fisheries that had been left in somewhat of a chaotic condition by the sudden, and, of course, unexpected resignation of its former head, after having been conscripted to the position of Chief Justice of the Appellate Court of New Brunswick. I am bound to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister of Public Works has shown his worth in his department and he is the only member of the Government who has evinced a desire to cut down expenditures and to do house-cleaning as he always did when he was on this side of the House.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. gentleman has intimated that the reason why the Minister of Public Works was selected for a place in the Cabinet was, that he held certain dangerous secrets within his breast, and that it was a means of quieting him. Will the hon. gentleman be a little more explicit in that regard?

Mr. COPP: I have taken the responsibility of making the statement I did, and the hon. gentleman will be good enough to draw his own conclusions, either from my remarks as he has heard them, or as he reads them in Hansard to-morrow.

Now, Sir, the Government was not yet fully constituted. There was a province remaining to be considered, and that was the old reliable province of Nova Scotia. After Hon. Mr. Murray had consulted with his friends and decided that he could not well be spared from his duties in that province, the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was induced to join the Cabinet. His demand for responsible office was not so pronounced as that of other members of the Cabinet, provided, of course, the question of salary was not overlooked, and there was provided for the hon. gentleman the chairmanship of some committee. I do not know just what the duties of that committee are, but doubtless the hon. gentleman is eminently qualified to discharge them with distinction.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) who is a member of the House, also willingly allowed himself to be conscripted for the Cabinet, and I have not yet heard him making any appeal to any local tribunal to be relieved of his duties. Whether he may be forced to do so or not, I cannot say, but I am sure we on this side are willing to give him a fair trial and if he continues as he has commenced, I personally, shall have no fault to find with him.

In the position of Solicitor General we now find an old and very respectable member of the Opposition (Mr. Guthrie) in whom we had very great confidence. He also saw fit to withdraw from this side and accept a position of emolument in the Government that is now controlling the destinies of Canada. I have no doubt that a number of others would have been quite willing to accept office, if the opportunity to do so had been vouchsafed to them.

Mr. EDWARDS: Including the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp).

Mr. COPP: I have never yet had occasion to withdraw from the party that I have always supported, and so long as they continue to advocate the policy which I believe to be in the interest of the country I shall not forsake them. I am not finding fault with those gentlemen who retired from this side, but when I am convinced that the policy of my party is wrong, then, I may tell my hon. friend, I shall have no hesitation in saying so and taking such steps as I believe to be in the interest of the country. That is the duty and the privilege of every hon. gentleman.

Now, Sir, the Union Government was formed, they went to the people and received a mandate from them. Let me impress upon the Acting Minister of Finance that I do not believe it was in the interest of the country that for the purpose of forming a Union Government the necessity existed for creating five or six new Cabinet positions, at additional expense to the people, at the present time. If hon. gentlemen opposite had the interest of this country at heart, as they wanted to make the people believe they had during the last session of Parliament, if it were in the public interest that a Union Government should be formed, and that politics should be dropped for the time being, in my opinion it would have been a more truly patriotic course for a sufficient number of ministers to have retired from the old Government, and to have replaced them by Liberals from this side of the House, and to do that without causing any extra expense to the country. Economy should be the watchword of the Government, but by

adding these additional departments to the administration of public affairs, the Government have augmented by between a million and a half and two million dollars the expenditures entailed in the carrying on of public business. Such a large additional outlay the Government were not justified in undertaking at the present time, when the people are being taxed, and practically bled white, to maintain the ordinary and capital expenditure of Canada, to say nothing of the enormous cost of carrying on its share of the burdens of war.

The advantage of the Union Government has yet to be demonstrated, and so far as the new members of that Government are concerned, no criticism can be offered on account of past acts, because they were not a party to those expenditures. I have no criticism to offer of the gentlemen now on the Treasury benches who went from this side of the House. That must be deferred until they come before Parliament to give an account of their stewardship and to explain the conduct of their departments, as they will have to do next year.

The Acting Minister of Finance in his Budget speech announced that the revenues of the Dominion during the fiscal year 1917-18 amounted to $258,000,000, of which, he told us, $203,000,000 were required to meet capital and ordinary expenditures, leaving $55,000,000 to go towards war expenditure during the past year. While $55,000,000 is a fairly large sum of money, yet, if we may judge by the criticisms in which the hon. gentleman himself indulged with respect to past financial statements, that sum is not nearly enough to meet our requirements. In 1913-14, the financial year immediately preceding the war, our total revenue was $163,000,000. If out of $163,000,000 Canada was able to carry on her business affairs and meet her outlays in both ordinary and capital expenditure, I say that during these times there is no reasonable or fair excuse that $203,000,000 is needed to pay our annual disbursement. If the Government had economized as they should have done, surely we would have been able to get along without larger expenditures than in the year 1913-14. And if that had been done, instead of having $55,000,000 to pay towards war expenditures this year, we would have had $94,825,000. Under these conditions we should have been able to save a larger amount than $55,000,000 by paring down our expenditures on public works and civil government all along the line. I wonder if I may have the privilege of reading to this House a few lines from a speech made by an hon. gentleman whose word, I think, should have some weight with the present Government, and, at least, upon the present Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean). In a speech delivered in this House on April 24, 1917, a year ago, criticising the Budget of that date, the following language was used:

> Now it is a fair question to put to this House and to the country: With our expenditures on war account, great as they are, and with this country so prosperous, whether it is satisfactory that we should have contributed out of our revenue toward that expenditure only $60,000,000 or less? Are we now doing our full duty or are we leaving too much to the future to pay? I believe that we are borrowing too much and paying too little.
>
> There are facts which should be carefully considered in this connection. After the war, we shall have a national debt of from $1,300,000,000 to $1,500,000,000, with charges for interest and pensions approximating, as I have already pointed out, $100,000,000 a year, which must be paid and for which the people must be taxed. We shall have a smaller supply of capital, interest rates will be higher, and the productive capacity of the country will be less. The transition from a state of peace to a state of war, was made easier in our case by the absorption of men into the army, but the transition in the reverse direction will be complicated not only by the discharge of munition workers from their employment, but in addition there will be the demobilization of the army. These are important facts and should be considered in discussing the question whether we should or should not now tax ourselves more in order to pay a greater portion of our war obligations than we are paying. We must further remember that the immense expenditure for war which is being added to our debt is unproductive. It leaves us richer in ideals and in history, it is true, but in a monetary sense the expenditure is unproductive. If the amount which we are obliged to borrow for war purposes were expended in the construction of railways, the development of agriculture, and the establishment of industrial enterprises, it would add to the productive power of industry and trade thus making it relatively easier to meet interest and sinking fund charges upon the debt. With these things in mind, is the Government policy with respect to taxation for war expenditure the correct one? Is it one which is approved by the best judgment of our people? Are we not handing down to posterity the obligation to pay too largely for patriotic performances?
>
> Taking the position, as I do, that we are not presently contributing sufficiently to war expenditures, I realize that hon. gentlemen opposite will naturally enquire what suggestion hon. members on this side would make, what policy they would propound. In the first place, I assert, and this is but a repetition of what we on this side have said on every Budget deliverance of the Minister of Finance since the beginning of the war, there should be further retrenchment in civil expenditure so as to leave a greater amount to apply to war expenditures, thus minimizing the additions to our debt.

That was the statement made by a gentleman who occupied a seat in this House. He pointed out distinctly, when $60,000,000

was put aside for war expenditure for that year, that that sum was not enough. We have had a lesser amount put aside during the past fiscal year, because only $55,000,000 was saved out of a revenue of $258,000,000. In spite of that fact, the hon. gentleman from this side of the House who made that criticism of the Budget of last year is the very gentleman who brought down the Budget this year as Acting Minister of Finance. I want to ask that hon. gentleman frankly, and my hon. friends on the other side of the House, in what position is he? Was he right when he made that criticism, from this very chair, I believe, last year, or is he right to-day in bringing down a financial statement such as he has and asking us to vote a large amount of money, while giving practically no promise for the coming year of any definite amount being put aside for war expenditure? He does say, however, that he hopes there will be some reasonable amount left out of next year's appropriations and the revenue he expects to derive from taxation he is now bringing into force for paying off some of the war expenditure.

The Acting Minister of Finance has suggested that he is making some changes in the taxes. Taxation is necessary. Money is required to carry on this war, and money must be got by taxation of some sort. My hon. friend has started in by putting a special tax upon tea and tobacco. I want to say to him frankly, and to put myself on record, that I am absolutely opposed to that taxation on these two articles. In the first place, it brings in only a very small amount of revenue—by his own estimate I think $3,000,000. To-day, tea on the table of the labourer or of the rich man is a necessity, and tobacco, to a very great extent, is the same. I grant you that on cigars and cigarettes, and possibly on high-priced tobaccos, a substantial tax might very well be levied. With that I find no fault, because I am one who believes that taxation should be so adjusted that we could pay more of our war expenditure as we go along and not leave so much to be paid by those who come after us. But I want to suggest to my hon. friend that, instead of putting this small tax on tea, which would only net the comparatively small amount of $3,000,000, he might have tried another means. I want to refer briefly to the amount of income tax that he proposes to put upon the people. I am sure that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House will agree, and will very gladly congratulate my hon. friend, if he is responsible, for increasing, in the very small degree that he has, the income tax. We have advocated from this side of the House ever since the commencement of the war that an income tax should be placed upon the rich people of our country who are receiving large incomes. They are the people who should be very thoroughly taxed, and taxed until they feel it. I submit to my hon. friend that in the small increase he is placing upon the rich men of this country, they are not being taxed to an extent that they will feel. Let me refer to a few of the incomes on which my hon. friend proposes to increase the tax to some extent. I start with the income of $10,000. At the outset, I want to say that I care not how people have lived in the past or how extravagant they have been, or what city they live in, but, to-day, when the Dominion of Canada and her sons are sacrificing everything under Heaven, no man should be left with an income of more than $10,000 a year to live on.

I go further and say that no man with an income of $10,000 or $20,000 up to $100,000 should be allowed to receive additional wages or profits during the war. The Government should allow him a fair annual living expenditure and take the remainder of his income for war purposes. Even then he would not be sacrificing nearly as much as the young man who is sent to the front to fight for the protection of the property from which the large income is derived. The tax should be made sufficiently high to cause the man of large income to feel that it really means something. For instance, the hard-hearted Acting Minister of Finance says to the man living in St. John, whose income is $10,000: I am taking $300 from you and leaving you the mere pittance of $9,700 to live on for a year. The man in Halifax—where the people are richer than they are in St. John—with an income of $20,000, is left only $18,618 to get along with during the year. The man of $30,000 income is left with only $27,298; the income of $50,000 is reduced to a mere $44,218; $75,000 to $63,000; $100,000 to $82,000; $200,000 to $150,000, and so on up to $400,000 and $500,000. I am not finding fault because the young men are taken, nor am I criticising the Military Service Act. But consider the matter from this viewpoint: a young man appears before a medical board and is examined in respect to his eyesight, hearing, chest measurement and general physical fitness. The Government then says to him: you are physically fit; you go to the trenches and fight for us at $1.10 a day. Would it not

be just as fair to have an auditor examine the accounts of the millionaire, so that he may be instructed: You have no son to go to the front, but Mr. T's son has gone; you must deliver up some of your wealth to help pay the cost of sending the boys to the front? It is only fair that the rich man should make sacrifice as well as the poor man or the man who goes to the front. The small increase proposed in income tax is not yet sufficient. I can see hon. gentlemen on the other side who last year made this chamber ring with their denunciations of the Government because they did not put on a larger income tax. I sincerely hope that they will have sufficient influence with the Union Government to induce them greatly to increase the tax on the incomes of rich people, and to do so during the present session.

Mr. EDWARDS: How much would the hon. gentleman allow the so-called rich man before he confiscated his salary?

Mr. COPP: That question I am not in a position to answer. In ordinary communities the man who has $10,000 a year to live on has a munificent salary. Even if we allowed him $20,000, large amounts could still be collected for war purposes from the incomes of rich men.

Something has been said during this debate with regard to the operation of the Military Service Act. I regret exceedingly that this Act has not been successful in securing the number of men it was expected to secure to reinforce the Canadian lines at the front. I doubted at the time that it would be successful. Realizing the responsibility resting upon them, the Government recently passed an Order in Council cancelling all exemptions of young men who had reached the ages of twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two. Since that time farmers' organizations, agriculturists—some through deputations which came to Ottawa —and the press have protested against this Order. I am not in a position to say whether young men engaged in farm work should be left here to assist in greater food production, or whether they should go to the front and let production take care of itself. I do know, however, that farm production in my constituency will be much hampered and decreased if this Order is carried out to the letter. The Government must take the responsibility for their action in this respect. In view of the reports of the food controllers of Great Britain, United States and Canada, and the representations of Senator Colby, who gave addresses in various parts of Canada on this subject, the Government should consider carefully whether they should take the young men from the farms, or whether they should leave them there to engage in much-needed production. It is of very little use to send men to the front if there is danger of their being faced by shortage of food.

I am not here to-night holding a brief for the farmers generally. There is no more reason why a farmer's son should be exempted because he is a farmer's son than there is that a merchant's son should be exempted, unless the exemption of the farmer's son is necessary for the greater production of food. If the demand upon Canada is for greater production, the farmers cannot produce the crops unless they have men to plant, cultivate and harvest those crops. I sincerely trust; in fact, I feel sure; that the Government will take into careful consideration their action in this particular case.

It has been frequently stated in this House—and I need not elaborate—that the Government could do nothing better to assist production in this country than just to take off their protectionist goggles for a little while and look through free trade spectacles and put agricultural implements on the free list, at least during the war. A number of hon. gentlemen who occupy seats on the other side of the House must realize that that would be a very great advantage, one of the greatest advantages to the farmer, to the man who goes on to the farm to produce. If that man could have his harrows, ploughs, tractors, binders and other farm machinery come into this country free of duty, what a tremendous impetus would be given to greater agricultural production. What a stimulus and encouragement it would be to the farmers who, to-day, with a number of their sons overseas, are working hard endeavouring to produce greater crops, if they could buy machinery at a cheaper rate and so be able to buy more machinery for use on their farms. I do not suggest that my hon. friends should go too far in this matter, because it is important that there should be more or less union and working together, and I do not wish to raise political questions at the present time; but I ask those of my hon. friends opposite who have the feeling and conviction that farm implements should be put on the free list, as I know a number of them have, to turn to Hansard of last year at page 1707, where they will find a very strong advocate. I know this hon. gentleman, who

occupies a position in the present Government, will stand by what he said last year. I am going to read only a few lines of his speech, and I would ask my hon. friends to read all that he said in regard to this question This is what he said:

> And then take the trade returns. Last year we imported altogether, of agricultural implements and parts thereof, everything which you can possibly imagine, including scythes and hand rakes and all the little things used on the farm, only $1,673,000 worth. I have again no idea how many million dollars worth are consumed in Canada, but there must be a great many millions, tens of millions of dollars worth of farm machinery consumed and yet we imported only $1,673,000 worth in Canada on which the Government received only $309,000 in duty, a mere bagatelle.

Imagine what a trifling amount. During the year 1916 we received only $309,000 in duties paid upon agricultural implements imported into Canada, while we used tens of millions of dollars worth of agricultural implements. But what we on this side of the House lay stress on is the fact that the consumer who uses agricultural implements has to pay the amount of the duty on these goods when manufactured in this country. The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

> And yet, Sir, we paid from 12 per cent to 17½ per cent and 25 per cent on all these millions and tens of millions of dollars worth of machinery used in Canada. We paid this, not to the Government, but to a little coterie of manufacturers in Ontario, and that same little coterie of manufacturers in Ontario were able to sell to the rest of this world practically $4,000,000 worth of these same articles. The exact figures are $3,854,000.

Those are the words of a gentleman who now occupies a seat in the Union Government, and I have no doubt, if the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him and who are and must be in favour of agricultural implements coming into this country free, could refer him to the speech he made last year in this Parliament, he would give their suggestions careful consideration and give them some encouragement that in the near future this action might be taken.

Mr. EDWARDS: Who is the gentleman?

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend will read Hansard of last year at page 1707, he will find the remarks I have quoted.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was not asking for the page; I was asking for the name of the gentleman who made the remarks.

Mr. COPP: If the hon. member will read the page, he will find out the name of the gentleman.

[Mr. Copp.]

Mr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has quoted a speech made by some person. My contention is that he should give the name of the person who made the speech.

The CHAIRMAN: I know nothing in the rules of the House which obliges an hon. member quoting from a speech to give the name of the speaker. The hon. gentleman has quoted the page of Hansard from which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) can get the information.

Mr. COPP: The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, as he is interested in the paragraph I have just read, look up Hansard and read carefully and fully the whole speech, and I know he will be very much impressed by the remarks made by the hon. gentleman whose words I have quoted.

I want to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) upon the action he has taken in regard to embarking on a shipbuilding programme in Canada. I regret exceedingly that the Government have, during the past four years, been absolutely silent and dormant in regard to this great industry. I well remember the gentleman who represented the city of St. John in the last Parliament, hour by hour urging upon the Government to embark on a shipbuilding programme. I am sure if the whole time he consumed in this way were added together, it would run into weeks of steady argument and talk, and yet the Government turned a deaf ear. Two years ago he told them that the transportation question would be practically the deciding issue in this great war, and he urged upon the Government to embark on a shipbuilding programme, as we had the materials and the opportunity. He stated that we could buy or construct shipbuilding plants, and he urged upon them the necessity of immediate action. Yet during all those months not a hand was turned, until the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came down this session with a policy of establishing a shipbuilding industry in Canada.

I am sure every man who has the interest of his country at heart must realize that is the proper thing to do. While I sincerely trust the war will be over before the ships now under way can be turned out, we shall still require a great amount of shipping for transportation purposes after the war, and I trust that my hon. friend's policy may be crowned with success, and that in the future we shall have steel ships built in this Dominion sailing over the seven seas. I regret that my hon. friends on the other side of the House have not been

able to influence the minister to start a shipbuilding plant in the Maritime Provinces. There we have the men, the material, and everything that is necessary for successful shipbuilding. In days gone by there was no place in the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific that was richer in opportunities for the shipbuilding industry than the ports of the Maritime Provinces, and I sincerely trust that the minister, after studying this question carefully will reach the conclusion that there is a splendid opening there for shipbuilding.

I sincerely believe that every man, woman and child in this Dominion is heart and soul in this war. We are all willing and anxious to do everything we can to win this war, but naturally there are differences of opinion as to the best things to be done, and that, I suppose, is the reason for so many different suggestions being made in this debate as to the taxation methods and other matters. We have been told to save, serve and sacrifice. If we will study those words carefully and apply them each to his own individual case, I am sure it would be very much better than to apply them to the other fellow. The rich men with large incomes do not require to save, but they should be forced to serve and sacrifice. The acting Minister of Finance the other day, in introducing his Budget, spoke of the deep feeling of earnestness throughout the country, and commended the patriotism of our people who subscribed so handsomely to the Victory Loan last year. While I do not wish to detract in the slightest degree from the loyalty and patriotism of the people who subscribed, I say it is no very great proof of patriotism for a man with $50,000 in the bank drawing three per cent interest to withdraw it and invest in a war loan paying six per cent, when the security, moreover, has the whole resources of the Dominion behind it. The Government, instead of borrowing this money from these people at such a high rate of interest, should take a little of it if these wealthy men are not willing to sacrifice, so that they will be made to pay a fair share of the money necessary to carry on this war. If we only will examine ourselves we will see that we are all more or less selfish. The other night one hon. gentleman, who no doubt thinks himself a high-souled patriot, one of the most patriotic people in the Dominion, said that the Cockshutts had done everything possible to win the war, and no doubt he believed it. But in his very next breath he said that within twenty-four hours of tractors being put on the free list, in the interests of greater production and to help win this war, he had a delegation on the way to Ottawa to protest against any such action. Why? Was it because he thought the Government were not sincere in their efforts to win this war? No. It was because he feared its influence on the industry in which he was engaged. I speak with all due respect to my hon. friend because if our hearts were searched to-night I have no doubt we should find many Cockshutts among us, who would take the same course were our interests affected. It is as natural as it is to breathe for a man to stand up for his rights, and when his particular industry is interfered with he will naturally rise in protest. That is a reason, I contend, why the Government should come down with a strong hand. Now is their opportunity. We have now a Government, we are told, from which politics has been divorced, and which is carrying on the affairs of this country in what they believe to be the best interests of our people. Here is their opportunity, then, to do away with all political interference such as has been going on for some time.

10 p.m.

The Acting Minister of Finance said that the Union Government had abolished political patronage. I sincerely hope he is right, but I am afraid he has not been on the penitent bench long enough to realize he may be mistaken as to the outcome of what he thinks is Civil Service reform and the abolition of political patronage. When this Union Government was formed some members of the Borden Government had to give place to the new members. The Minister of the Interior in that Government was waited upon and was willing to step out provided he got an equally good position. So he was made Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Another gentleman from my own province, when asked to retire, also professed his willingness provided he got a good position. So he was made Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the province of New Brunswick. I think the only member of the Borden Cabinet who retired without getting some position almost as lucrative as that of a minister of the Crown was the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), but I understand he is still hoping that when the railways of this country have been nationalized he will secure the very honourable and lucrative position of chairman of the commission that will operate the system.

I have trespassed longer on the time of the House than I had intended, particularly after the Minister of Labour had lectured us so severely for taking up the time of the House, but I sincerely trust that when he remembers I have not occupied more than fifteen minutes of the time of the House this session he will forgive me for speaking at such length to-night.

It will be my pleasure—I believe, my duty—to give to this Government all the support that will be in the interest of the country to give it in connection with the very great and grave questions and responsibilities with which it is faced. I realize as fully as any one what these responsibilities are. I trust they will be successful in working out the very difficult and knotty problems that arise in connection with the questions which are engaging their attention. I have no desire to take any part in any party or petty criticism of their acts. I sincerely trust that they will realize more this year than the Government did last year the very great importance of the responsibilities resting on them and will see to it, when the country is asked to bear such a heavy load of taxation to assist in carrying on this war, that they themselves set an example by practising rigid economy as well as preaching it.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, the last Parliament will be referred to in history as the long Parliament. This, I suppose, will be referred to as the Union Parliament. It may also be referred to in some respects as a remarkable Parliament. I find myself hardly yet used to the changed conditions which I find around me. Men who were formerly sitting opposite to me in the House and directing their criticisms to those on your right, Mr. Speaker, I now find associated with me on this side of the House and supporting the Union Government. I have noticed that one or two of these gentlemen, who formerly sat on the other side of the House and who are now on this side, have thought it advisable to offer something in the nature of an apology for being on this side of the House. That reminds me of a story I heard once of a bashful young man who saw a lady home. He was afraid that his friends, if they learned about it, would joke him, and when he reached the home of the young lady he said: "Mary, don't tell any body I came home with you to-night." Mary said: "Don't worry, John, I am just as much ashamed of it as you are." I hope that will not be taken too literally to represent my feelings in regard to the newcomers on this side of the House. I am only referring to one or two, who, it seemed to me, thought it necessary or expedient to shed one or two tears in parting with their friends across the way and to make a sort of apology for their position over here.

Hon. gentlemen who are occupying seats on this side of the House, whether they are Cabinet ministers and drawing salaries, which seems to go against the grain of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Copp), or whether they are ordinary members like myself, need make no apology for sitting on this side of the House or for leaving the party with which they had always been associated and taking their places in the ranks of the Union party. Whose fault was it? Was it the fault of these hon. gentlemen who were formerly staunch supporters of the Liberal party? The fault was not theirs. The fault was in the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and it was due to the fact that during the many years in which he has been in public life in this country he has failed to rise to the great responsibility of his position. He failed to appreciate what was due to himself and what was due to the people of this country at this great crisis in the history of the Dominion and of the Empire. These men suddenly severed their connection with the party with which they had always been associated because they had always been determined that there was something above party ties and that was keeping faith with the boys who had gone overseas to fight for the people of this country.

I regret very much that my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) has departed somewhat from the ordinary custom in refusing to give the name of the gentleman from whom he quoted. I suspect he was quoting from one of his own former speeches and notwithstanding the fact that he put it again on Hansard he was not altogether pleased with it but that he was rather a little ashamed of it and therefore did not want to give the name. I cannot conceive of any other reason, because if he had considered the matter worthy of commendation he would have been doing honour to the man responsible for these observations by placing them on Hansard and would not have objected to giving the name of the person who had made these remarks.

I am not going to occupy many minutes of the time of the House to-night but I want to say a word or two with regard to the Income Tax. The matter was dealt

with, in my judgment, in a splendid manner by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) the other evening. I want to endorse his remarks. The proposed tax might have been reasonably increased on the higher incomes. I will not go to the length of the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the idea that you should confiscate all property. I can see very many objections to placing a limitation upon a man's energies. In that case he might use his energies only to the extent of making the income he was allowed to possess and the country would lose. But I do think there is a feature in regard to the income tax which it is worth while calling the attention of the House to. I presume the idea is to be fair to all parties. One reason why I think the tax could be reasonably increased on the higher income or that a higher percentage could be taken is this: The men throughout this country who have given their sons to go to the front are contributing far more than the hundreds of people who have large incomes. Take, for instance, a man who has an income of $5,000 a year. The amount of the tax which he will contribute under this Income Tax Bill is comparatively small when compared with the contribution which is being made by a man who has a hundred acre farm and whose only son has gone overseas. I venture to say that the man whose only son has gone overseas will lose, because of lessening production, several hundred dollars a year. The financial loss which he will sustain will be far greater than the amount of money which actually passes from the pocket of the man who has an income of $10,000 or $20,000 a year.

In view of such facts, it does seem to me that the larger income might very properly bear a greater percentage of taxation than it has to bear under the Government's proposal. I will say furthermore, that whereas it might be advisable to place the tax where the Government are placing it at the present moment, I am quite certain that the time will come, and that in the very near future, when the suggestion that has been made by several hon. gentlemen on both sides that the tax on higher incomes be increased will be acted upon, and a higher percentage will be exacted from those who have the greater wealth and the greater income. That is all the comment I have to make in regard to the income tax.

I would like to express an opinion with regard to the tax on automobiles, which, of course, can be discussed more fully in committee. The object of the tax is to obtain revenue, but having talked the matter over with persons in the business during the last two or three days, I am not sure but that the purpose for which the tax is being imposed will be to some extent defeated by fixing the amount at ten per cent. I am not sure but that we would obtain more revenue if the tax was placed at five per cent instead of ten per cent, coupled with a tax of, say, two cents per gallon on gasolene, to be collected from the wholesalers at the distributing centres, and not from each little town where gasolene is used, or from each individual consumer. I am sure that would produce a very large sum of money and I think every person who uses an automobile, or has means enough to buy an automobile, would have sufficient money to pay the extra two cents on the gasolene that he uses. That I put forward as a suggestion which may be enlarged upon, or further considered, at a later stage.

My chief object in rising was to make some observations in regard to a matter which has been dwelt upon more than any other by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is, the removal of the duty on agricultural implements. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), in his speech outlined the way for other hon. gentlemen, and has been followed by several speakers who have advocated the total removal of the duty on agricultural implements. In his speech the hon. member for Brome said:

> I am sure that the Acting Minister of Finance who has not yet had time to dissipate the sound economic views which he held on this side of the Chamber, will agree that no national policy could possibly be founded on the absolutely artificial financial conditions which confront the country at this time.

I wish to say that I entirely agree with that statement. I have always been a pretty strong protectionist, but in my judgment it is at the present time absolutely impossible for any Government, or any set of statesmen, to outline a fiscal policy for this country until after this war is over. So far as I am concerned, notwithstanding that I have always held very strong views along protectionist lines, I shall keep an open mind with regard to the consideration of this question when the war is over. We will have to consider the subject then in the light of the changed conditions which have been brought about by the war. I do not believe we are in a position at the present moment to properly consider the question, and to say what should or should not be done with regard to the duty on this or any other article. At all events we are not in a position to make a sweeping demand such as has been

made by the hon. member for Brome when he asked that the duty be removed entirely from agricultural implements. Does not that hon. gentleman see that he has been inconsistent? He says that no national policy could possibly be founded on the artificial conditions which confront this country at the present time. Yet, after expressing that conviction, the hon. gentleman immediately proceeds, with dialectical ingenuity which he has developed to a remarkable degree, to lay down a policy and asked the Government to carry it out. Surely the hon. gentleman can see the inconsistency of his position. But if his dialectical ingenuity in argument is great, I must say that in my judgment he has shown himself somewhat reckless in his statement of facts. After he had given reasons why the duty should be removed from agricultural implements, and had said that a refusal of his request must be based upon some other consideration than the loss of revenue, the hon. gentleman was asked by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) how much the Liberal party, when they were in power, reduced duties—at least that was the substance of the question. In reply, the hon. member for Brome instanced the case of cream separators. He stated that cream separators were dutiable under the Conservative Government, but when the Liberal party came into power they removed the duty. If the hon. gentleman had wished to be exact he might have called attention to the fact that the Liberal party came into power in 1896, and did not touch the duty on cream separators until 1907, and in giving the whole history of the facts he might also have added that in the tariff of 1894 the Conservative party removed part of the duty from cream separators. That change in the tariff, however, was not alluded to. A further fact might have been added to make the story complete, and that is that after the duty was removed from cream separators—done, as the hon. gentleman says, in the interest of the farmers—the price was higher than it was before 1907.

We will pass to another item. The hon. member for Brome referred also to Indian corn. The Conservative Government, he said, allowed corn to come in free of duty in order to enable the distiller to make whisky, but when the farmer wanted to import Indian corn he had to pay a duty of 7½ cents a bushel. That, I suppose, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, makes a very nice statement.

I suppose that will appeal very nicely to some persons who do not know the facts.

[Mr. Edwards.]

But allow me to tell the hon. gentleman that he is absolutely wrong in his statement of facts. The duty was kept on corn for distilling purposes by the Conservative party at 7½ cents a bushel, and was retained by the Liberal party at that figure after they came in office. The hon. gentleman thereis down to 1907. The hon. gentleman therefore in making his assertion about the Conservative party catering to the distillers—making an appeal to the temperance elements of this country, I suppose, was his object—was entirely outside of the mark.

Mr. ROBB: Does the hon. gentleman state as a fact that the duty on corn for feeding purposes was kept at 7½ cents a bushel until 1907?

Mr. EDWARDS: I won't evade the hon. gentleman's question. I think he will give me credit for never evading questions put to me in this House. I was referring to the remark made by the hon. member for Brome that the Conservative party when in power had taxed the farmer 7½ cents a bushel for corn for their purposes, and had allowed corn to come in free when the distillers wanted it to make whisky. I say that that statement is absolutely wrong. There was a duty of 7½ cents a bushel on corn under the Conservative tariff. For what purpose? On corn that was used by the farmer for feeding purposes, and on corn that was used for distilling purposes. All that paid a duty of 7½ cents a bushel. But the tariff of 1894 removed the duty on corn used by the farmers to be sown for ensilage purposes. Let me give the item, No. 610 of the tariff of 1894, as follows:

> Indian corn of the varieties known as "Southern white dent corn" or horse tooth ensilage corn, and "Western yellow dent corn" or horse tooth ensilage corn, when imported to be planted or sown for soiling and ensilage and for no other purpose, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council.

All that the Liberal party did in regard to the matter was to permit corn to come in if the farmer wished to use it for feeding purposes, and 7½ cents a bushel was taken off that corn, but a duty of 7½ cents a bushel had to be paid for distilling purposes just the same under the Liberal party as under the Conservative party. In looking over the tariff, my hon. friend from Brome stopped before he got to the free list. That is the mistake he made, perhaps not a very extraordinary mistake in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman, I presume, has not studied tariff matters very closely.

Mr. ROBB: May I again be permitted a question? The hon. gentleman admits that

the Liberals removed the duty on corn in 1897, which was to be used for feeding purposes. Will he also admit that there was a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty on corn used for distilling purposes?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not admit either part of the hon. member's statement at all, because I understand that the Liberal party did not remove the duty in 1897, they did not get busy until 1907. That is my understanding of the fact, and I think I am right. The hon. gentleman said that in addition to corn and cream separators, there were other changes made. Yes, there were some other changes made in 1907. The duty on cattle and sheep was increased from 20 to 25 per cent by the Liberals. The duty on meats, poultry, lard and tallow was left just as it was in the tariff of 1894. The Liberal party reduced the duty on eggs from 5 cents to 3 cents a dozen, although the duty on the American side was 5 cents against our eggs. The Liberal party left the duty on butter and cheese the same as it was, at 4 cents and 3 cents respectively, although the United States duty was 6 cents on each of these articles. The Liberal party increased the duty on tomatoes, and on cabbages and onions; they put 10 cents a bushel extra duty on beans and 5 cents a bushel on peas. The Liberals also, in 1907, increased the duty on potatoes from 15 cents to 20 cents a bushel, and even that was 5 cents lower than the American duty against our potatoes. When the duty was raised on potatoes from 15 to 20 cents a bushel, did any one hear any great noise from the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Read)? Not that I heard of. Did any one see any tears running down his bronzed and weather-beaten face because they had increased the duty on potatoes? Not that we have ever known of. The hon. gentleman at that time, and others who sit on the opposite side, and who at the present moment are great free traders when potatoes are in question, had not a word to say during all those years that the Liberal party kept the duty on potatoes and actually increased it when they made a change. Was that a step in the direction of free trade? No. But it was accepted, and accepted cheerfully, by those hon. gentlemen who laid aside their great principles very readily when party expediency called for it, when their party leader said: You must take this and accept it. Then they had not a word to say about free trade. They tied their free trade principles up into a bundle and conveniently tucked them away. Even when an added duty was put on potatoes, there was not a whimper from any of these gentlemen, not even the hon. member for Brome.

But the hon. member for Brome paid his respects principally to agricultural implements and it is in regard to agricultural implements that I desire to give a little past history. The hon. gentleman has said that the acting Minister of Finance has not yet had time to dissipate the sound economic views which he held on the other side of the House, that he has not been long enough on this side to be contaminated entirely with the protectionist doctrine. He, and other hon. gentlemen on the other side, have spoken of the sound, economic views which the Acting Minister of Finance learned when he was on that side. What were they? Well, in 1871, the Liberal party deplored the fact that Canada was dependent upon foreign countries for manufactured goods and said: "It is our duty to foster our national industries." That strikes me as pretty strong protectionist doctrine. In 1876 the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said:

> It is asserted by many and assumed by more that free trade is a Liberal principle and protection a Conservative principle. If I were in England I would be a free trader, but I am a Canadian born and resident here and I think we require protection.

In 1878 his policy was "tariff for revenue"; in 1887, "commercial union"; in 1891, "unrestricted reciprocity"; in 1893, "free trade as in England." In 1895 and 1896 the Liberal party came out with blood in their eye; nothing short of complete destruction of protection would satisfy them. They said: We will cut off the head of protection and trample on its body. And these hon. gentlemen who back up that party learned sound economic views, we are told, from leaders of the Liberal party on the other side of the House. Why, those leaders were changing their views practically every day. It has been known for years that there are as many fiscal policies on the Liberal side as there are Liberals; each one has a fiscal policy of his own. The member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) will speak very loudly of free trade till you touch something in Cape Breton North—and then he shies off to one side. So it is with other hon. gentlemen from different parts of the country: When their own district is affected, they want protection. They cannot and never have been able to see this matter from the standpoint of Canada as a whole. The Liberal party has been an

absolute failure so far as fiscal policy is concerned.

Let us consider the question of agricultural implements, which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) wants to make free. In 1907 the Liberals reduced the duty on agricultural implements from 20 to 17½ per cent. The people thought that that was a step in the direction of free trade. When the matter was before the House on that occasion the member for Souris, now Senator Schaffner, proposed this resolution:

That the Committee reconsider item 445, and that it be amended by striking out the figures 17½ per cent. in the general tariff and inserting in lieu thereof the figures 10 per cent.

The resolution was negatived by a vote of 56 to 22. Every Liberal in the House voted against it and several members from the West spoke against it, notably the member for Moosejaw, Mr. Knowles, who said:

I shall give the Government hearty support, for I believe the policy of the Government is in the interests of the country.

The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) also spoke against the proposed reduction, in the following words:

The Tariff Commission got information all over the country. I do not think the farmers of the West, at all events, asked for a great reduction such as is proposed by this resolution on agricultural implements. They ask that the duties be left alone. I shall give the Government hearty support on this quesion.

That is, on retaining the duty at 17½ per cent. Hon. William Paterson, who previous to 1896 had declared for free trade in everything except biscuits, said, as reported at page 5582 of Hansard:

I do not disguise the fact that we propose to give these people—

That is, the manufacturers.

—nearly the amount of reduction in duty that has been made. For it must be remembered that 17½ per cent. is no more than a revenue tariff.

That was the "sound economic school" from which the member for Brome and others on the opposite side get the free trade principles which they now enunciate with such gusto. What did the present member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), then Finance Minister in the Liberal Administration, say with regard to the position of the Liberal party concerning these duties? His words are to be found on page 5621 of Hansard, and are as follows:

By a careful calculation we are advised that the drawbacks we allow are somewhat less than the disadvantage under which the manufacturer is placed by the reduction of the tariff. Even suppose for a moment that he got everything free and had a duty of 17½ per cent. on the implements, would that be an extravagant duty as things go in this country? I believe this proposal of the hon. member for Souris, if adopted, would do an injustice to an established industry.

My belief is that if this motion were passed we would strike a severe blow at one of the great industries of the country. I believe the International Harvester Company would find it to its interests to close up its business at Hamilton, at least so much of it as is devoted to mowers and binders and have them made at the American branch and bring them from the United States. The factory in Hamilton is an American concern. With a moderate duty we have induced American capital to come into Canada and to establish that great industry and after we have brought it in and established it in Canada I believe that if we were to pass this resolution the company operating that industry would find it profitable to close the Hamilton factory and bring in the goods which they make in the United States.

That was the position taken by the Liberal party at that time with regard to agricultural implements. But I wish to recall the statment made by Hon. William Paterson, that in reducing the duty from 20 to 17½ per cent they were giving back to the manufacturers nearly the amount of the reduction that had been made. How was that done? The duty under the Conservative party was 20 per cent. A binder was valued for duty purposes at $80, making the duty $16. When the duty was reduced from 20 to 17½ per cent, immediately the value of a binder for duty purposes was increased from $80 to $100, making the duty $17.50. This party which, according to the members for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and Westmorland (Mr. Copp), is the authority on economic questions, said to the farmers: We may not have proceeded as rapidly in this matter as you would like or as you had a right to expect in view of our promises, but we are starting now; we are taking off 2½ per cent, and we will take off more. The farmers said that they were satisfied.

At last, they said, the manufacturers are getting 2½ per cent cut off the duty, and that will help a little. The Liberal Government, however, immediately turned around to the manufacturers and said: Do not worry, we have a way of fixing this so that the farmers will not catch on; they are too busy; they have to work from before daylight until after dark, and so they will not have time to look into these things; we are simply raising the valuation from $80 to $100, and we are really making the farmers pay one dollar and a half more, and they will not catch on. I do not believe the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) would

have caught on to it until to-night, because if he had, I fail to see how, clever lawyer as he is, and with all his ingenuity, he would have had the face to point to his side of the House as a place for one to go for sound economic views, and for the principles of free trade. When this matter was under discussion, the then Minister of Finance, the present hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) made certain remarks which will be found in page 2452 of Hansard of January, 1911, when the great reciprocity pact was brought before the House. Some queer skips were made in the reciprocity pact. Did the hon. member for Brome, the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) and other hon. gentlemen, when they were considering what a boon this was to the people of this country, when they were talking about dinner pails and all that sort of thing notice that when Hon. Mr. Paterson and his colleague went down to Washington, when they took the duty off certain things, they raised the duty on biscuits? That was not exactly along the line of free trade, but still it was done. It was not exactly consistent, but there was some person who was deeply interested in biscuits. There were also some friends of the Government who were deeply interested in cement, so the Liberal Government made a bluff at cutting the duty on cement, but it was only a bluff. When the matter was being discussed in January, 1911, the Minister of Finance of the day said:

They—

That is the farmers of the West—

—would be glad to have them—

That is, agricultural implements.

—free of duty; but I must frankly say to them that we do not think that it is fair. Like all others they must be prepared to give and take; they must be prepared to bear their share of the burdens of the country.

And so on. He then proceeded to say that the duty, which was 17½ per cent, had been reduced to 15 per cent. The then hon. member for Dundas, Mr. Broder, put this question to the Minister of Finance of the day. You can see the reason why he put the question:

Mr. Broder: Is there any change to be made in the valuation for duty?

Mr. Broder was a farmer who thought and read and who knew what had been done on the previous occasion, and naturally he put this question. What was the answer given?

Mr. Fielding: Our negotiations have not touched the question of valuation; that must be left to the operation of the customs authorities of the two countries.

And so they intended at that time, with the support of hon. gentlemen like the hon. members for Brome and Westmorland in this House supporting them, if they possibly could, to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of this country, making the farmers believe that they were free traders and were moving in the direction of free trade, while at the same time they were holding out the glad hand to the manufacturers, who, of course, were the source of their election fund. That was the situation in regard to agricultural implements. I do not blame the hon. members from Western Canada one particle for asking for free agricultural implements. Everybody understands the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite on this particular occasion. They have to throw something before the public, and they think this will be catchy out in the West. But this is not the time to tinker with the tariff. It would, in my judgment, be absolutely impossible, while the war is in progress to arrange a fiscal policy for this country which we could be sure would be perfectly satisfactory after the war had terminated. We are passing through great changes. Our tariff will necessarily, to a greater or less extent, be affected after the war is over by the position taken by our neighbours to the South and by the position taken by other countries. I do not believe any man is in a position to say what the fiscal policy of this country should be after the war is over. We shall then have to meet changed conditions that have been brought about by this war, and so far as I am concerned, while I have strong views in regard to protection, while I believe in protection for a country like Canada, I have an open mind as to what should be done after the war is over in dealing with the duty on agricultural implements or on anything else. I am a believer in protection because I represent a farming community, because I represent a constituency which is as strictly rural as perhaps any constituency in Canada. In my constituency I have not a single incorporated village. I am in favour of protection for the farmers of this country because, every year that goes by, science has more and more annihilated distance; science had brought the countries of this world closer together. We now reckon distance in time, not in miles, and our competitors are brought closer to us to-day than they ever were before. Do

you mean to tell me it is fair that a farmer in the province of Ontario, who has to spend thousands of dollars in building expensive barns and stables in which to house his stock; who for five and six months of the year is under the expense of feeding that stock, awaiting the opening of the next season; who, during that time is not making a dollar out of this stock which is a bill of expense to him, should be placed on an equality, his protective duty being removed, and obliged to compete with farmers from the Argentine Republic and from certain parts of the United States where they have not the climatic disadvantages which we have? A protective duty is, in my estimation, the only means of equalizing conditions which are made unequal by climatic conditions.

I do not think that I would be doing my duty if I did not express in a few words my opinion in regard to another matter. We have in this country men of different races and different creeds. We have our differences, and no doubt will continue to have them. But I, for one, do not despair of unity in Canada in the days to come. Why, Sir, in England they have been working for a thousand years rectifying mistakes, smoothing out wrongs, and adjusting difficulties, and they are not free from dissension and strife over there yet. But who will say that progress has not been made in England? No one, I venture to say. Progress has been made in that country, and at this moment England is recognized as the leader of that world democracy which had its origin in and which circles around her to-day in the fight for human liberty on the battlefields of Flanders. We have our differences here, and our differences, in my judgment, are due to a great extent to political cowardice. They are due to the fact that so-called statesmen in this country, place, and have placed, political party expediency ahead of the future good of this country. We have had too much compromise in this country. We have often heard it preached that compromise is the proper way to deal with differences in this country—compromise, compromise. Compromise is illogical. It is an invitation to future trouble; that is all it is. A question is never settled until it is settled right, and I do not believe in the compromise which has taken place in this country. By a system of compromise we have encouraged people in this country to carry on a propaganda here which is nothing less than seditious and treasonable. If we are going to have unity we must

teach all races that no one race in this country is going to dominate, that all must obey the laws, that if they want to share in the privileges this country offers they must share in the responsibilities this country places upon them. And I repeat here to-day what I have said on former occasions in this House, that it strikes me as disgraceful that men should be allowed in this time of trouble and stress to maintain their rank in the militia of Canada who have been a disgrace to the uniform they wear because of the seditious utterances they have been allowed to make. Compromise is not the way to deal with a man like that. There is only one of two things to do with a traitor: either put him behind the bars, or put him with his back to the wall and shoot him.

There is another thing I wish to raise my voice against. There has been too much compromise in regard to the press of this country. Newspapers in the Dominion of Canada, and notably in the province of Quebec, have been allowed to preach treason day after day, week after week, and year after year since this war started. Those are the people who are largely responsible for the situation down in that province, a situation which does it no credit, and which in my humble judgment is unfair to the habitant and to the ordinary people of Quebec, who I think would show themselves to be made of the same timber as the men who made name and fame for themselves at Courcelette if they had not been wrongly led by certain men and certain newspapers. I say we are not doing our duty as public men if we do not raise our voice against any sort of compromise in dealing with these people. I for one have no use for that kind of compromise. In my judgment there is only one way to deal with them, and that is to deal with them in such a way as to silence them forever.

Just one word more. An hon. gentleman speaking in this House the other day alluded to the Orange Order in the Dominion of Canada as the Yellow Peril. Do we need to be afraid of that Yellow Peril in this country? Let me tell the hon. gentleman who spoke that way the other day that there have gone over to France more members of the Orange Order in Canada than the whole province of Quebec has enlisted from 1914 down to the present time. That is a fact. If these men are a menace to this country, then I ask him what can be said of the men in the constituency he represents. I resent anything of that kind. We have too many men connected with

the Orange Order in this country, who lie in Flanders to-day, having given their lives for the great cause, and I for one will resent on the floor of this House any aspersions on an Order which not only in this war but in all former wars has always shown a loyalty to British institutions and to British principles which hon. gentlemen opposite who criticise the Order might very well emulate.

I have not dealt with public finances to any great extent, and I shall not do more now than to express my very great gratification at the speech delivered by the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), which indicates that the people of Canada, so far as their financial burdens are concerned, are prepared to do their full part in carrying on this war

Mr. FRANCIS N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): I arise at this late hour to express my views, not at too great length I hope, but whatever time is required that I shall have to take. The question under debate is the expenditure and revenues of this country. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) brought down the Budget, and I have not had time since to go into it thoroughly. I have no very serious comments to make on it. Taxation is something that nobody likes, whether he be rich or poor, but taxation under the present circumstances is something we cannot avoid and we may as well accept it cheerfully.

There are two things in a Budget which always interest the people. The first is that all taxes should be equally apportioned so that every person bears his share according to his circumstances. It has been said by some and by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House only this evening, that we should not tax tea and coffee, that we should not tax the poor man. The rich man, in his opinion, should bear the whole burden. If I understand him aright he argued that the poor man and the poor man's sons were doing the fighting, and therefore the rich man should pay the bills. As he belongs to the middle class I presume he would be exempt from both. I do not look at it that way at all. This war is the nation's war and every man, rich and poor, should bear his fair share of the burden. This should be demanded if only as a matter of principle, that every one may realize that the country is at war. I admit that the rich man is the best able to pay and I think under the present taxation proposals he will have to pay. So long as the taxes are evenly distributed, whether they be high or low I have no fault to find. Personally, I would rather favour high taxation at the present time. The country is prosperous. There is an immense amount of money coming in. Everybody is prosperous, the farmer, the labourer and every one else. When the people have money is the time to provide for paying the bills. There is a time coming after the war when probably the country will not be as prosperous as it is at present and we will be less able to meet the taxation that will be imposed. Consequently, I would not object to high taxation to meet a large part of the expenditures which have been made for the defence of our country, providing every person bears his equal proportion according to his means.

I have no objection to taxation providing the money is legitimately, properly and economically spent. That is quite as important as the imposition of taxes. We must provide the amount of money necessary to meet such expenses as cannot be avoided, but on the other hand we should not spend a dollar for any purpose that can be avoided. The expenses should be cut down in every department of government and otherwise. The Government should see to it that every man in its employ gives service for the money that he receives, gives a dollar of value for every dollar that he receives, whether it be in labour or anything else. One of the ministers, when submitting his estimates the other day, admitted that his department was very much overloaded, that other departments were in the same position, and that offices were maintained where there was nothing doing. But he wound up by saying that it was a hard thing for a man who has a heart to say to a person in the employ of the Government: We have nothing for you to do; we must discharge you. I would be sorry to think that the whole Cabinet would be so tender-hearted as that.

Let me put this matter in a proper light before the House. The Union Government went to the people on the question of conscription. The mothers of this country have spent their lives sitting up at nights weary and tired, nursing and caring for their boys. Now, when these boys have grown to be nineteen or twenty years of age, the Government, under the authority of Orders in Council which they have passed, say to each of these mothers: Your King and country requires your son; kiss your boy good-bye, it may be good-bye forever. I am not finding fault with

this; it may be necessary to do it, but the Government that has a heart to tell the mothers of this country to give up their sons and say good-bye to them surely cannot turn around and say that they have not the heart to tell a man in their employ for whom there is no work that there is nothing for him to do and that he must look for another position. I am not finding fault with the Government for imposing conscription, but they cannot escape their responsibility when asking the country to sustain heavy financial and other burdens, by saying that they have not the heart to dismiss an unnecessary employee. That does not seem to me to be logical. I am not finding fault with the Government for their measure of conscription. It is the law and we must abide by it. I was not in favour of it because I did not believe it was necessary. But I say it is necessary to preserve the money and resources of this country, to see that the money is properly spent and that no man is kept in his position simply because he has a position unless there is something for him to do and he can give value for the money he receives.

The conscription measure brought down last session does not seem to have produced the desired effect. It was evidently a measure of conscription to get exemption. The Government have brought in a measure lately by which they have tightened the screws and made conscription more stringent. It may be wise, or it may be otherwise. My judgment is that if it is true that the overseas forces need reinforcement and that we should send men over, I doubt very much the wisdom of doing it just now. The men who are conscripted now cannot be trained, equipped and got into the firing line before winter. This Government and every other power we have in Canada, have been preaching greater production to the people. The farmers have just got to the point where they were ready to commence their seeding when this Order in Council was put through declaring that every man from nineteen to twenty-three should be conscripted. The order has gone out and some of these young men have been called. Inasmuch as these men cannot be got into the firing line before winter is on, it would have been wiser on the part of the Government to have delayed until the crop was in, and probably out. Then they would have had all the winter months to prepare these men and get them into the field ready to take their places at the front.

This brings up another matter which I have in my mind. I have never heard it expressed by anybody else; perhaps there is nobody else who thinks as I do on it. But, I think it is a very grave question and one well worthy of consideration, whether Canada would not have better served the Empire and the Allies if she had sent less men and more food. We are told that Italy has two million five hundred thousand men whom they cannot put into the field simply because they cannot equip and feed them. Would it not have been the part of wisdom if they had said to Canada: Your country is one of unlimited and unbounded resources from an agricultural standpoint; produce food and produce munitions? Would it not have been equally wise if we had said to Italy: Put your men in the field and we will equip and feed them. This is a combination of nations at war, and a combination of nations resembles a combination of people. If one nation can supply men, and another nation can supply food, why not develop their resources along those lines? This is a suggestion I am throwing out. I believe, and have believed for a long time, that the Government would have been well advised if they had considered the question of producing more food and more munitions, and had sent fewer men. The point may well be worth considering yet, but I do not imagine that the Government will take my advice. The people of the country perhaps may not credit what I say now, but when they recover their rational senses and get over their enthusiasm they will conclude that it would have been wiser and better for Canada, and this country would have been of greater assistance to the Allies, had we followed to some extent the suggestions which I am now making. So much for matters of finance and the Budget.

There is another matter which has been raised by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) which I am very glad to have the opportunity of discussing, and that is the matter of the pulp and paper business in Canada. I shall endeavour to deal with it as briefly and as carefully as I can. I shall endeavour to place before the House and the country the respective attitudes of the manufacturers, the publishers and the Government. At the outset let me say that this great industry has attained the proportions of being the third largest exporter in Canada if not the second largest. Under the circumstances we would expect the Government and the press of Canada to show it due consideration. The press sets itself up as being a public edu-

cator, if not a public benefactor, and a public benefactor is one who supports everything that is in the interest of the country. Now the paper industry is not only a source of revenue to the people engaged in it, but the export of paper of all kinds from Canada, if we take this year alone, represents a value of upwards of $60,000,000. This large sum of money attracted to this country and distributed among its people indicates that the industry is one which is not only worthy of the attention of the Government, but is entitled to their support, as far as they can give it.

Perhaps it would be well for me, as a sort of introduction, to briefly review the state of the industry prior to the outbreak of war in 1914. At that time the industry was at a very low ebb and so keen was the competition that only those mills that were located close to the raw materials, with the advantages of cheap water-power, cheap labour, freedom from strikes, and things of that kind, could succeed in making any money. For example, the International Paper Company had reorganized once, if not twice, in the five years immediately preceding 1915, and had not paid a dividend even on their preferred stock for some years prior to that time. They were not alone, for there were some manufacturers in Canada who were in the same position, and could not even pay a dividend on their preferred stock. The war broke out and in the latter part of 1915, or in the early part of 1916, the business of manufacturing paper commenced to improve. The demand increased, but the cost of production increased as well. Let me illustrate my statement that prior to 1915 the paper manufacturing industry was in a very bad state, by stating what the conditions of doing business were. The conditions were these: The manufacturer of newsprint had not only to manufacture his paper, but had to ship it and prepay the freight to destination in the United States, and had to store it at destination and deliver it from day to day at the publisher's sidewalk—what they call "sidewalk delivery."

This meant that he had to keep at least two months' supply at his storehouse to guarantee the publisher against strikes or other interruptions to trade that might happen. Such were the conditions of the paper trade prior to 1914. Under the circumstances any gentleman in business, or who understands the situation, realizes how essential an improvement in prices was. But, strange to say, when prices commenced to rise early in 1916, the publishers came down to Ottawa and interviewed the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), and I do not know who else, and practically, without consultation with the manufacturers, without hearing what their claims or reasons were, the minister undertook to fix a price. In the autumn of 1916 he wrote a letter to Mr. Chahoon to the effect that a suggestion had been made to him in some way, or from some source, that the publishers would consent to a rate of 2½ cents a pound on paper, and he wound up his letter by saying: My advice is accept it, because if I have to pass an Order in Council I shall make the price much less. From the interviews we had with the Minister of Finance, as the arbitrator between the publisher and the manufacturer, we thought we discovered that we had an adverse jury. and we also found that the Finance Minister had been at one time in his life connected with one of the large papers in Toronto, and still had a leaning that way, and rather than take any chances the manufacturers consented, for a period of four months, starting from March 1st, 1917, to undertake to supply the necessary requirements of paper to the publishers of Canada at 2½ cents a pound, but with this rider and understanding, however, that the Government would appoint a commission to investigate the matter. Not only did they ask the Government to appoint a commission, but they asked that they should also appoint an auditor, which they did. Mr. G. T. Clarkson was appointed to examine and audit the books of the manufacturers and to establish from the books what the cost of manufacturing paper was. Mr. Clarkson audited the books of thirteen of the largest newsprint mills in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is Mr. Clarkson?

Mr. McCREA: He is a chartered accounted, appointed by the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From Ottawa?

Mr. McCREA: From Toronto. Mr. Clarkson reported that from the books of these thirteen companies, as he had examined them, the cost of manufacturing paper was $56.90 a ton. Mr. Pringle, after having held I don't know how many sessions at different places, but very many, on the 1st of September, or prior to that, made an interim report to the effect that he had not completed his investigation and examination, but that he had gone far enough to satisfy himself that the cost of making paper as established by the auditor was a

fair and reasonable conclusion to arrive at, and he stated in effect: Whilst my examination is not completed, I would recommend that the price of newsprint to the Canadian publishers from September 1 to January 1 be 2.85 cents a pound, or $57 a ton. The publishers, who had all the opportunity they needed, could have produced any evidence that they wished to, attended all the sessions and sittings, and asked all questions. They could have been represented to establish their case that paper should be sold at $50 a ton. They evidently did not take any part in the investigation, or not very much, but instead of accepting the recommendation of Mr. Pringle of 2.85 cents a pound they came down in force to Ottawa and simply told the Cabinet and the minister: You shall not accept Mr. Pringle's report; if you do—I do not know what they said, but it sounded to me like a threat.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, as I was present. Nothing of the kind was said by the publishers. There was no threat whatever.

Mr. McCREA: No threats? Just listen. Mr. Richardson, Member of Parliament for Springfield, is, I may state, the proprietor of the Winnipeg Tribune, and was one of the publishers who attended that meeting, and spoke before the sub-committee of the Cabinet. The publishers came down to protect against the Government accepting Mr. Pringle's report. Naturally, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, if you would not expect, when this delegation came before the sub-committee of the Cabinet, that they would offer some argument why they could not stay in business and pay the increased price, or give some reason to show that the manufacturer was getting an exorbitant price. But what did Mr. Richardson say?

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the date of that interview? Before the election?

Mr. McCREA: Shortly before the election. Here is what Mr. Richardson said:

> The newspapers are doing a good work for this country. You may find if you grant this order that it will be necessary for the Union Government to take over the national newspapers and furnish their own editorials.

Is that giving an argument why the publisher could not pay the price, or why the manufacturer was getting too much? Was that a threat or what would you call it? I would call it a threat not an argument.

[Mr. McCrea.]

Mr. RICHARDSON: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word? That is not a correct transcription of what was said because there is no such thing as national newspapers. However, the point I made was a joke and was laughed at and accepted as a joke, as the hon. Acting Minister of Finance, who was there at the time, knows.

Mr. McCREA: Did you ever see this in print?

Mr. RICHARDSON: As to the furnishing of their own editorials, the hon. member must see, as everybody saw, that that was a joke.

Mr. McCREA: Did you ever deny having said so?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I never saw it before to-day. I do not deny it now.

Mr. McCREA: Mr. Rowell, replying to your statement, said:

> They would lack variety in that case.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That proves that what I said is right.

Mr. McCREA: Hold on a minute. Here is what follows:

> Mr. Richardson: If you contemplate that possibility I think you would rather hesitate before making an order of this kind.

Is that a threat, or giving a reason? I ask you—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. McCREA: Is that an answer or a reason why the manufacturers of newsprint should not get the price suggested by the commissioner who had been appointed by this Government?

Mr. RICHARDSON: It was no particular reason. The reason the publishers waited upon the Government and asked that the order be not enforced was that the publishers withdrew from the investigation months before, having made up their minds that the investigation was loaded against them and that they could not rely upon having a decent investigation. They refused to proceed. They never asked that the price of newsprint be less than cost plus a reasonable interest on capital.

Mr. McCREA: Who was to establish the cost?

Mr. RICHARDSON: An honest investigation was all we required, not a loaded one.

Mr. McCREA: Mr. Speaker, I put it to you and to this House, the Government

had not been asked by the manufacturers alone to appoint a commission, but by the manufacturers and publishers jointly. They appointed Mr. Pringle, who is well known to the members of this House, and I do not think any hon. member has a right to impugn Mr. Pringle's character or honesty. They not only appointed Mr. Pringle, but Mr. Clarkson, a capable and prominent auditor. The Government appoints only capable men. Mr. Clarkson's reports that he investigated the books of thirteen of the leading manufacturers in Canada, and that he found the cost to be $56.90 per ton. Mr. Pringle recommends that $2.85 shall be the price from September 1 to January 1, and when he completes his report the price may be more or may be less.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What did you say the cost was?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The House is not in committee. The member for Sherbrooke has the floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON: He puts questions to me, Mr. Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He has no right to.

Mr. McCREA: Here is what Mr. Pringle says about this:

> I must say that when the investigation commenced the manufacturers of newsprint loyally came forward, produced evidence when I required it, brought witnesses from long distances at their expense and asked no compensation. On the other hand, the Press Association of Canada have given me no assistance.

The publishers practically intimated that the Government might be called upon to write their own editorials if the requests made were not acceded to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A hold-up.

Mr. McCREA: When the commissioner brought in his report the manufacturers were not satisfied with it and they are not satisfied with it to-day, because the price of materials, labour and everything else is steadily going up. The manufacturers say this: we will abide by Mr. Pringle's finding for the time being and accept $2.85 per hundred provided the commissioner makes his final report within three months and, in the event of that finding or report not being satisfactory to either party, we simply ask that the matter be referred to a judicial tribunal of three of the most eminent judges in Canada. That is what has been done in the United States. I understand that this Government have expressed their concurrence in the suggestion, but so far I believe that no judicial tribunal has been appointed. All we want in this matter is a fair and square deal and no interference with our business, which represents an export valued at some $60,000,000. At a time when exchange is heavily against Canada, the matter of the export of newsprint and the bringing into Canada of $60,000,000 from a foreign country for circulation here is very important. I believe that eventually we will get justice, but this is one of the things which the Government should take an interest in protecting.

The member for Springfield said the other night that the publishers of Canada succeeded in obtaining an indictment at Washington against certain Canadian manufacturers; that these manufacturers pleaded guilty and paid their fines, and that the publishers were consequently entitled to a great deal of credit. The newspaper publishers of this country are supposed to be the educators of public thought, to be engaged in every good work, to do all they can to promote Canada's interests. Is it a credit to them that they should hound and follow the manufacturers of newsprint down to Washington and assist in getting indictment against them for having sold their goods in a foreign market at the best possible price? The newspapers claim that they are a public service; that they are one of the things that cannot be dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I did not say that the newspapers of Canada did any such thing as my hon. friend suggests, for they had no part or lot in the transaction.

Mr. McCREA: You said "we."

Mr. RICHARDSON: I said nothing of the kind. It was the American Publishers' Association that brought these men to justice and had them fined. The Canadian publishers had no part in it. The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent my position.

Mr. McCREA: I will show the hon. gentleman before I get through that his statement is not correct. The member for Springfield said: we have succeeded in bringing them before the tribunal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is obliged to accept the correction of the hon. member for Springfield.

Mr. McCREA: All right. I will tell you what happened. Some Canadian manufacturers were indicted and called to Washing-

ton to answer a charge of having violated the Sherman Act. They went there three or four times for hearing. Meanwhile, the publishers of the United States and the manufacturers came to terms, agreeing that the price of paper should be a certain amount for a certain period; and nothing remained except the litigation that was pending. The publishers expressed their desire not to proceed with it further. The manufacturers of Canada had, at great expense, already been down there three different times with witnesses—and, as every one knows who has employed a lawyer in the United States, a litigant has to pay for counsel whether he wins or loses. The court said that they could not dispense with the fine, and counsel said: You may have to come down here three or four times more, and if you do, the cost will be two or three times the amount of any fine. Would you rather confess judgment, pay the fine and let the thing drop, or proceed with it? I believe your case is good. A number of them said: We prefer to pay the fine, whatever it may be, and drop the thing. But Mr. Henry Wise, a New York advocate who represented George Gould, said: No legal wrong has been committed; we will confess no judgment; proceed with your case. But the publishers did not proceed further with the prosecution and Mr. Gould, who was answering the same charge as all the others, was discharged without paying one cent by way of fine, and went home a free man. That is what that prosecution amounted to.

In the section of the country that I come from, bordering on the eastern New England states, there are a large number of paper mills. Thousands of cords of wood pass through my home town every day. The Burland mills alone use 1,200 cords of wood a day which is largely exported. We hear politicians and business men throughout the country who know about these conditions saying: Why should this not be manufactured in Canada so as to give employment to Canadians? That is a sound view. The Government of the province of Quebec, in their wisdom, some years ago passed a law by which timber taken from the Crown land had to be manufactured in Canada. The same thing was done in Ontario. The tendency has been to build up the pulp and paper trade in Canada.

If this Government are going to take the attitude that paper must be sold at 2½ cents per pound, which is less than cost—I do not want to tongue-thrash the Government,

[Mr. McCrea.]

but I want to put them in possession of the facts. A business which is bringing into Canada some $60,000,000 a year, a business which might be extended and enlarged so as to prevent this export of raw material to a neighbouring country, is worthy of consideration. The fact of supplying the Canadian press with their requirements at 2½ cents per pound, even though it be at a loss, is not the most serious matter. Only eleven or twelve per cent at the outside of the paper manufactured in Canada is required to supply the press of Canada. Here is where the most serious part comes in. The manufacturers in the United States are up against the same thing as we are confronted with here. The press of the United States is daily and hourly pressing their Government for the same ruling to fix the price of newsprint and not to allow the manufacturers to charge them too much. One of the arguments they are putting up to the Government of the United States is this: Why should Canadian paper manufacturers be allowed to sell paper in the United States at 3 cents or 3¼ cents a pound when the Government of Canada are forcing them to sell paper to the publishers of Canada at 2½ cents a pound? That is sound argument, sound reasoning. Supposing that the Government of the United States takes this attitude and says to the Canadian manufacturers: Inasmuch as you can sell paper to Canadian publishers at 2½ cents per pound, which your Government thinks is a right and reasonable price, why should we allow you to sell paper in the United States at any price you see fit? Hon. members may say: Oh, he is a crazy paper manufacturer, speaking for himself. This is an industry. While it affects me directly, it affects every man in Canada indirectly. Any business that brings into Canada $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 per annum is worth considering, and the amount is increasing. In 1890 the exports of pulp and paper from Canada amounted to $7,574,118, and the number of men employed in paper mills was 2,718. In 1915 the amount of capital invested in the paper industries in Canada was $133,760,602, and the last report we have, that is of 1917, shows that the capital invested in the paper and pulp industry of Canada was $145,800,000. The exports we expect will this year exceed $60,000,000, and the amount is increasing every year. At this particular time, when the exchange is so adverse to Canada, it is in the interest of everybody to encourage an industry that is bringing foreign money into Canada in exchange for our raw material.

Another matter that the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) somewhat emphasized by rapping his desk while he was discussing it, was the Brompton Pulp and Paper Company, which, he said, had made enormous profits. He read their annual statement, showing a profit of 14½ per cent on the common stock. That is correct. Does the hon. gentleman understand, first, that the Brompton Pulp and Paper Company have not supplied one pound of paper to Canadian publishers? We have no customers in Canada with the exception of one in Sherbrooke. Perhaps the House is not aware that the newsprint produced by the Brompton Pulp and Paper Company is less than one-sixth of our total product, and whilst we are not making one dollar on newsprint, we are making money on some other things. That is how the Brompton Pulp and Paper Company have made the enormous profit, as it appears to the hon. member for Springfield, of 14½ per cent. on their common stock, but they have not made it on newsprint. I am not speaking for the other newsprint manufacturers, but I know that the Laurentide Company, which was cited by the hon. member for Springfield as being a company which was very prosperous, have large interests in what is known as the Shawinigan water-powers, which give them large profits. They are also manufacturers of 100 tons per day of sulphite pulp, on which there are no restrictions, and those who have been manufacturing that class of goods have been making money. They are the manufacturers of 100 tons per day of ground wood, which they have for sale in addition to what they use for themselves. If you take those three items, they will pretty nearly explain the large profits that firm is making. I do not think the hon. member for Springfield made his statements with bad intent, but he was not informed. I am not making these statements with any intention of knocking him, but simply to put him in possession of information which he evidently does not have.

There is, in connection with this pulp and paper matter, another feature which I wish to draw to the attention of the House, and it is this. The Minister of Finance passed a ruling whereby the publishers of Canada should receive what paper they require for their publications at 2½ cents per pound. The manufacturers said: "There are some mills in Canada which have no Canadian customers and which are not supplying the Canadian business." The minister said: "Those who do not supply any Canadian customers will have to pay the manufacturer who does the difference between the price of 2½ cents and the price that he could get which, at that time, was estimated to be 3¼ cents, the ruling price in the United States. That is, any mill in Canada which did not supply its proportion of newsprint to the Canadian press would have to pay its neighbour for whatever its proportion of newsprint would be. Here comes in a peculiar circumstance. Lord Atholstan, who is a very important man, the owner of the Montreal Star and some other papers, is also the owner of a paper mill at St. Remo in the province of Quebec, a mill which has a capacity of some thirty or forty tons a day. Lord Atholstan, better known as Sir Hugh Graham, did not buy or build this mill for the purpose of going into the business of manufacturing paper for sale, but simply for the purpose of supplying paper to his own press. Instead of supplying eleven per cent of his paper to the Star and shipping the balance across the line, he supplied all the paper he made in his mill to the Star. Then in September last he presented a bill to the Minister of Finance and said: "Your ruling, Sir Thomas White, was that any mill in Canada that did not supply its proportion of paper would have to pay some other mill that had supplied more than its share. Under your ruling I was bound to supply eleven per cent of my production to my press, and the balance was to be supplied by the other manufacturers of newsprint in Canada. However, I have supplied the total production of my mill to the Star and here is my bill for the eighty-nine per cent supplied to my press at two-and-a-half-cents a pound. I could have got three and a quarter cents if I had shipped that balance to the United States. That represents fifteen dollars a ton more than my proportion under your ruling, and I want you to collect that from the other manufacturers of newsprint in Canada and reimburse me." What did Sir Thomas White say to Lord Atholstan? And let me say that there are lots of men with less titular honours than Lord Atholstan who have a great deal more honour than he has, and who would not have been guilty of that kind of business. What would I have said? I would have said: "If under my ruling the paper manufacturers of Canada are compelled to supply paper to the press at less than cost during war time, when conditions come back to normal, they will at least have a customer. If these

manufacturers had been supplying the Star they would have a customer in the Star, but as it is they will not have the Star for a customer after the war, as you will supply that paper from your own mill." But Sir Thomas White did not say that. He said: "My ruling is that every mill in Canada must supply its proportion or pay somebody else for doing it." What do you think of that Mr. Speaker? Here was a mill that was acquired for the sole purpose of supplying the Montreal Star and the other publications of Lord Atholstan with paper. The Government's ruling was that the manufacturers must supply all the paper that was required in Canada at two and a half cents. Then Lord Atholstan comes along and says: "I supplied all my paper, and under your ruling I must be reimbursed by the other manufacturers." Mr. Pringle, I might say, has intimated to the manufacturers of Canada that Lord Atholstan should be settled with, but the manufacturers have not consented to it yet, and I do not believe we will right off. That is how the manufacturers of Canada are being treated. I do not make any accusation against the Government because they have not pronounced finally on the matter, and it is not right to pronounce on unfinished work. But I appeal to the Government and to this House and to the people of this country that this industry should not be crippled for any trifling foolish nonsense. I quite admit that the press may not have been able to afford a higher price when the war broke out, but there is no reason in the world to-day why the press of Canada cannot do as other people have to do. Pass it on. Before the war the price of newsprint was somewhere around two cents a pound. To-day it is only two and a half cents. Prior to the war the price of pulpwood was less than fifty per cent of what it is to-day, and labour was only getting half the wages it gets to-day. Repairs of every kind have gone up in price. Let me give one illustration. Prior to the war we averaged up the cost of fourdrinier wire for eighteen months, and it averaged $212 a wire, and the life of it was almost six weeks. To-day it is costing us $490, and its life is less than half what it was before the war. The manufacturer says he cannot get the material; I do not know whether it is on that account or because of poor work that the life is so much shorter, but it now lasts only three weeks as against six before the war. And the price of all other repairs has gone up in the same proportion. Is it reasonable, therefore, that we should be asked to continue to supply paper at the same price when we have the figures of the Government's own auditor and commissioner to support us? I was very pleased the other evening when the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) speaking of railway conditions in this country, referred to the Drayton Commission as comprising men held in high esteem, and he said the Government should be guided by their advice and report. I agree with him. But if the Government should accept the report of the Railway Commissioners and be guided by their counsel, why should they not accept the report and advice of Mr. Pringle? I do not think any man in this House will accuse Mr. Pringle of being anything but a straight, honest and upright man who uses his best judgment. Not only Mr. Pringle but the Government auditor have shown that the cost of newsprint is $6.90 more than we are getting, and under the circumstances I think the whole matter is entitled to greater consideration than it has hitherto been getting, and I trust the sub-committee of the Cabinet or whoever has charge of it will see that the manufacturers are protected.

Shortly after the price of newsprint had been fixed a delegation came from Toronto and other parts of Canada to interview the minister at Ottawa in an effort to get him to fix the price of book papers, wrapping paper, and many other classes of paper. They said: "You have fixed the price of news print at 2½ cents, which is a twenty-five per cent increase over the ordinary price. Here are our invoices showing what we paid for this grade of paper prior to the war, and here are our invoices showing what we are paying to-day. In some cases the increase is very high." I think that is the strongest kind of argument they could lay before him—to show the invoices before the war and the invoices of to-day. I was there to defend our case if necessary, but I was not needed. The minister said, "Gentlemen, I am sorry for you. The law of supply and demand governs, and it is dangerous to interfere with that law. If you interfere and curtail the production of this particular article, you will drive the manufacturer of that article out of business, and eventually you will suffer." The hon. member for Springfield the other night told us that a combine had been established whose object it was to discourage and curtail the building of mills.

It was not a combine for which the manufacturers were responsible. The concern I

am connected with had placed an order for a new machine which should have been made and delivered by December, 1917. But when the Government commenced interfering with our business, and fixed the price so that we could not manufacture except at a loss, we said: Stay your hand and do not make that machine for us; we are already losing money; that is enough. These publishers are responsible if there has been any curtailment in the business. They have put their hand, their authority and influence on this business and they have said to the Government: We will not allow these people to make money; we must dictate the price. And they have dictated it so far. I beseech this Government, in the name of the business interests of the country and of everybody, to hesitate before they proceed too far in curtailing prices. Newsprint and wheat are the only things of which the prices have been fixed. The price of wheat was fixed at $2.21 a bushel, which was double the normal cost, whereas the price of paper was fixed at a twenty-five per cent advance. Is there any equality in that? Not in my judgment. I think I have dealt sufficiently with this matter. I have not spoken with the object of tongue-thrashing or abusing anybody. I have but stated the facts as they appeared to me, and I am pleading with the Government to give us justice and fair treatment. We do not want this industry to be made a football of for the sake of pleasing a few publishers. It is too important to the country and to everybody in it.

Now I pass on to the railway situation. I think that the taking over of the Canadian Northern railway was a rank deal put over on this country. I do not know that I could express it more strongly in view of all I know about it. With reference to the arbitration to fix the value of the stock, it appears to me that it would be a good deal fairer to arbitrate to see how much the promoters of the road should refund of the money which they misappropriated and did not put into the road at all. However, I shall not further comment on that. It is not much use, and I have expressed myself before.

But one of the questions that I do propose to say a little about is the increase in rates. A good deal of fault has been found with the action of the Board of Railway Commissioners in granting a fifteen per cent rate increase especially to the Canadian Pacific railway, who, they say, are already rich and should not be allowed to make any more money. I never had a dollar of interest in the Canadian Pacific railway and I have always given preference, as far as I could personally, to the Grand Trunk railway because that was the road I knew when I was a boy and I have grown up with it, and I kind of hang on to old things. I have understood from members of this House that the Canadian Pacific railway had been lavishly dealt with; but in looking over the reports and comparing the assistance that has been given to the Canadian Northern railway, the Canadian Pacific is not in it. The Canadian Pacific railway has received $35,000,000 in cash, 18,700,000 acres of land and two short pieces of railway. That is the total assistance that it has got, but by good and careful management it has been made a success. I venture to say that if you put the Canadian Pacific railway, with all its great prosperity, into the hands of a few freebooters, in the next ten years it would be on the rocks and appealing for assistance. A fifteen per cent increase has been granted but the Canadian Pacific railway is penalized to the extent of $7,000,000 because it is prosperous. I do not know that that is good reasoning. You are simply penalizing prosperity and good management and putting a premium on bad management when you undertake to bolster up the weak ones at the expense of the prosperous ones. You are penalizing those that are giving good service. Some hon. gentlemen have criticised this increase which has been allowed to the railways and an hon. gentleman speaking the other night said that fifteen per cent means $40,000,000 taken out of the pockets of the people of this country. Very true; probably it does. This hon. gentleman says that the farmers of the West are going to be taxed $40,000,000. I am probably as large a shipper as there is in this House. I have never had a dollar's worth of stock in the company, but I would like to be fair. We have all had some experience of what additional costs amount to. We know that coal, labour and all these necessary things are more expensive, and if you figure out the additional cost of all the material and equipment you will realize what the railways are up against. A car that you could buy prior to the war at $600 or $700, costs more than double now, and everything else is in the same proportion. Suppose you do take $40,000,000 out of the people of this country, and part of it from the West, you must not forget that the people of the West are getting for their

crop now more than they got prior to the war. What does the increased rate that the railways are getting for carrying the goods amount to compared with the increased price the farmers are getting for their goods? If you balance the thing you will find that the railways are getting a very moderate increase. I repeat that I am a shipper and that I ship as much freight probably as any man in this House, but, we want to be fair. Whilst the times are good, and farmers and all others are getting rich, we should allow the other fellow who carries our goods to market a fair compensation for his work, too.

I hope that the Government, in their wisdom, may see their way to deal fairly with this pulp and paper question. It is a very vital question, not only to the manufacturers but to the business interests of the country, and I hope the Government will not be carried away by any threats such as I have just read, even though the Press of Canada did elect this Government. It probably would have been elected without its assistance. Whether it did or did not elect it, all we ask from the people of this country is a fair show and no favours. We will take our chances and we will conduct our business as it should be conducted. The manufacturers of Canada are endeavouring to build up their industries and to build up a very prosperous country if they get the necessary protection. We believe that we are entitled to it. We are not asking it as a favour, but as a right, and something that we are justly entitled to.

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, permit me, briefly, to draw the attention of the House, to another phase of the situation developing from the application of the Budget, so ably laid before us by the hon. minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean). We have been treated to many views of this subject and from many angles, but I ask that the House look on it for a few moments, with the eyes of the West, the Northwest, at that; and let me say I am not going to treat—or ill-treat—the House to a vast array of figures.

The minister states that we must rely on our own capital and our own labour so far as we can see, to carry on our present war trade programme; and that to enable the people to do this, it is necessary that we continue to produce wealth. I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere in the Dominion can greater production for the outlay involved, be secured, than in some portions of the West. The per capita production of Saskatchewan for 1917 stood

unequalled in the world. I wish, particularly, to draw the attention of the House to the great hinterland in the northern portions of the three prairie provinces, more particularly the province of Saskatchewan. Many localities throughout this vast territory are well suited for agriculture and I wish to remind the hon. members that the farther north wheat is grown the better is the sample likely to be in the percentage of the more important constituents, which go to make up that sample. In proof of this, I would point out that the wheat produced in the Canadian west shows up very much better in competition tests than that produced farther south; and I will carry this point a little further. The wheat which has won the championship of the world on a good number of occasions, has been grown in the province of Saskatchewan, and on most of those occasions in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and which, with the exception of the Yukon, is one of the most northerly in the Dominion, a neighbour of my own, Mr. F. D. Cherry, located near Prince Albert, having won the coveted trophy twice, while on several occasions it has been won by Mr. Seager Wheeler, of Rosthern, also in the Prince Albert riding, whose research work has been worth millions of dollars to the Western farmer, and whose work, I think, the Government would be well advised to recognize in some tangible way.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I wished to draw the attention of the House to the great hinterland to the north. For many years this has been a fruitful source for talkfests, and several commissions have been appointed to investigate it; but, like many other commissions, no results ever came from them, and it was left entirely to private enterprise to prove what this northern country is capable of. Most of the talk in former years was more or less conjecture, but I think I can show what is now being really produced. I will touch on three of the natural resources which, along with agriculture, are being developed. These are now past the conjectural stage, and from these the Dominion can very materially increase her wealth production. These three are minerals, timber and fish.

The copper and gold deposits of the northeast section of Saskatchewan and of the northwest section of Manitoba are showing wonderful and almost unlimited possibilities at the present time, and I have been informed from an authoritative source that

this will develop into one of the largest mining camps on the American continent. One company which has been making extensive and expensive investigations down to a depth of twelve hundred feet, has already blocked out ore, which at the present price of copper, would total two hundred millions of dollars, or more than the total production of minerals in the whole Dominion in 1917. The reason why I emphasize the importance of copper production is that at the present time copper is very essential in the carrying on of the war. Another company has been shipping ore last year and this year at great inconvenience, having to transport it a long distance by team and water before reaching a railway, to a smelter in British Columbia, ore which runs as high as twenty-two per cent pure copper.

Another industry which is doing good work in Northern Saskatchewan is that of lumbering. I have been informed by the manager of a company, operating at Prince Albert and Big River, that they have already got the logs and expect to cut in the neighbourhood of one hundred million feet of lumber this year. This goes to show that the territory to the North, from which the logs are brought, is rich in timber and there are great possibilities for pulp factories located on almost unlimited water-powers, a fact which should be of special interest to some hon. members who have taken part in this debate. I might say in passing, that the estimated water-power of Saskatchewan is over three million horse-power, and that this is nearly all in the northern portion of which I have been speaking.

Then there is the fishing industry. This should also be encouraged, as its possibilities are very extensive, many of the lakes never having had a net placed in them. From lakes north of Prince Albert, during the season just closed, which lasts only two and one-half months, there were shipped, roughly speaking 2,500,000 pounds, mostly white fish with a fair proportion of lake trout. A portion of this was shipped to consumers on the prairies, but a large percentage was also shipped overseas for the use of the forces.

I think I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that these regions can produce a tremendous amount of wealth, and that without any very great outlay. I am not asking for a bonus for any of these industries, neither am I asking for protection on any of them. Protection is something which does not sound good to me, and I may also say that it does not sound good to the people of the West. The point which I wish to make is this: These three industries of which I have spoken are badly, very badly, handicapped by the lack of transportation, and if the production of wealth is going to help to supply the necessary sinews of war, then, Sir, I believe here is an opportunity which should not be overlooked.

I said protection was something which did not sound good to the West. We have passed through a long term of it and know whereof we speak. In this connection I would like to state that anything that has been said in regard to the western members being pledged at election time does not apply in any case that I know of. It certainly does not apply to me. As to this I would like to endorse everything said by the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), and I have no hesitation in saying that we are all hand in hand in supporting this Union Government in every legitimate effort to push the war to a successful finish, and are willing to carry our fair share of the financial burden. At the same time we want to know that what we are contributing goes to the coffers of the Government and not into the pockets of the private individual.

Mr. ARTHUR L. DESAULNIERS (Champlain) (translation): Mr. Speaker, in taking the floor in this debate I am animated by the best of feeling towards the British Empire and its Allies; I am here to represent Champlain county, one the richest farming districts in Quebec province.

Hence I feel it my duty to express in this House what I take to be the unanimous opinion of my constituents, since my opponent in the contest of December 17 last, the Hon. Lieut.-Col. Blondin, who, by the grace of the present Cabinet, is still Postmaster General, succeeded in polling only 398 votes out of a total of 10,000.

I wish first of all, Mr. Speaker, to declare that I fully approve of Canada's participation in the present conflict, this great war in which so many of those we hold dear are shedding their blood and offering up their lives on the battlefields of old Europe for the triumph of democratic liberty throughout the world. However, Mr. Speaker, I hold that we should take a rational and reasonable part in this struggle; a part proportionate to our resources in men and money. That is why the tone of these few words, Mr. Speaker, is a note of protest against the actions of our present Government, who have brought about a condition of things whereby all the energies of Canada are being practically wasted. The

British Empire with its 450,000,000 subjects has raised an army of a little more than 7,000,000 soldiers, or 1½ per cent of the total population, while Canada alone, a young country, barely three centuries in existence, has already given to the Allied cause nigh onto 7 per cent of its British subjects.

Our powerful neighbours, the Americans, with a population of over 110,000,000, have sent across the water so far only a few thousand troops. Should the war continue for some years to come it is my humble opinion that the United States will be neither willing nor able to equal, in proportion, Canada's effort. Hence I conclude that the people of this country have done their duty nobly and in doing so, have gone beyond the bounds of their resources.

Now, if we look into the conduct of the war from a financial standpoint, we find that, through the most abject favouritism, the people of this country have been mulcted in millions upon millions of dollars —the people who are being forced to-day to pay abnormally increased taxes so as to balance the public treasury. It is not necessary for me to go through the political history of these last few years and read the list of the notorious scandals which have darkened our horizon—for I wish to be brief—but if the Government wishes to economize, let them lead the way by the adoption of measures which will not run counter to their policy of economy.

Let our friends to your right, Mr. Speaker, inaugurate a programme of reclamation and of economy rather than a policy of highway robbery.

In the course of this excessive prosecution of the war the Government, there is no doubt about this, have given undeniable proof of their systematic opposition to the people of Quebec, just as the old Tory party did last session on the Lapointe motion with regard to the French language.

If the Government are sincere, if they really wish to win the war, let me tell them this: It is true the Allies require guns, munitions and men; but let us meet the chief need of those "over there" who are fighting for the liberty and civilization of the world by sending them the means of living and of fighting: food.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, food; the hungry men in the trenches seem to cry out for food and still more food while the trusts, backed by the Government, close their ears to every appeal.

At present labour is scarce because so many of our men have gone to the front.

If we want the wheat which constitutes the food of mankind to ripen and bear fruit, we need hands to care for it. Therefore, we need the help of the farmer. What shall we say, then, of our conscription of to-day which is tearing our sons of the soil away from the land and sending them in serried ranks into the trenches; what shall we say of the Government's appeal for increased production, of the convening of the provincial ministers for the purpose of promoting increased production while the Government, on the other hand, with their ridiculous way of doing things by Order in Council, are advocating a contrary policy. We want to win the war; very well. But then we should pass a law to curtail, if not indeed do away with the manufacture of articles of luxury which require so many workers, musical instruments, victrolas, pleasure cars, which entail such heavy expense, children's toys, of such questionable usefulness.

How is it that the food controller, who receives his salary from the Government, who is paid by the people of this country, forbids all excessive consumption of sugar in our restaurants and then closes his eyes to the manufacture of candy and sweetmeats which are of no possible use and which are even injurious to health? How is it that the Government encourages and tolerates pleasure cars into the construction of which enter so many things necessary to our soldiers, for in the materials which go to make these automobiles we find large quantities of brass and leather. Now, if economy were practised in these things we would arrive at much better results for the Allied cause and we would lighten the burden which is bearing down on the people.

We are living through a terrific crisis, Mr. Speaker. Does the Government wish to carry on our part in the war in a sensible and rational manner or do they wish to bankrupt the country, in the words of the hon. Minister of the Interior. The great necessity of the moment is to help the Allies to the limit of our strength. This help means building ships, transporting food and leaving our sons on the farms to cultivate them and increase their yield.

In this manner we shall no longer witness the sorry spectacle of citizens of the same country staining with their own blood the pages of our national history. The Canadian, no matter what his nationality, would have to choose between working in this country and enlisting. From whatsoever standpoint we should view Canada's part in the war we would see the youth of

our country working together in perfect harmony for the triumph of the sacred cause of the Allies, through the assiduous and constant participation of Canadian labour.

You invite the youth of Canada to give themselves to the Allied cause. But why force them into the trenches where they cannot give the full measure of their capacity, for constraint can never be a justifiable motive of human actions.

At least let the Government adopt a policy which allows a choice between enlistment and work on the farms, in the munition factories, in the shipyards. In any case the conscript will have given useful service to the country and to the Allied cause.

Let the Government adopt this means, Mr. Speaker, and there will be an end of the racial cleavage which paralyzes the efforts of those who live in this country. At last we shall see the dawn of the day when all men of good-will, united together in a single purpose, will give all that is in them for the ultimate triumph of the cause so sacred to the civilized world.

Mr. E. D'ANJOU (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the speeches delivered by the members on the other side of the House. To hear them one would think that they are not Canadians and that, to their mind, Canada does not exist. To win the war they would wipe Canada off the map.

Well, allow me to tell you that I do not entertain the opinions of these hon. gentlemen; I am a Canadian, and I am quite content with that title. I acknowledge no other country than Canada and Canada alone has all my love, and all my unswerving fedelity.

It is evident that we folks from the province of Quebec have not the same frame of mind, the same aspirations as the majority of our fellow-citizens from the other provinces of Confederation, and I may assert, with full knowledge that what I say is true, that we are the only true Canadians. We have proved this on more than one occasion and we are proving it to-day by our constant devotion to the true interests of Canada. We were born in this country and we are proud of our origin; we are the descendants of the discoverers of this country, the heirs of those who blazed the way and of those intrepid missionaries who, one day, left the enchanting shores of old France, to bring to this land of America, with the Cross of Christ, the seeds of civilization. This explains, Mr. Speaker, why we hold so tenaciously to this soil which has been sprinkled with the blood and the sweat of our martyrs and our missionaries. We are here to stay, and here we will remain. Just as our fathers were born and buried in this country, so do we intend to live and die here, too. As for myself, I acknowledge no country other than Canada and never will I acknowledge any other. Nevertheless, although I should like to see the Government take a little more interest in Canada than they have done during the last four years, I must say that I have never been opposed to Canada's taking a rational and reasonable part in this war, with the free consent of the Canadian people.

I should not like to see the Government abandon our soldiers at the front who enlisted as volunteers; but, to be consistent with my anti-conscription attitude, and faithful to my mandate from the voters of Rimouski county, I must say that I cannot accept the war budget in its entirety, and I wish to express a most energetic protest against the sums of money being voted to defray the expenses brought about by the application of conscription in this country.

Mr. Speaker, if I have the honour of a seat in this House, I owe it assuredly to my sincere and well-known views against conscription. I have given my pledge that I would fight against conscription in any manner or form, and from whatsoever source, and I intend to keep my promise and respect my pledge; and I stand opposed to the present Government while the conscription measure is part of the statutes of Canada.

I fail to understand, Mr. Speaker, how a Government which is asking the people of this country to sail overseas and fight for violated liberty did not itself hesitate one instant to violate the liberty which is most dear to the Canadian people.

Didn't the Borden Government merely to further its political ends, disfranchise a very large part of Canada's population? The Government acted like the Kaiser, taking away their political rights from thousands of Canadians to whom we had granted all the rights enjoyed by every citizen on this free soil of America. And this, Mr. Speaker, is done in Canada, under a Government which declares its willingness to bankrupt the country, in striving to avenge the violation of Belgium and to uphold the sanctity of treaties and the freedom of the small nationalities. While our soldiers are dying on the other side of the water for the freedom of civilization, here, in a British country, a Government which claims to guide itself by British institutions, has

the tremendous and cynical audacity to deprive the people of Canada of the last shreds of liberty. The Canadian Parliament is no longer consulted on questions of the highest importance, which affect every one of our citizens.

The Government, in violation of all constitutional law, even while Parliament is in regular session, passes Orders in Council which ratify certain changes brought about in a law passed by Parliament during the session which preceded the general elections. The Government evidently has gone mad over Orders in Council.

If the Government decided, some day to pass an Order in Council repealing the conscription Act, they would have my entire support and the support of all the Canadian people. On the 3rd of December last, a few days before the election, the Government passed an Order in Council exempting farmers from military service. We have the blinding proof to-day that the said Order in Council was simply a shameful political manœuvre meant to catch the votes of the Canadian farmers. Only a few days ago the Government cancelled the Order in Council exempting farmers, and at the same time abolished all other exemptions. Still the Government preaches production, and still more production. The conduct and the acts of the Government are pitiably inconsistent. How can we increase production if we take away from the land all those whose work we need so as to obtain from our soil the yield we have the right to expect? If the Government is sincere in its desire to increase production—and I do not believe that it is—there is but one thing left for it to do: keep all the farmers on their farms instead of sending them into the trenches. In this way it will attain its object and will be infinitely more helpful to the country and to the Allied cause.

I will not delay the House by arguing, point for point, the speech delivered by the Hon. Minister of Finance. I merely wish to note that the new taxes set forth in the budget speech will fall, as usual, on the shoulders of the poor man, who never ceases his sacrifice and toil in an effort to earn a living for himself and his family. When the Government puts a tax on the necessaries of life, it is the poor man who must pay, for the wealthy can always obtain what they wish, no matter what the price may be or what taxes the Government sees fit to impose. It is evident that the Government have not the slightest intention of taxing their good friends, the war profiteers, these new millionnaires, who in the course of the last four years have waxed rich by speculating on the equipment and the blood of our soldiers. Let the Government make these leeches disgorge; they would like to see the war go on for ten years more so as to continue their shameful and criminal exploitation. Instead of conscripting the blood of the Canadian people, the Government would have been more just and more patriotic if it had conscripted the millions of all these bloodsuckers, who live by the war while the blood of the poor and unhappy people of Europe is flooding the continent.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we began to give a little thought to our own poor country, threatened with horrible bankruptcy. Let us be, first of all, Canadians; let us guide ourselves by the proud and noble motto of the illustrious leader of the Opposition: "Canada, first; Canada, always; Canada alone."

On the motion of Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson) the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. MACLEAN the House adjourned at 12.46 a.m., Tuesday.

Tuesday, May 7, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 73 (Letter F of the Senate) for the relief of Frederick Ernest Zang.—Mr. Redman.

Bill No. 74 (Letter G of the Senate) for the relief of Thomas Bailey Wainwright.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 75, respecting the Protective Association of Canada.—Mr. Demers.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT EXEMPTIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I desire to draw the attention of the Government, if their attention has not been already called, to an article which appears in this morning's Journal-Press, which, in describing the proceedings of an exemption tribunal held in the city of Hull yesterday, states that fourteen exemptions were granted, all the applicants being between

the ages of twenty and twenty-three. The cases cited are:

John Burns, burner, aged 22, claimed he was sole support. Disallowed.

George Charron, merchant, 21, claimed ill-health. Allowed.

Louis Carufel, culler, 21, claimed domestic conditions render his presence necessary. Allowed till August 1, 1918.

Albert Bourgoin, papermaker, 20, claimed he was sole support. Allowed till Oct. 1, 1918.

Oscar Demers, clerk, 20, claimed he was sole support. Allowed till Oct. 1, 1918.

Auguste Guerin, employment not stated, 20, claimed domestic reasons. Allowed till Aug. 1, 1918.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I saw in this morning's paper the article from which the hon. gentleman has quoted, and I immediately telephoned the Military Service Council, who had no knowledge or information regarding it, but are having the matter investigated. It is presumed, but I am not positive as to that, that these were claims that were pending under the Military Service Act on which decisions had not been given. Any appeals by young men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two inclusive who come under the Order in Council, even if exemptions are allowed, are immediately and automatically cancelled as the men are called up for service. The Military Service Council have promised to present a report on the matter, but they say the explanation that I have given is the only way in which the matter referred to by the hon. gentleman can be accounted for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand from the answer which the Minister of Militia has given, that the tribunals are still sitting and that they have authority to grant exemptions?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The tribunals, of course, are still sitting as their functions still continue. The effect, however, of the Order in Council, which has been approved by both Houses of Parliament, is this: Any exemptions heretofore granted, or now claimed, or that are now pending, are abolished in respect of men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two, both inclusive, or in respect of any other age that may be called out under the provisions of the Order in Council so approved. Do I make myself perfectly clear to my right hon. friend? Of course tribunals have to do their work, because until men of other ages are called out, the question of exempting them must still be determined by the various tribunals, and eventually by the central appeal judge. But as soon as men of any particular age are called out—and men from twenty to twenty-two years inclusive have been called out—, this exemption, whether granted or claimed, ceases to be effective so far as they are concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is what I understood. I understood that by the recent regulations, approved by this House, all exemptions granted by tribunals, were null and void.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In respect of the young men of the ages mentioned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But do I understand that the tribunals are still sitting for the hearing of claims of men of other ages?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, because it is uncertain yet whether men of other ages will be called out under the provisions of that Order in Council. If they should not be called out then, of course, the question of exemptions would have to be dealt with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then the tribunals are sitting for other reasons than those specified in the last Order in Council?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The tribunals are sitting. As far as men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two years are concerned, it would not seem to me that the tribunals ought to deal with them once they have been called out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is the way I understand it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I entirely agree with my right hon. friend. All the tribunals would have to say with respect to these men is, "This Order in Council has been passed, and it is of no further use to consider your exemption." But with respect to men between the ages of twenty-three and thirty-four, who have made claims for exemptions, their claims must still be heard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me again. This is a matter of some importance and there may be some confusion abroad. I have understood that with regard to the men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two no exemptions are to be allowed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And that with respect to men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two all the exemptions that have been granted are of no account.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is quite so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If that be so, what is the use of the tribunals sitting?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is no use for the tribunals to sit with respect to men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two. But there are men not within these ages who have claimed exemption and whose claims have not finally been dealt with, and these must be considered by the tribunals. Do I make myself clear?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know that I understand exactly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Men from twenty to twenty-two years inclusive have been called up. So far as they are concerned exemptions are abolished whether already allowed or now pending. But there are men from twenty-three to thirty-four years, both inclusive, who are in Class 1 and who have claimed exemption, and appeals are pending with regard to them. Some of these appeals have not yet been disposed of, I believe, by the first tribunal. It is necessary to proceed with the consideration of these claims because it is not yet known whether these classes will be called out.

Mr. J. E. LESAGE (Hochelaga): I call attention to certain matters which have taken place lately in Montreal. I have been aware for quite some time that the medical examination is not as complete as it should be. Now that we understand that all exemptions are supposed to disappear under the Military Service Act as amended, it seems to me most important that the medical examination should be made conscientiously.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is proceeding to enter into a discussion. I would remind him that such is not in order at this stage.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Ask your question.

Mr. LESAGE: I want to know if a chemist or a dentist, who voluntarily reports to the proper depot in his district for military service is entitled to be examined as he should be, and how he would be classified by the medical boards? The reason I referred to the medical examination was not to discuss the subject, but simply to have an explanation on that particular point. I understand that a chemist or pharmacist who applies naturally expects to be classified by the medical board. If he should be examined and classified in Category A he is not entitled to be considered, as I understand, as eligible for service in his particular medical branch. That is why I wanted to submit this detail to the Government in the hope that they would see that the medical examination is properly done. I would like to know from the Government what proceedings should be taken and what this young fellow should do to be classified by the medical boards as he should be.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid I do not understand the hon. gentleman's question.

Major-General MEWBURN: Men reporting for service will undergo a medical examination as to their physical category to determine whether they are fit for general service or not. If a man is found fit for general service he is put in Class A, and he will join the regular depot battalion. The medical board have nothing to do with the classification of a man according to his trade or occupation. The intention is to try and utilize the services of a man where his professional knowledge or otherwise may be best for the nation. If he is a chemist and desires to join any particular branch of the Army Medical Corps, it is a question of whether there are vacancies requiring such men. I understand that in England they are trying to classify men according to their trade and occupation, whereby their knowledge will be best utilized. The medical examination made when a man reports does not go into that: It is to determine whether the man is physically fit or not.

Mr. J. ALFRED LEDUC (Westmount-St. Henry): With reference to the exemptions from twenty to twenty-two years of age, I would like to understand this matter thoroughly so that when we go before our constituents we can tell them about these exemptions—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is not in order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the question?

Mr. LEDUC: The question is: are the exemptions still in effect, or are they withdrawn with respect to men from twenty to twenty-two years old?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are absolutely withdrawn in the case of men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two years, both inclusive, but in respect of other ages the tribunals may adjudicate.

Mr. LEDUC: What I wanted to put before the House, Mr. Speaker, is this: a man who—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the other question?

Mr. LEDUC: The other question is: I want to know if a man can still go before a tribunal in cases where he has had his exemption claim in his pocket for about two months, the hearing being postponed from one day to another, and no decision having been given?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What age does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. LEDUC: Twenty-one years, going on twenty-two.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: His exemption is of no avail if he is twenty-one years. If the hon. gentleman wishes further information he might see the Minister of Militia and Defence who will endeavour to make it perfectly clear to him.

THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means (resumed from May 6.)

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the consensus of opinion in this House that the Budget speech of the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was a businesslike and comprehensive effort and that his taxation provisions are along right lines. However no taxation proposals are free from criticism and such as has been given has been mainly of a constructive character, being of the nature of suggestions with the idea that certain changes would bring the Budget still more in harmony with existing conditions. There are so many things to be considered in a large question of this kind, that I venture the opinion that were the hon. acting minister himself to go over the ground again he would himself advocate some material changes. It is not in a spirit of condemnation, but with the same helpful idea that has actuated previous speakers, that I shall venture to discuss certain items.

A feature of the Budget proposals which stands out prominently in this connection is the tax on tea. I am anxiously looking forward to the minister's explanation as to why he proposed a specific duty on tea rather than an ad valorem duty. Tea is a commodity which, owing to its universal use, would lend itself to a tax which would bear equitably upon all. Those who are in the poorer circumstances of life buy the cheaper brands of tea, while those who are in in better financial circumstances buy the more expensive brands. The result is that an ad valorem tax would bear equitably on the different classes of society. In this case a straight duty of ten cents per pound has been fixed, so that the burden is not equitably distributed. Possibly the acting minister has an explanation for this.

In this case the burden is greater than it appears, for although the tariff is only ten cents per pound, it is placed presumably on the import price of tea, on which two or possibly three profits will be charged, with the result that by the time it reaches the consumer the tariff will have increased the price of a pound of tea by twelve, fifteen or sixteen cents—and this increase will be no less on a forty cent pound of tea than it is on tea which sells at $1.40.

In the West we have always looked forward to the time in the near future when the duty on agricultural implements would be materially reduced, if not altogether eliminated. It was stated some time ago that an arrangement had been made whereby matters affecting the tariff should not be considered during this session of the House, or before the conclusion of the war. I am in conformity with hon. gentlemen from Saskatchewan who have already addressed the House, and who say that as far as they know such an arrangement was not made. For my part, I never heard of it until I came to this House. I have been confidently expecting that some reduction, at any rate, would be made on agricultural implements, thus lightening the burden resting on the farmer and bringing about that which is of such serious importance at this time, increased production. However, the West will do its duty; will bear whatever burdens are placed upon it; will even accept more or less gracefully any unfair discrimination that may be made in connection with the tariff. We reserve, however, to ourselves, the right to our opinion of those who use the tariff for their own advantage, at the same time pretending to wear the cloak of patriotism. I regret that some measure of reduction has not been made in the tariff on agricultural implements; perhaps there are reasons of State more important than I know of why this has not been done. We shall, therefore, in the meantime, in view of existing conditions have to wait, but trust it will not be for long.

The acting minister intimated that the debt of Canada is now $1,200,000,000. The interest on this debt at 5 per cent would be $60,000,000—and the principal amount is increasing by leaps and bounds. Interest charges and pensions will certainly bring the annual outlay in this connection up to a far greater amount than what was the total outlay of the Government a few years ago. This is an increasing burden which, if the present plan is followed, is to be handed down to posterity. It seems to me that the situation is not as it should be. While posterity should, perhaps, have to bear a large share of the burdens of the war, it is possible that too great a share is being unloaded on them. The remedy for this state of affairs is rather in the nature of a preventive; that is, we should pay more at the present time. Now is the time to tax the people; the people are prepared to pay and to accept with equanimity and patience whatever reasonable burdens are placed upon them. Any criticism we have to make along this line is that the acting minister has not gone far enough in his taxation proposals. Incomes might be taxed to a greater extent than they have been. I am informed that a man in England who is receiving a yearly income of $6,000 pays $900 by way of income tax, whereas a man receiving a similar income in Canada pays only $120. No matter what we at home have to pay in money, the burden we have to bear cannot compare with the sacrifice of those who are fighting our battles at the front. There is far too great a discrepancy between the $900 paid in England and the $120 paid in Canada on the same amount of annual income. I am not contending that at this time the income tax in Canada should be as great as it is in England, but the discrepancy should not be nearly as marked as it is.

As has been pointed out on several occasions, the Government should exercise the most rigid economy in the administration of all its departments. Several ministers have already indicated in what way this economy is to be brought about; others, we are satisfied will follow along the same lines. But there is an opportunity now under Union Government for practising such economy and making it of the most rigid nature, that has not prevailed hitherto under any government that Canada has had. The Union Government can set an example which all future Governments of Canada, whether Union or of the party variety, will feel it incumbent upon them to follow strictly—it will be hard for them to get away from it. I do not advocate that Civil Service salaries should be cut down, except to the extent that many salaries paid to those who are uselessly employed might be eliminated. As a matter of fact, in quite a number of cases salaries should now be increased. I might mention specifically salaries in connection with certain departments of the post office, with regard to which more will be said later.

As the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) pointed out last night, there is another way of providing for the tremendous debt that the country will have incurred for war purposes, and that is by creating as much wealth in the country as we can. As he pointed out, there is no way whereby so much wealth can be created with so little effort as by giving proper attention to our vast natural resources. With the exception of the three prairie provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, these natural resources belong to the provinces themselves. In the three provinces which I have mentioned, however, the natural resources belong to the Dominion. Vast resources have not yet been alienated from the Crown; possibly they were not known to exist hitherto, or the situation might not be as it is. Developments have taken place within the last few years which show that immense resources exist in the northern parts of these provinces which hitherto have been undreamed of. These prairie provinces have been looked upon as great wheat producing areas, solely devoted to the raising of grains and cattle. But would it be surprising to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. gentlemen of the House to know that a comparatively small proportion of the vast areas of these provinces is really known as wheat producing land, and that only a very small proportion of this is actually used in the raising of grain and cattle? To illustrate this, I point out that Prince Albert, which is looked upon as a city pretty far in the north, is really several miles south of a line which might mark the northern boundary of southern Saskatchewan. That is, Prince Albert is down in the southern part of the province of Saskatchewan, thus leaving the vast northern part of the province to a certain extent unknown land.

Some years ago a scheme was devised for the marketing of the increasing crops of grain of the prairie provinces in a more expeditious and less expensive manner. The idea was to build a railway from the wheat fields to Hudson bay. It is not

within the purview of my remarks to discuss at all the Hudson Bay railway. I do not need to argue the advisability of the construction of such a railroad on the grounds mentioned, because I know of no national enterprise that has had behind it such unanimity on the part of the people as the construction of this road. Both great political parties are pledged to its support. Both of them had this programme in their platforms. The right hon. gentlemen who now lead the respective sides of this House both spoke in favour of the project, and addresses along the same lines were delivered by Sir Charles Tupper. When Saskatchewan and Alberta were formed into provinces, the platforms of both parties in the first elections in those provinces contained provisions to the effect that it was necessary, in the interests of the country, and particularly in the interests of the West, that this road should be built. If there is any question regarding the attitude of the people of the West as a whole in the matter of tariff reform, in the matter of reducing the duty on agricultural implements or eliminating it altogether, there is absolutely no question in the minds of the people of the West, they are absolutely and entirely united, as to the advisability of constructing the Hudson Bay railway.

As I have previously intimated, the argument used hitherto has been entirely of the character stated, but a large quantity of water has passed over the rapids of the Nelson river during the past few years, and now we find that conditions have materially changed and that there are other arguments, probably of more importance than those already advanced, for the construction and early completion of that railway. It is well known that there are in Hudson bay resources of great value, in particular, minerals of various kinds, and fish. The construction of the railway will, therefore, give Canada another ocean port, and will bring to the people, particularly to the people of the West, the benefit of the immense resources which lie in and around the shores of Hudson bay. The most important feature in this connection is the fact that we now know that in the northern parts of the western provinces, and particularly in Manitoba, in which more results have been brought to light within the last few years, and in which, by the way, lies the whole extent of the Hudson Bay railway, resources of great importance have been shown to exist. Up to that time that northern territory was looked upon as a vast waste of rock, forests, water and muskeg, and the railway was simply considered as a bridge between the wheat fields of these provinces and Hudson bay, and regret was expressed that the intervening distance was so great, because there would be no local traffic therein whereby the railway could earn any revenue. In the mind of the people, the only industry in that country was the fur trade. The fur trade is still very important, producing a yearly revenue of a million dollars in that district alone, but it is the least important of the resources to be found in that particular stretch of territory.

People tell me that there are no agricultural possibilities in that northern country. There is a general opinion that land that is not of agricultural value, that territory that does not produce crops of grain or raise stock, is of no particular use. I do not for a moment admit that there are no agricultural possibilities, but I want to emphasize the fact that these are not the only important resources; that there are other resources that are worthy of taking a place beside those of an agricultural nature. But in that northern country there are great areas which are suitable for farming purposes of different kinds. It is true that there has not been definite exploration and investigation of the agricultural possibilities of that northern country, but explorers have been there at different times, missionaries have lived there, surveyors and other men have been sent out by the Dominion Government, and there are settlers in different parts of the country. I have here a number of opinions regarding the agricultural possibilities of that stretch of country, but I shall just quote a few of them. I shall start off with a quotation from an article by Mr. J. B. Tyrell, than whom, perhaps, there is no one more cognizant of the situation in the northern country. Mr. Tyrell has made many trips of exploration throughout that territory, and he has, during the past twenty or twenty-five years, paid considerable attention to it. He says:

> Incidentally we determined the existence of an extensive area of rich alluvial land in the valley of Grass river and its vicinity.

This is in the neighbourhood of a mineral deposit about a hundred miles north of The Pas:

> For a hundred miles north of the Pas the country is almost level, and the soil is often quite thin, being underlain by flat-lying beds of limestone. Thence onward almost to the end of the track the land is generally rolling and sparsely wooded with spruce and poplar. The underlying rock is chiefly granite but it

is usually covered with a considerable thickness, perhaps thirty feet or more, of beautifully stratified clay which looks as if it would yield abundant crops to the farmer if it were properly cultivated. Very few cuttings on the railroad go down into the granite rock, but there are a number which show beautiful sections of this rich stratified soil.

Mr. Dickson, of the Department of the Interior, who made a special trip of exploration and investigation into that territory, has this to say:

From 50 to 75 per cent thereof is arable land, and probably has a good agricultural future. I estimate the area of that portion included from north to south, between Wintering and Cross lakes, and from east to west, between Setting and Sipiwesk lakes, at 2,000 sq. miles. The soil is exactly similar to that around Cochrane, in new Ontario, which yields such large returns under right treatment. On well drained spots, as far north as Split lake, the flora is almost identical with that of similar sites in Riding mountains of Manitoba, proving that during the growing season these localities lie under one and the same isotherm, or nearly so. And yet Riding mountains are nearly 400 miles south-west of Split lake. Two other factors which help vegetation in this northern clay belt are the low absolute elevation—only 500 to 700 feet, and the large proportion of sunlight during the growing season.

Mr. R. H. Campbell, Director of Forestry of the Forestry Branch, Department of the Interior of Canada, in an address delivered before the Canadian Forestry Association at Winnipeg in 1913, said:

In northern Manitoba, an area approximating three to four million acres on the Saskatchewan river might by drainage works be made of agricultural value. At present lake and muskeg cover most of this area.

A start has already been made in the raising of cattle in the district around Moose lake, and has met with very great success. Several men are engaged in the business and have fair sized herds. In the future these will be increased, and doubtless other men will engage in the enterprise. The oldest inhabitant is Mr. T. H. P. Lamb, who in talking to me some time ago said that a two-year old steer which he drove into The Pas in March, tipped the scale at 1,224 pounds. It was rolling in fat and had been out in the open ever since it was a calf.

I have travelled over that northern country extensively, and while I have not gone far back from the railway, except along the watercourses, I can confirm the statements made in the extracts I have read. For a distance of a hundred and twenty-five miles north of The Pas to the crossing of the Nelson river, at Mile 240, there is a territory which compares favourably with the scrub land of the southern portion of Manitoba. The soil is a rich clay loam, with sub-soil of different kinds, and is capable of growing satisfactory crops.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What about the climate?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The climate of The Pas is practically the same as in Winnipeg, but further north it gets colder. I would not advocate the raising of wheat crops in that northern country; I think wheat crops could be raised to better advantage in the southern portion of the province. But I would advocate the raising of the coarser grains, cattle, roots and vegetables. In some places cattle can stay out all winter. Of course, there is a great diversity in conditions throughout that vast district; some places would be quite suitable for raising cattle, while others in the same latitude would not be suitable at all, but on the whole the crops I have mentioned can be grown satisfactorily. I might quote from the Rev. John Semmens, who is well known in the West, and has spent several years as a missionary in the North. He has lived in that country year after year and is therefore in a position to say definitely what are the possibilities for that country.

He says:

There are found large areas of open country and valleys of tributary rivers, where the soil is rich and deep and there grazing and stock raising could be very successfully carried on. The sheltering forests and the abundant water sources and numerous beaver dams, and the rich native grasses, would indeed make this locality ideal to sheep raisers and general ranchmen. The absence of anything like a market has hitherto kept this country from being reported of, but if a railway becomes an actual fact, Manitoba will add very much to her available resources when extension comes, and settlers will find that in soil, in wood, in grasses and in waters, this unknown land will afford comfortable homes for thousands.

But it is not in the matter of agriculture that we look for immediate development. In the last few years development has been mainly among mineral lines. Before going into that, I might touch on some of the other resources of that country. First, take timber and pulpwood. There are vast possibilities in that country for the extension of this industry. As to merchantable timber, there is a mill at The Pas with a capacity of one hundred thousand feet per day of ten hours, or of two hundred thousand when two shifts are working. If it were not for the scarcity of labour, this mill would double its capacity, but as conditions are, that will have to be a later development. The timber around there is

practically all spruce, and runs from eight to twenty-four inches in diameter. I am not prepared to say how much of this kind of timber can be found north of the Saskatchewan river, only somewhat cursory examinations have been made, but there are at any rate areas of merchantable timber sufficient for the needs of the settlers and development work in that district. Timber, of course, is a commodity which comes in very useful in the development of other resources. There are however extensive areas of timber valuable for pulpwood, and these demand careful investigation. I am satisfied that before long there will be mills up in that north country rivalling those in the East. It is to be noted that tributary to these areas may be found, as a rule, water-powers of considerable magnitude.

With regard to fish, the cold waters of the northern lakes turn out a product which is second to none in this country, the main varieties being sturgeon, whitefish, trout, pike, pickerel and several others. Eighty cars of fish from this northern district were shipped from The Pas this winter. That perhaps is not a very great quantity, but this is the first time commercial fishing has been attempted in that country, and the quantity would have been considerably more if it had not been for peculiar conditions affecting the fishing at the beginning of the season. One was of a local nature, and the other was the ruling of the Food Board. Just about the time when the fishermen were ready to go out to the fishing grounds the Food Board fixed the price delivered at The Pas at seven cents. This was not high enough to justify the fishermen going out, and a number of them did not fish at all. Shortly afterwards, the board realized they had made a mistake, and increased the price to seven and a half cents, but then it was too late, and there was not as much fishing done as would otherwise have been the case. While I do not wish to criticise the actions of the Food Board in any way—I think it is doing a good work—I would point out that when prices are to be fixed, a fair margin of profit should be allowed to those engaged in the industry, and an announcement should be made sufficiently ahead to give those affected time to make their preparations. In the case of fish, the price should be announced not later than July. I must say that the price fixed for fish last year was not high enough to justify the fishermen getting out the quantity required. It was not on a parity with the prices fixed for wheat and other commodities, and perhaps not as many fishermen will go out next year for that reason. The best of them could barely make a living at the price fixed last year, and many of them played a losing game. I have no hesitation in recommending that the price this year should be fixed one or two cents higher, in order to give the fishermen who are doing this work for the country reasonable remuneration for their efforts.

Perhaps, Mr Speaker, one of the features which has been given least attention is that regarding the water-power resources of the country. I do not wish to delay the House by going into detail here, but I have read over the reports of the Conservation Commission and of the Water-Powers Branch of the Department of the Interior, I have gathered information from far and wide, and I have arrived at what I think is a very conservative estimate of the horse-power that can be developed from the water-powers in northern Manitoba. The hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Knox), in his address last evening, gave us some information with regard to the water-powers in Saskatchewan. In the district to which I refer there may be developed the following:

	Horse Power.
Saskatchewan river (in Manitoba)	100,000
Nelson river	2,500,000
Churchill river	500,000
Hay, Burnt Wood, Grass and other rivers	400,000
Total	3,500,000

These figures, I am satisfied, are well within the mark, although we have no definite measurements or reports on a number of these water-powers. The important point is that the falls which furnish this power are in close proximity to the resources which I have already mentioned, and the development of which will be assisted by the utilization of such power. Perhaps the most important mineral deposit which has been discovered in the North is within thirty miles of a water-power from which 50,000 horse-power can be developed, and it is the intention of those who are in charge of the property to develop that power as soon as the labour situation is such that the work can be done. I would also point out that the Hudson Bay railway practically parallels the Nelson river for a stretch of about 300 miles. At no point during the whole of this distance is the railway far from the river. The river is one that drains one of the

largest areas in the world, and, while short itself, it is very rapid. It is 400 miles in length and in that distance drops 700 feet. Naturally there are numerous rapids during its course and some very considerable falls. At the points where the railway crosses the Nelson river are places where power could be developed with advantage. I am looking forward to the time in the not very remote future, I hope, when double tracking will be needed and when the business will warrant the electrifying of the road. When that takes place the power with which to operate the road will be found easy of access.

Now, I come to the final point in this connection, and it is the one which is creating the greatest amount of interest in the West. I refer to the mineral possibilities—I might say the mineral actualities—of that north country. There are three mineral districts in Manitoba, the Star lake district, east of Winnipeg; the Rice lake district, east of lake Winnipeg, and the district north of The Pas. Regarding the first named district, I have not very much to say, because I am not conversant with it. As to the Rice lake district, I do know something, because I have seen samples of gold quartz, some of the most wonderful ores that have been found on the North American continent. What this area will develop into we cannot say, but the samples are certainly marvellous. North of The Pas the mining activities extend over a much wider range. The mineral district that has been discovered so far consists of a region bordering on a chain or series of lakes and rivers extending from within the eastern boundary of Saskatchewan almost to the Hudson Bay railway. This would form the base of a triangle with The Pas as the apex, the other sides respectively being the Hudson Bay railway and the Saskatchewan river. Either end of this particular district can be reached without difficulty by the railway on the one hand and by the Saskatchewan river on the other.

At the present moment there is a dump or pile of copper sulphide ore at Sturgeon Landing almost on the boundary of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, containing almost 9,000 tons, 22 to 23 per cent copper with gold and silver also present to the extent of $5 per ton. This pile, or dump, would be worth, in round figures, over $1,000,000. This ore was hauled by teams a distance of 40 miles during last winter and is piled there awaiting its taking out by barge and boat during the summer, a distance of 125 miles, and further by railway to Trail smelter, a distance of approximately 1,200 miles. It must be a commodity of exceeding richness to stand 12 noon. such an amount of handling as that does. It needs to be handled half a dozen times, and in each case actually by hand, before it reaches its goal. However, over 100 per cent is realized on the output. That will give you, Mr. Speaker, a kind of idea of what we have in the way of copper in that north country. The mine from which this is taken was discovered in October, 1915. During the winter 1916-1917 about 3,600 tons of ore were shipped out. The owners of the mine have been so actively engaged in getting out this ore that they have not yet learned the extent of the ore body but it is known that there are over 100,000 tons of that ore in one lens. It is probable that there is considerably more than that and that other bodies will be found when further prospecting is done. Four or five miles north of this there is the greatest body of ore in the whole country and one of the greatest bodies in North America. This is being thoroughly investigated, diamond drills have been on the job now for two years, two of them having been working during that time, and a third one has recently been taken in there. The result of this very careful investigation is that from 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 tons of this copper sulphide ore has been proven up. This, however, is not of the exceeding richness of that which I have mentioned, although it is of a fair average value, about $10 per ton. It will not stand the great expense necessary to ship it out to a smelter in British Columbia and in order to develop it a railway and a smelter will be necessary in that district. These undoubtedly would have been in course of construction at the present time but for the serious conditions created by the war. It is confidently expected that in the not too remote future this body of ore will be developed in the way that I have mentioned.

Going from there to the other end of the district, to the Herb lake region, we find a gold mining proposition. The Rex mine there is now in operation, a mill has been erected which has a capacity of forty tons a day, and machinery has been installed. If this mill is not already in operation it will be in the course of a few days. Other properties there are in different stages of development. From one of these, the Moosehorn, a carload of ore has been shipped to the smelter. This was not hand

picked but was taken in the ordinary way from the shaft. The shipment realized over $80 per ton. Considering the fact that only a very few prospectors have been engaged in the work in the north country the results have been most gratifying. There were more prospectors in there at one time but they have gone out to perform other duties in connection with the war, and for the same reason, others have not gone in. The country has merely been scratched, and possibly in no other part of North America, or in the world, can such results be shown after such small effort. Were it not for the great monopolization of men and the vast expenditure of money entailed by the present great war, much greater results would have been accomplished by this time. I am satisfied, however, that we will have most satisfactory reports from this northern country, and that our expectations will be realized.

The remarks which I have made had reference only to northern Manitoba, but a similar situation, I have no doubt, exists in northern Saskatchewan, and we aleady know, to a certain extent, what the conditions are in respect to mineral resources in northern Alberta. I would therefore urge that special attention be given by the Government towards the developing and working out of a scheme whereby these resources shall be most advantageously utilized.

In connection with our returned soldiers, I have grave doubts about the number who are likely to go on farms. It would seem to be the idea of a great many persons that the majority of these soldiers are going to occupy land after they come back. From any experience I have had with them, I would say that only a small proportion are prepared to go on the land. I have talked with a number of them, and I am inclined to think that more would be favourably disposed towards the work of prospecting and investigating the northern area which I have mentioned; and I would suggest to the Government that steps be taken to provide as far as possible for the returned soldiers carrying on this line of work, that they be given the advantage of such education as is necessary for any prospector to have, and that the way for them to investigate our resources of minerals, or otherwise, be made as easy as possible. I am quite satisfied that their natural inclination would lead them along this line rather than to go into farming operations, although I have no doubt a great number will do that.

I had intended to discuss the matter of mining regulations, and kindred matters, in the Northwest, but as the time at our disposal is limited, I shall defer that until later. I shall merely say this: In connection with the possibilities of mining development in Canada, there is, it appears to me, a situation in connection with the laws of this country regarding minerals which is not conducive to such development as we would like. The Department of Mines, for instance, has no authority or control over the mining claims themselves. These are in the hands of the Mining Lands Branch of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Mines appears to be constituted more for the purpose of investigating the mineral resources of the country and of acting in an advisory capacity. To me it would seem to be a proper thing to enact a comprehensive act covering all matters in connection with mines. At the present time there is no statute regarding the taking up of mineral claims and the obtaining of title thereto. This is all governed by regulation. There may be some reason in the present unsettled times for using Orders in Council to a considerable extent; but why such matters as pertain to mining should be governed by Orders in Council, or regulations passed thereunder, is beyond my comprehension. Even the best of Orders in Council, or the best of regulations, I am told by those who know, are not as satisfactory as mining laws, even though the latter may not be quite as good in their character; but laws are certain, whereas regulations are intermittent, and we do not know when such regulations may be abrogated; and I would strongly urge upon the Government the advisability, at as early a date as possible, of comprehensively dealing with this whole matter, by incorporating all mining ordinances and regulations into one law.

Recently—I think it was in the year 1914—there was passed by this House an Act which affected regulations in connection with the holding of titles to mineral claims, whereby people who were entitled to such claims, instead of getting a patent or grant, were compelled to content themselves with a lease. There may be arguments for adopting such a policy, but on the whole the opinion of those best calculated to know seems to be that it is desirable in the interests of the country generally to restore the old order, so that when a man has done his duty on a mineral claim he shall be

just as much entitled to a patent or a grant for it as the man who does his duty on a homestead. Just why there should be this difference I do not know. There is this further ill-effect which has been wrought by the change: the mining regulations are out of conformity with regulations or laws in the country to the south of us and in adjoining provinces. The provinces of Ontario and British Columbia have enacted laws under which grants or patents are given to the holders of mineral claims, and similar laws are in force in the United States. We, therefore, find that in the country surrounding the prairie provinces there is one style of procedure, and in those provinces there is an altogether different kind of procedure. I will not delay the House longer by discussing the matter at any further length, but would strongly urge that it be taken up comprehensively and a law passed covering the whole subject.

I have sketched in a brief manner some of the existing conditions and possibilities of the great northern hinterland of the three prairie provinces, and I would express the hope that the Government will give to the development of the vast resources indicated their very earnest attention and consideration so that the greatest and best results may be obtained therefrom for the people of this country.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the financial statement which has been submitted to this House by the "alter ego" of the Minister of Finance, this year, requires to be studied with most particular attention. With the war raging throughout the world, with the famine threatening everywhere, with the economic ruin of several people; is this not sufficient to awaken those who rule this country? On such a momentous occasion, one must not let himself be carried away by the impetuosity of passion; we must not allow ourselves to be swayed by any question of feelings; reason should be our sole guide. Unfortunately for this country, for a period of almost four years, emotion and sentiment have been dominant in the councils of the Government and are still directing their management of public affairs.

The present budget is the necessary and inevitable conclusion of the way in which our dictators have ruled over this country. It is a short statement expressing their desire of affirming their strength, without providing for the requirements of the people of the Dominion, as regards man power and pecuniary resources as well.

Their Orders in Council override the Acts of this Parliament. Have they not amended the Military Service Act merely through Order in Council. The War Measures Act, notwithstanding the extraordinary powers it confers on the Government, does not satisfy their ambition. They require more than that to quench their thirst. Did they not go so far as to ask this Parliament to vote unlimited amounts for the use of the hon. Minister of Railways, and even in certain cases, without any obligation of accounting to Parliament for their expenditure? There is no country on earth, except Prussia, to-day, where a Government would dare make such an attempt at dictatorship. For once, reason got the better of emotion, in this Parliament, and only a few scraps of power have remained in the hands of the representatives of the people. It is a national disgrace for Canada that such an attempt should have been made in this House.

To justify their drastic measures, the Government, and the Prime Minister himself, tell us that we must win the war at any cost, no matter by what means. His idea was strengthened by the statement made by the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), who believes that, to attain this end, we must lay aside part of the constitution of Canada. Thus, do they not state very clearly that the Government is determined to act as dictators: let us lay aside part of the constitution, if necessary. Are we living under the rule of Ancient Rome, or are we still on the morrow of the French Revolution? However, I fail to see any Caesar or Bonaparte occupying the Treasury benches.

The revolutionary and anticonstitutional spirit that prevails in the cabinet grieves me less considering from what part of the country the ministers hail.

We also want to win the war on this side of the House; we want the cause of Justice and Liberty to be triumphant; the cause of the Allies is our cause.

That object is dearer to us than any other. We are British subjects, and it is our wish to remain such. We are at odds with the Government not concerning the end in view, but concerning the means and methods whereby to win the war which is unanimously sought for by the Allies and by the Canadian people.

What are the means advocated by either of us to win the war? What is their military or economic value? What will be the effect now and in the future? At this time when a gigantic struggle is being car-

ried on by the nations, we are justified in asking ourselves with the poet "what will tomorrow be made of"

The Government wants tomorrow to be made of compulsory enlisting of all men, without taking into account the financial resources of Canada and the necessity in which our geographical position puts us to feed the Allies and to produce more than ever before.

The Government would like to have plenty of food and they call on the people for increased production.

The duty to feed Great Britain and her Allies rests with Canada, I believe it is our foremost duty; but they want to supply the armies with men, first, last and always.

It is impossible to apply both these means of winning the war at the same time in this country today. One is the negation of the other. After so many of our people had gone to the front, the rural districts had become depopulated, and to such an extent that now comes from all parts of the country a cry for farm labour and the request that the farmers be kept on the land.

What are the various provinces asking for today? If I refer to the organ of the War Lecture Bureau, I find in the issue of March 15, the following:

GREATER FOOD PRODUCTION.

"The average Canadian household to-day has "been little affected by the war so far as food "supplies are concerned, and for this reason too "many of us do not fully appreciate the "seriousness of the situation at home—as well "as overseas— Meatless days and such other "regulations already passed may remind us of "the necessity of being economical, but a fuller "understanding is necessary if we are to not "only save at home but also economize suffi-"ciently to permit of the export of the neces-"sary foodstuffs with which to help fill the "already greatly depleted larders of our Allies.

"The principal factor, if the effort at greater "production is to be successful, is to have "sufficient farm labour for seeding and the "harvest. The land is waiting—but we must "have farm help to work it.

"Greater food production is only possible "through augmented labour facilities and with "the drain on our man-power through the call "for fighting men. the call of the munitions "plants and other war time industries, the "farmer finds himself so short of labouring help "that even to bring his crop productions up to "ordinary standards will be a hard task. But "ordinary standards will not suffice. Not only "must we feed Canadians at home, but we must "feed our Canadian boys overseas and also "help feed the peoples fighting side by side "with our men. With this end in view and with "a full understanding of all the conditions pre-"vailing, the Canadian Food Board is calling "upon the older boys of the Dominion."

(Translation.) The shortage of labour is still more evidenced by the fact that a delegation of farmers from all parts of the province of Ontario came lately to submit a resolution to the Committee of Agriculture of this House, and asked the Government to exempt from military service all the young men between nineteen and twenty-two years of age who are working on the farms, and to allow them to remain there as long as they will be required for agricultural purposes.

What about the requests made by the various provinces, as published in the issue of March 15, of the War Lecture Bureau?

Alberta was asking then—that is in March, the 15th of March—6,000 men for spring and summer work and 7,000 for harvest time.

Manitoba was asking also for 7,000 men for spring and summer work and 10,000 to take in the crops.

Ontario was asking for 7,500 men for spring and summer work, 12,500 men for haying and harvesting; 15,000 boys and 5,000 women.

Quebec was asking then 10,000 men.

New Brunswick wanted from 1,500 to 2,000 men, and Nova Scotia 2,500.

Before the Committee of Agriculture, the other day, the Western Provinces alone were asking as their share upwards of 54,000 men for sowing and harvesting, and we have nothing to give them save the help of women and school-boys.

Therefore I believe that both means are ineffective when applied simultaneously, because if you send all the men to the front you shall be without help on the farms.

When facing these facts, can we think of raising more men to force them into the fight? For each request for men we have ten for food. Without plenty of food, we cannot win the war. It will not be the soldiers alone who will win the war, it will be the food and the economic power of the nations who are behind them that will achieve that result:

Mr. Hoover, Chairman of the United States Food Commission, said recently: At the present stage of the war the question of food overshadows all others, those of economy, of strategy and even of the management of public affairs, not only among the nations at war but also among neutrals.

Furthermore, food production is recognized as one of the most effective forms of patriotism. Professor Kellog, a member of the Food Commission of the United States, and a member of the committee for the relief of Belgium, told the Americans that we must follow the example set by Germany, who claims that the production of food is on a par with the best form of patriotism.

What must we think in the face of such statements coming from men of authority, and the denunciations of those who insult our farmers' sons and the fishermen of our coasts? The patriotism of the tiller of the soil, the patriotism of the fisherman is equal to that of the warrior who goes down into the trenches. His work is just as useful. True, he toils without danger and dives without glory, but his patriotism is superior to that of his detractors who do nothing for the country or the army, who are, themselves, the real cowards, the real slackers. It is to hide their cowardice and their shame that they throw mud in the faces of their fellow-citizens who perform the work of the country. It is not they who will help to solve the food problem which is so important, we learn from Mr. Hoover, "that our inability to solve it in all its details will result fatally in our inability to solve the problem of the war in the way that all civilized nations, together with ourselves, would like to see it solved."

These words of authority would already be sufficient to cause all thinking men to stop a moment and reflect and to imbue them with a more fruitful purpose than that which guides them to-day, if these gentlemen would only consent to lay their emotions aside and direct their conduct by the dictates of reason. It would be well to reflect still further on the cable addressed by Lord Rhondda to Mr. Hoover on the 25th of January, 1918, in which he says:

> Unless you can ship to the Allies 75,000,000 more bushels of wheat than you sent up to the 1st day of January last, irrespective of what we have received from Canada, I cannot take the responsibility of assuring our people that we shall have enough food to win the war.

So this question of food is all-important and in no respect secondary to our duty to furnish reinforcements to our troops in the war zone. We must all do our best, our absolute best, to produce food in abundance. It is not in spending enormous sums of money to raise battalions of soldiers that we will attain the object desired by the Empire as well as by the people of Canada.

As regards this problem of food we should ascertain what the different provinces are doing. I note in the official publications of the Government, for instance in the Canadian Food Bulletin that Ontario intends putting one million acres under cultivation to insure the greatest possible production of foodstuffs. I note also that it is the intention of the Maritime Provinces to increase the number of acres under cultivation to 400,000, an average gain of five acres for each farm; and I note that Quebec has placed its objective of cultivation at 600,000 acres.

I observed, the other day, and several members of this House noticed it also, perhaps with regret, that Ontario farmers had come here to interview certain ministers of the Crown. They had to admit that if the young men were taken off the farms they would be obliged to retrench in their production campaign and reduce the acreage which they intended planting next spring.

I had heard, moreover, a few days previously, that Ontario was threatened, in all likelihood, with another crop failure.

I am sorry Mr. Speaker that I have not at hand statistical data in connection with last year's crop in the different provinces; however, since, on more than one occasion, members have taken the floor in this House to throw stones at the province of Quebec, pronouncing it backward and benighted, and qualifying the French Canadians as lazy shirkers, allow me to lay before you a statement of what Quebec has happened to accomplish the matter of increased food production during the last few years. Let those who have produced more and done better, cast stones at us.

Area, yield, quality and value of the staple farm crops in Quebec 1915, 1916 and 1917.

Crops.		Area.	Yield by acre.	Total yield.	Weight by bushel.	Average price.	Total Value.
		acres.	bush.	bush.	lb.	$ c.	$
Spring wheat	1915	71,000	19.88	1,411,000	59.62	1 34	1,891,000
	1916	64,000	15.00	960,000	57.71	1 86	1,786,000
	1917	277,400	14.00	3,883,600	57.94	2 46	9,553,700
Oats	1915	1,400,000	30.13	42,182,000	36.92	0 55	23,200,000
	1916	1,073,000	22 75	24,411,000	33.55	0 77	18,796,000
	1917	1,492,700	21.75	32,466,200	34.34	0 92	29,868,900

Area, yield, quality and value of the staple farm crops in Quebec, 1915, 1916 and 1917.

Crops.		Area.	Yield by acre.	Total Yield.	Weight by Bushel mesured.	Average Price.	Total Value.
		acres.	bush.	bush.	lb.	$ cts.	$
Barley	1915	85,000	26.53	2,255,000	48.79	0 86	1,939,000
	1916	72,800	20.00	1,456,000	46.67	1 15	1,674,000
	1917	165,600	18.50	3,063,600	48.14	1 58	4,840,500
Rye	1915	8,700	16.71	145,000	55.90	1 12	162,000
	1916	8,300	14.25	118,000	53.97	1 40	165,000
	1917	22,450	16.75	376,000	53.36	1 78	669,300
Peas	1915	24,400	16.56	404,000	61.14	3 47	998,000
	1915	21,600	14.00	302,000	59.95	3 22	972,000
	1917	66,457	12.00	797,500	59.75	4 51	3,596,700
Beans	1915	4,700	21.89	103,000	59.38	3 17	327,000
	1916	4,400	17.75	78,000	60.18	5 56	434,000
	1917	55,157	15.00	827,400	59.99	7 77	6,428,900
Buckwheat	1915	104,000	24.69	2,568,000	48.17	0 84	2,157,000
	1916	101,000	19.00	1,919,000	46.35	1 21	2,322,000
	1917	163,577	16.50	2,699,000	46.55	1 73	4,669,300
Mixed Grain	1915	101,000	29.67	2,997,000	45.44	0 73	2,188,000
	1916	91,000	20.25	1,843,000	44.04	0 99	1,825,000
	1917	122,819	21.25	2,609,900	44.50	1 33	3,471,200
Flax	1915	600	11.89	7,000	54.16	2 18	15,000
	1916	500	10.50	5,300	54.50	2 50	13,300
	1917	5,700	8.25	47,000	53.21	3 37	158,400
Indian Corn	1915	16,300	31.17	508,000	56.85	1 12	569,000
	1916	13,000	24.75	322,000	59.18	1 52	489,000
	1917	74,339	24.25	1,802,700	56.89	2 25	4,056,000
Potatoes	1915	117,000	149.66	17,510,000	....	0 55	9,631,000
	1916	112,000	131.00	14,672,000	.....	0 97	14,232,000
	1917	226,917	80.02	18,158,000	.....	1 38	25,058,000
Turnips and other Root crops	1915	10,200	308.25	3,144,000	.....	0 36	1,132,000
	1916	10,000	265.00	2,650,000	.....	0 48	1,272,000
	1917	70,192	224.51	15,759,000	.....	0 52	9,298,000
			tons	tons		tons	
Hay and Clover	1915	2,922,000	1.26	3,682,000	.....	15 89	58,507,000
	1916	2,985,000	1.75	5,224,000	.....	11 00	57,464,000
	1917	2,961,983	1.71	5,065,000	.....	9 58	48,523,000
Fodder corn	1915	34,000	8.61	293,000	.....	6 39	1,872,000
	1916	31,000	8.00	248,000	.....	5 75	1,426,000
	1917	69,030	8.50	586,800	.....	5 00	2,934,000
Alfalfa	1915	2,860	2.84	8,100	....	11 78	95,000
	1916	2,600	2.65	7,000	.....	9 50	67,000
	1917	3,818	2.26	8,600	.....	8 37	72,000

Note.—The areas under cultivation in 1917 are based on more exact data than were supplied in the preceding year; therefore, they are not strictly comparable to the figures of 1916.

Let part of the money which it is proposed to spend for the purpose of strengthening our military efforts be appropriated to the aid of agriculture and of the different forms of food production; leave the men in the fields instead of sending them to war, and this country will be in a position to furnish the Allies with what they need above all else: food, and still more food. In this manner we shall fulfil our duty entirely, we shall constitute ourselves a force to the Empire and to its Allies.

You should not be astonished, Mr. Speaker, if in the presence of these facts one part of the country has shown itself opposed to conscription. I was, myself,

opposed to it, and I shall continue to be so, until I have been convinced that I am at fault.

We have not sufficient men to produce the necessary food; have we enough to furnish soldiers? We evidently have not. The time has come when we must admit that we have reached the last man; haven't we also reached our last penny?

I was asking a moment ago "what will be done with to-morrow." We already know that to-morrow will see the last man gone. To-morrow will see the Allies, our brothers in arms, left without food. To-morrow will see the last penny spent; to-morrow, national bankruptcy will stare us in the face.

At present we owe more than one billion dollars. Before this session is over we shall have voted another billion to meet the needs of the country and to pay for the administrative bungles of the Borden Government.

The Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean) foretold of a deficit of over 245 million dollars, exclusive of the amounts required for the purchase of the Canadian Northern stock and other of his colleagues' fancy tastes in railways. Doubtless we shall need 150 millions more to meet these requirements; so that we find a deficit of 400 million dollars in this year's budget. This figure alone will open the eyes of the most reluctant and show them which way we are heading. The fine words of our ministers are evidently meant to camouflage our national bankruptcy. What is our credit worth at the present moment? The 47 per cent specie which we have to guarantee payment of the Dominion's notes is not sufficient to place our credit on a solid foundation either at home or abroad. At the present time are we in a position to pay the tremendous sums required by the Government to continue its work of ruining this country? We may well doubt it when we observe the Prime Minister's silence regarding his American visit. Could they, perchance, have made him the answer: "No trade nor truck with the Canucks?" And our credit is too weak to afford us a share in the money lent England by the United States. We are financially exhausted; after the last man, the last penny.

That is the state to which the present Government has brought this country: ruin, national poverty, bankruptcy, that is the price of victory that our administrators are ready to pay. What will remain of our citizens' freedom when our ministers will have satisfied the ambitions and swelled the fortunes of their friends? The people, who are forced to pay taxes on their most essential needs, will toil and sweat to keep the wolf from the door and to pay the unfairly distributed taxes of the day, while our millionaire war-profiteers will continue to laugh at the poor man's burdens and to wax still richer, immune from taxes on the privileged yield of their millions.

War profits, swelled by the blood of our soldiers, are taxed no more than others. Still they should be the first to pay. Every war industry, living on the war, and by the war, should be first to contribute to the cost of the war. These industries are temporary and in no way tend to strengthen the industries of our country for the post-bellum period. It is the industries of peace-time which invigorate a people and raise it from the sloughs of despond. What has the Government done to further the development of these latter and to insure their stabilty now and hereafter? The Government is trying to destroy, to discourage our peace-time industries. To-day these industries are barely able to hold their own; why not give them the preference over the industries of war? These are principles of justice and politico-social economy which are being deliberately ignored, the more easily to favour those who are building fortunes out of the money voted for war purposes.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the people are suffering, that they are groaning beneath the ever weightening load saddled upon them by the Government. Why not help the farmer in his endeavours towards increased production by allowing him access to agricultural implements without having to pay prohibitive duties. Why not adopt immediately a policy of free trade in food with our American neighbours. They are fighting side by side with us for the same rights, for their flag, for the freedom of the seas. In addition they are fighting to repay a debt of gratitude; "Here we are" said Pershing over the tomb of a French soldier; they are fighting for France.

Let us go back to them; let us start anew the negotiations of 1911 and find among them all we need to help our people bear the burden of the war, so that this country may be of more assistance to the Empire and to the Allies.

Is it not astonishing that our Government should have done so little concerning the civil re-establishment of our returned

soldiers? These brave men left all they had, and to-day they must be content with their poor pension of from $20 to $40 a month, according to rank. On the battlefields of Europe our heroes fell in glory; others, at this instant, are facing the German gunfire to carry on the glorious task of their brother volunteers; they have fought, they are fighting still, for their country, for their family, for their little cottage, for that little corner of the globe which is enshrined in their hearts, and where their dear ones are anxiously living and yearning for their boys' return.

Alas, what will be our answer to these brave men when they demand their share of happiness and comfort! The awakening, once they have come back, will be terrible for them. They will cry out vengeance and their voices will find an echo in the hearts of their countrymen who will then condemn, as we do, the extravagance and the inertia of the present Government. On their return they will find in ruins the country for which they will have fought in vain. What will it profit them to have won the war if the victory has cost them the loss of their own country?

Pause a moment, you gentlemen of the Cabinet, and contemplate our Canada that you are leading to ruin; reform your ways. Save what is left of our dying country. To-morrow the history of your administration will be inscribed for all time; like that of Nero, your page will be a black page; you will see yourselves buried alive beneath the ruins of our country, beneath the ruins of Canada.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): I would like to add my congratulations to those tendered by other members to the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) upon the presentation of the Budget, and upon the reasonableness of the proposals which he has submitted. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it will be agreed that the imposition of taxes is one of the functions of Government which usually produces the keenest criticism. So I have been interested to notice that the criticisms levelled at the Budget on this occasion have not been very severe, and more interested still to notice that throughout the country the new taxes have been assented to with a cheerfulness quite unusual. I think that is a very great credit to the people of Canada. Some of the taxes which have been imposed, especially the increased income tax and the excess profits tax, while I entirely agree with them, touch a great many people in such a way as might reasonably lead them to offer protest, but we have had no objection of any consequence, and the result must be very satisfactory and gratifying to the Government.

There has been one feature which has been impressed upon me by my correspondence, and that is that the tax on tea operates somewhat against the British possessions. I have no knowledge of the tea business myself, but I am told that a very large quantity of tea comes to Canada from Ceylon and other portions of the British Empire, and that recently large quantities have been coming from Java in Dutch bottoms. I presume that there should be a preference in taxation shown to the teas that come from the British Empire. But even that objection is not impressed upon me with any great force, and it does not appeal to me as being something for which the Government should be severely criticised.

But there is one question before the Government which, according to the newspapers, is to receive some attention, and which I think should receive attention; I refer to additional remuneration for the letter carriers and mail carriers of this country. We have had no definite word as to what the Government intend to do in this matter, but I am quite sure that any hon. gentleman who has regard to the small salaries paid to the men who are distributing the mail in our cities must agree that their remuneration is entirely inadequate. I trust that the Government will see that that condition is remedied, and that those employed in thus serving the public shall be recompensed in a reasonable way for the labours they perform. The duties of these Government employees are exacting and onerous. They are on their feet all day; they have the responsibility of carrying letters of great value, and, on the whole, the nature of their duties justifies their receiving better remuneration than they have been receiving. I trust that the Government will consider this matter and see that the requests made on behalf of the letter carriers are met as far as possible.

It was not my intention to make any speech on the Budget until the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) made certain reflections upon an organization with which I am connected—reflections which, to my mind, should not be allowed to stand on the record without correction. The hon. gentleman compared the Loyal Orange

association, a great loyal and tolerant institution, to Chinamen—rather to the disadvantage of members of that association. That may be due to his lack of knowledge of this institution, but he could easily have become better informed, and if he had obtained information which was within his reach I am sure that he would not have gone so far as to compare those who compose that organization with subjects of nations which we are accustomed to refer to as constituting a yellow peril. The members of this organization may have yellow as their colour, but recent events have shown that the yellow is all on the outside, and that members of this institution have not exhibited the faintest trace of any yellow streak inside, because they have done their duty in this great war in such a way as to command the respect of all classes.

I have sometimes been surprised that in some sections of the country this organization is so greatly misunderstood. I wish it were possible for me to present its real character to all the people who do not believe in it, because were I able to do that I could convince them that they are labouring under a misapprehension as to its purposes or as to any desire existing among its members to create trouble. I say that I am surprised, because an institution organized on similar lines exists in great strength and prosperity among particular classes of our population which seem to misunderstand the Orange institution most grossly. I refer to the St. Jean Baptiste society in the province of Quebec. I have observed some of the parades of this patriotic and religious society, and for colour, for music, for all things that make up a very entertaining demonstration, they have certainly been remarkable. I think I have seen nothing in Canada that could surpass a certain demonstration which I witnessed in the province of Quebec a few years ago. The organization to which I refer has the same aims as the great Orange order, with the one difference that it represents a different religion, and, perhaps, a different idea of patriotism. The St. Jean Baptiste society is patriotic, as patriotism is understood by the French Canadians, and it is religious as representing the Roman Catholic church. That is within their right; nobody ever heard a complaint from Ontario that the St. Jean Baptiste society was an evil institution and should be disbanded. Indeed, nobody has ever heard from Ontario any adverse criticism of that society. But we have heard some very bitter denunciations at times of the other organization in Ontario. The Orange order is patriotic and religious. Orangemen have a different idea of patriotism from that of the French Canadian society, mainly in this respect: that the Orange order stands for the maintenance of connection with the Mother Country—that is one of their cardinal principles. The other difference is that they represent the Protestant religion. The member for St. Hyacinthe says: "I have a right to belong to the Roman Catholic church." Surely he has. That is one of the things that the members of the association which he rather discredited, if not seriously misrepresented, not only concede to him as a member of the Roman church but is obliged to protect him in. I suppose if there is any party of extremists in Ontario, I should be called an extremist. I am satisfied with that classification, however, because I do not believe that I or those with whom I am associated are extremists. Holding the views we do, differing very sharply from some of our fellow citizens, we make no attempt in Ontario or elsewhere and have never done so, to deprive them of any right which they enjoy under the constitution. That is a feature of this great loyal Orange order. The only time in Canada's history when an agitation arose in Ontario with regard to anything that had happened in Quebec was when the legislature of that province passed an Act restoring a considerable amount of money to the Society of Jesus, an Act known as the Jesuit Estates Act. The passing of that measure aroused considerable discussion in Ontario and it is interesting to note that the men who organized that movement and carried it on, the men who were the head and front of it, were among the warmest friends that the present leader of the Opposition had in Ontario. The president of the movement was Principal Caven of Knox College. Nearly all the leaders of the movement were well known leaders of the Liberal party in Ontario. Their agitation brought to them a great many from the other side; but this is what happened. There were men in our province who recognized that that Act was within the law, that it was within the constitutional powers of the legislature of the province of Quebec. Among those men was the late E. F. Clarke, for many years a member of this House, a very prominent man, who might have been called, as I have been called, an extremist. I myself heard him at large Orange gatherings tell the Orange-

men of Ontario, who were dissatisfied with that legislation, that they were wrong; that the Act was within the power of the legislature of Quebec, that they had no right to object to it, and that it would be very unwise for them to do so. He was not the only leader in Ontario who took the same stand at the same time. As I recall these circumstances I have been greatly disappointed that in agitations which have later arisen in the province of Quebec, there were not men in that province who would take the same stand as did the late E. F. Clarke, and who would go to their people and say: "This is within the power of the legislature of Ontario, we must accept it loyally and faithfully." An organization that produces men like the late E. F. Clarke, who will stand up and oppose their friends when their friends are very angry about certain things in the light of justice, and constitutional rights, and peace and harmony in this country, is an organization which should not be discredited upon the floor of this House.

I should just like to read a few lines to show the kind of men that this organization brings together. As it has been traduced here, its true status ought to be presented. These are the qualifications that are essential for membership in this organization:

> An applicant for admission should have a sincere love and veneration for his Almighty Maker, productive of those lively and happy fruits—righteousnes and obedience to His commands; a firm and steadfast faith in the Saviour of the world, convinced that He is the only mediator between a sinful creature and an offended Creator. His disposition should be humane and compassionate, and his behaviour kind and conciliatory; he should be an enemy to savage brutality and every species of unchristian conduct; a lover of rational and improving society; faithfully regarding the Protestant religion, and sincerely desirous of propagating its precepts, i.e., charity and good-will to all men. Zealous in promoting the honour, happiness and prosperity of his King and country; heartily desirous of success in those pursuits, yet convinced that God alone can grant them. He should have a hatred of cursing and swearing, and of taking the name of God in vain; he should use all opportunities of discouraging them among his brethren, and shun the society of all persons addicted to those shameful practices. Prudence should guide all his actions; temperance, sobriety and honesty direct his conduct; and the laudable objects of the association be the motives of his endeavours.

An organization based upon these lines is one that should at least command the respect of those who do not see eye to eye with all its members. While all its members have not lived up to these requirements, they have lived up to them as nearly as the members of any church obey the injunctions of their religious teachers. Some church members come very far short of living up to the full professions of the sect, or denomination, to which they belong. That is the case with every human organization, and this is a human organization; but this is what we ought to do, and that is the kind of men we aim to have within our organization.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto) (Resuming): When the House rose at one o'clock I was going on to discuss the political side of the Orange order, which has been referred to in a way that I thought required an answer; but before doing so, I should like to say a word on its religious aspect as my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) has referred to that. He claims the right to belong to the Roman Catholic church—a right which no man in this country would deny to him. We in Ontario, or a good many of us, at any rate, claim the right to belong to the Protestant church, and the right to exercise the same privileges as are exercised by any other denomination. To show how far from intolerance are the people of Ontario, and especially the members of the Orange order, I would point out that we welcome to the city of Toronto every year a number of the Paulist Fathers, who come on evangelical missions to the Protestants of that city. I invariably receive an invitation to their revival meetings, and I attend as often as I have the opportunity. I have in my hand at this moment the last invitation they sent me, covering a period from March 10th to March 17th of this year. Our people hear the Paulist Fathers presenting their religious views with the idea of making conversions, and we say that Protestant evangelists have just as much right to make the same appeal from our side in the province of Quebec or in any other part of this country. While I have attended a good many of the meetings of the Paulist Fathers they have not yet succeeded in converting me to their way of religion, but if they persist long enough no one can say what may happen. Nobody in Canada threatens to invade this right, and as representing the extreme party in the province of Ontario, I would assure the members from the province of Quebec, as this question has been raised so often, that no man in Ontario could possibly raise an agitation that would threaten the religious liberties of any man in the

Dominion of Canada. So far as I know, there is no organization nor even a small group of men anywhere in the province of Ontario or in western Caanada that has the intention of doing anything of the kind.

As to the patriotic side of the Orange organization, which I am trying so inadequately to defend, in all their professions of loyalty, which have been derided on many occasions, they have been absolutely sincere. Since the war broke out, Orangemen have sealed those professions of loyalty with the blood of a good many thousands of their brethren, and I submit that no stronger proof could be adduced of a man's sincerity than when he lays down his life in defence of the principle in which he believes.

Our members have gone out to fight in such numbers that our lodges are depleted. I will reveal the secrets of this institution so far as to inform the House that it takes only seven members to make a quorum, and yet there are many lodges throughout the Dominion in which they are unable to get a quorum, due entirely to the fact that the membership has so unanimously gone to the defence of Canada and the Empire. How is this? For hundreds of years in this country we have been teaching loyalty in our lodges. Be the lodge large or small, whether its membership be only twenty or whether it be one hundred or two hundred members, the exercises invariably touch on the question of loyalty—loyalty to the flag of the Empire, and loyalty to our connection with the Mother Country. The result of this teaching of a hundred years is seen in the fact that from this one organization, composed of perhaps two hundred and fifty thousand members in the Dominion of Canada, over sixty thousand have enlisted to go to the front. General Sir Sam Hughes places the figure much higher, but I place it at sixty thousand, and I am convinced that figure will be verified when the returns are in from every district in Canada. That is a substantial contribution to our overseas forces. It is one of which this institution is proud, and one which should place the Orange order beyond the pale of unfavourable criticism so far as are concerned its political duties and its loyal devotion to the British Empire. We are just as sensitive as any other class of the community, and when it is suggested that our organization should be disbanded, we offer these facts to support our argument that it is one of the last institutions in this Dominion that should be disbanded. It is not only at the present juncture that Orangemen have shown this amazing loyality. If we go back in history to the year 1812, we find that members of this organization were among the Loyalist forces fighting for the preservation of Canada to the Empire. Again in 1837, in 1866, in 1870, in 1885, in the Boer War, as to-day, the members of this organization have been ready to shoulder a musket in defence of liberty, to defend the interests of the country, and to maintain its laws.

I am convinced that if reasonable men would give consideration, not to the professions but to the practices of this order, instead of wanting it disbanded they would want its principles extended the world over. I do not believe they will be extended very largely in the province of Quebec, but the Orange Order will certainly not interfere with the rights of the people of that province.

I wish in the kindest possible spirit to make a few references to what has happened since this war began, and I trust that in doing so I shall not wound the susceptibilities of any member of this House. At the outbreak of the war we were acquainted in our province with the fact that the young men of French Canadian extraction in the province of Quebec were enlisting in a splendid way. I believe it could be substantiated that at Valcartier the French Canadians did enlist in magnificent numbers. We rejoiced at that fact.

It looked as if the prediction of a very good friend of mine and a faithful follower of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would be proven to be true. This gentleman is Mr. John McMillan, who was brought up in the city of Quebec, and who, until the last few years, was a member of the Liberal party and a great admirer of the leader of the Opposition. He used to come to my office on many occasions to talk about the possibility of effecting national unity in Canada, something that he desired quite as much as I did. In the course of our discussions he used to say that, as far as he could see, having an intimate knowledge of all parts of Canada, and particularly of Quebec, that if the British Empire and France should by any fortune or misfortune be found fighting a common enemy, and should their forces be aligned together for the defeat of that enemy, it would most certainly produce that national unity in Canada which we all so much desired. I entirely agreed with him, as I think any person who looked

at the situation at that time must have agreed. When the forces were gathered at Valcartier we congratulated ourselves, he and I, that this thing had at last been brought about.

But then something happened. I am not going to discuss what happened, or to venture to make a guess at what happened. I refrain from doing so in order to avoid anything that may be considered acrimonious in this discussion. But something did happen in the province of Quebec. That flocking to the colours, which we saw prior to the Valcartier camp being formed and the first contingent going away, ceased. I might say a good deal about the stories that came to the province of Ontario, giving us the reasons for that, but I am not going to say it. I have been in the habit for many years of visiting Montreal and Ottawa, and I myself heard a great many explanations. I heard a great many things that were not creditable to certain leaders in Quebec. But the fact filtered through Ontario that recruiting in Quebec was not going on. Is it any wonder that there should be some feeling west of the Ottawa river under such circumstances? We had recruited men in the city of Toronto, in every town and village in Ontario and in the West—in fact, recruiting in the West was rather better than in any other part of the country—and we were forced to look upon one province of Confederation which was not doing its duty. When I say that I think I am within the judgment of the members on the other side of the House. But I will not pursue that any farther. I mention it only to point out that if those hon. gentlemen who represent Quebec constituencies would put themselves in our places, and if their constituents would put themselves in the places of our constituents they must agree that there would be no more feeling expressed in the province of Ontario and the western provinces against Quebec than would have been expressed in Quebec against us if the situation had been reversed.

We are told that the people of Quebec are sensitive, being a minority. Well, the people of Ontario are sensitive, and they are particularly sensitive on the question of loyalty to the Mother Country. These people of British birth have love for the Mother Country and its institutions, which arises from the fact that Great Britain is their birthplace. They are just as sensitive as any other part of the population, and that sensitiveness was very strongly felt under the circumstances to which I have alluded. If our friends from the province of Quebec will put themselves in our place and review the whole situation calmly, earnestly and sincerely, they will admit that nothing was said or done in my province which was unnatural or which called for the severe criticism directed at us by the French Canadian press. I am not going to refer to the French Canadian press. I have kept a scrap-book on the French Canadian press. I am very fully informed as to what the various papers in Quebec have been saying, and I might read a great many extracts here, but that would serve perhaps only to excite those antagonisms which I am trying to avoid. While I am trying to avoid these antagonisms, I am yet trying to put our case as we view it to the hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House and who represent the other province, and I am trying to do it in such a way that they will get our viewpoint. We are told that we do not understand the province of Quebec and that we ought to get their viewpoint. I quite agree that we do not understand Quebec as well as those who live there, and I think their viewpoint is very different from ours. Let me point out one thing that is not generally known. I think the members from western Canada are not aware of it; at least they would not have been aware of it from their reading of the general press. It was one full year before a single newspaper in the province of Ontario criticised the province of Quebec for its lack of recruiting. I make that statement, Mr. Speaker, after having recently gone over the files of the principal papers in Ontario, and I make it with this further knowledge that when the dispute arose as to the recruiting in the different provinces, I got information from the cities of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, but I, representing those people, whom they regard as fanatics in the province of Quebec, deliberately, and of settled purpose, refused to discuss it. The newspaper which represents the Orange organization did not print one word of criticism of French Canadian recruiting until after the Globe had discussed it, which was on the 29th of July, 1915. I have the clipping here. The first criticism on any lack of recruiting in the province of Quebec which was made in a public journal of the province of Ontario, was in the form of a news despatch from Montreal to the Globe under date of July 29, 1915. The Globe at that time, I think, would hardly be considered to be unfriendly to

the province of Quebec. It was then the organ of the leader of the Opposition and it was defending him and his policies with a good deal of vigour. The Globe is conducted by men whom I know, and have known intimately for a good many years. There is no finer staff on the North American continent than that which is made up of the gentlemen who are responsible for the publication of that newspaper. I know Mr. Stewart Lyon. I worked with him for many years; I know Mr. John F. Mackay, the business manager, and I know that there are not two more public spirited men in Canada than they are. I make that statement without reference to the question whether we agree or disagree. I do not agree with them on many political questions but I know their sincerity of purpose and I know the reliability of the Globe newspaper which first published this matter. I feel that any paper in Canada would be free to copy its statements and to refer to the facts that were contained in any of its articles. The papers in Quebec have been telling us that the existing friction arises through our insulting the people of Quebec.

Mr. J. BUREAU (Three Rivers): That statement is true.

Mr. HOCKEN: I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said, but it does not matter. The fact is that for one full year there was no criticism of any kind by any newspaper in the province of Ontario. The men in our province who are styled fanatics, showed remarkable restraint. They were sending out their young men by the tens of thousands when they had reason to believe that another province was pursuing an opposite course, and was retarding and restraining its young men who wanted to go to the front. I say that those people in Ontario showed remarkable restraint in not making any criticism for one year after the policy to which I have alluded became apparent. I was determined, Sir, that so far as I could control it, the newspaper organ which represents the Orange order should not be the first to be chargeable with saying things by way of harsh criticism of that particular element of our population. Now I am not going to place the responsibility for what was done in Quebec. But it is only fair to say that in Ontario practically every pulpit was a recruiting centre, and practically every public man was out on the hustings urging our young men to enlist. Whether that was so in the province of Quebec I am going to leave to hon. members opposite to state,—a good deal might be said in that regard which I do not wish to say.

I think it is true of the province of Ontario, as of the provinces west of Ontario, that we keep our politics pretty much apart from all religious issues. No religious leader in the province of Ontario can bring to bear, in political matters, any influence other than his powers of persuasion with his people. I am not going to discuss the question as to whether in another province much more extensive powers are sometimes exerted; but in our politics we are absolutely independent, and that particularly refers to the element of the population of which I am speaking. You will hear it said in our own province that that element is a Tory organization. Nothing could be further from the truth, although it might perhaps be said that the majority of those connected with it are Conservatives in politics. But the explanation for that goes back a long way, and it might be interesting to the House to know its genesis.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: This was how it began: It was about the year 1870, or sometime in the sixties—I was too young to have the exact date fixed in my mind—that the late Hon. George Brown ran an election campaign with the late John Hilyard Cameron in the city of Toronto. The latter was the Grand Master of the Orange association, and the Orangemen of Toronto voted for him. That incensed Mr. Brown to such a degree that from that day forward, as long as he occupied the position of editor of the Globe, he denounced the Orange organization. The entire party press took up Mr. Brown's denunciation and it has almost become a habit for Liberal papers in the province to curse that association. The result was that it had the effect of keeping out of the association the very men the Liberals should have wanted in it, because, being a democratic and liberal organization its principle should have appealed to Liberals.

Going back to the year 1896 we find that the men connected with the Orange order supported the right hon. leader of the Opposition. At that time there were four constituencies in the city of Toronto. Two of those constituencies elected supporters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the candidates for the other two constituencies were compelled to pledge themselves not to support the policy of the then Tupper Government. I sat in Massey hall, Toronto, in the early

summer of that year and saw an audience, composed of these young men who are described as Tory fanatics, refuse to give the Prime Minister of the day, Sir Charles Tupper, an opportunity of speaking, so enthusiastically were they at that time supporting the leader of the Opposition. Coming down to a later date, in order to prove the political independence and loyalty to principle of these men, I could refer to happenings in the province of Manitoba when amendments to the School Act were enacted, which seemed then to threaten the integrity of the public school system. The members of the Orange order had been in the main supporters of the then provincial government, but upon their refusal to repeal the amendments complained of, the Orangemen of Manitoba went to the polls and defeated the administration, and placed in power in Manitoba a Liberal government, which fact I am sure will satisfy hon. members opposite that it is not a political organization with the one purpose of voting to keep a Tory government in power.

I have but a few more words to say. I would like to mention to hon. gentlemen opposite what the province of Ontario, and the provinces west of it want from the province of Quebec. It is not a very large or unreasonable request, and I think it is one that men who are anxious to bring about national unity should be very glad to concede. What the other provinces want from Quebec is a recognition of their obligations of citizenship, and a respectful and obedient observance of the constitution of the country. I submit that this demand is not unreasonable. It is because the people in the province of Quebec have been unwilling to accept Senator Belcourt's interpretation of the constitution, that much of the existing acrimony and friction has arisen. Let the people of Quebec loyally accept the provisions of the constitution as we have accepted them. There are features of the constitution which are not altogether acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite, and there are features of it which are not acceptable to us. There are provisions in the British North America Act which the people of Ontario and of the western provinces would wipe out to-morrow if they had the power. I submit to you, Sir, that there has never been a community in any country that has more loyally observed its constitutional obligations, notwithstanding the fact that there are obligations with which they do not agree, than have the people of the provinces of Ontario and the West. All we are asking is that the same spirit shall be manifested and expressed by the people of all the provinces. And, Sir, if that happy condition had existed loyally at the beginning, I think there would have been none of this unfortunate friction.

The people of Quebec have certain special privileges defined by the constitution and confined to their province. We say to them: We make no attempt to infringe those privileges, but you must not extend those privileges over the rest of the Dominion of Canada; they have no constitutional effect in the other provinces and they should be confined to the province for which the British North America Act provides them. We welcome French Canadians to the province of Ontario if they will come in the spirit of obedience to our law. If we go into Quebec we go in the spirit of obedience to the law of that province; we recognize the power of its legislature to enact laws within its own sphere. We say to those coming to our province: You must recognize the power of our legislature to enact laws within its own sphere. If objection can be found to that principle, I submit that it is unreasonable.

But if the French cannot live happily in Ontario, they have room enough in their own province. They evidently find it to their advantage to come to Ontario, and there is no objection made to their coming. The only thing we do object to is that they should bring with them ideals which are repugnant to the ideals of Ontario, and for which they have no constitutional warrant, and which the people of our province will not submit to. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario has not interfered with the domestic affairs of Quebec, but Ontario has contended that the principles upon which Quebec is governed shall not apply to her. There is no party in Ontario advocating interference with the province of Quebec. But there is a settled determination not to permit the French to establish their special Quebec privileges in our province. I say in all frankness that the British Canadians are ready to co-operate with the French Canadians to unite in building up a great free democracy, but it must be based upon obedience to the laws and the constitution. If they are unwilling to co-operate on that basis, they may depend upon it that the people of Ontario and, I believe, the people of the western provinces will with all the influence they possess resist the attempt to impose upon Canada any ideal of national life which they consider to be lower than

that they now possess, and which they have inherited from their forebears, and the maintenance of which they believe to be necessary to make Canada within this century the most powerful and prosperous nation in the world; a nation which I dare to hope will make a contribution to the advancement of civilization and liberty equal to, if not greater, than that of any nation on the earth to-day.

That is the ambition animating the English-speaking people of this Dominion. They see in this emergency the necessity of making enormous sacrifices if they are to achieve this high destiny. That is why feeling exists in some places because of the indifference heretofore of the people of Quebec. And I ask hon. gentlemen from Quebec to give consideration to that sentiment, because it springs from the highest and holiest motives which stir the human heart. I intended to say before, Mr. Speaker, but you will allow me to interpolate here, that, speaking for that extreme faction I have referred to, we believe the French Canadian is potentially as good a citizen as there is in the world. We have not called him a coward; that charge has been made in the French papers, but not by us. Some of us have read the history of France, and know that the same blood flows in the people of Quebec as in the veins of the men of France. We look over their history, we see their heroic conduct to-day and we are forced to believe, and we want to believe, that those who are of that language in this country have the same possibilities and potentialities as the men who are valiantly holding the lines against the Huns. We ask the French people of Quebec to recognize the situation and be loyal to that Act of Confederation which is our constitution, accepted by their representatives just as it was accepted by ours.

We have heard some eloquent appeals and pleas for national unity in this House and in many other places. In trying to achieve that aim, Sir, we have a difficult task, rendered difficult by the fact that the makers of our constitution incorporated in it two disintegrating elements which stand there now, which probably will stand there, and which will, in my judgment, make absolute and complete national unity an impossibility. These two disintegrating features of our constitution are the two languages and the two sets of schools. There is no proposition from our side to interfere with them. That being the case national unity depends upon one thing and that is that the advocates of these two principles, who regard the dual langage and the separate school as among the vital and sacred things to them, shall accept the situation as it is and shall not try to extend these privileges to the province of Ontario or to other provinces outside of Quebec. I am quite satisfied that if they will do that there will be no friction between any other province and the province of Quebec. If they will not do that, then I submit there is nothing else for the English-speaking people of Canada to do, than to resist the attempts to impose upon them something in which they do not believe, in which they never did believe, but which was conceded to the people of Quebec in order that they might enter Confederation freely and voluntarily and take their part as citizens of Canada. In the acceptance of the situation, Mr. Speaker, we can reach, if not a complete, then a very considerable, degree of national unity. But if not in that way, then I cannot see how else it can be accomplished. I put the onus upon the leaders of the province of Quebec to bring that unity about.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect when speaking on the Budget that I would have to discuss the Orange Sentinel's orthodoxy, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hocken) has chosen to deliver a lecture on the ideals of the Orange party and of the Sentinel, which he edits. I shall, therefore, for a few moments, reply as best I may to the very specious arguments brought into this discussion by that hon. gentleman.

I wish at once to correct one of the views to which he gave expression. The hon. gentleman has been very kind—indeed, over-generous—to the French Canadians. He has conceded that the French Canadian is "potentially" as good a British subject as any British-born or any Anglo-Canadian. Let me add a little rider to my hon. friend's definition. The French Canadian, I am proud to say, is not potentially but actually as good and as loyal a citizen as any British-born or any Anglo-Canadian in this free Canada of ours. It is because some people of my hon. friend's ilk choose to consider their fellow men as inferior beings that the other fellow—to use my hon. friend's word—resents such assumption on the part of an alleged superior race. My hon. friend aptly defined himself this afternoon—and I must congratulate him for his sincerity—when he said, "I am an extremist; I represent

the extremist views of Ontario." Mr. Speaker, the bane of this country is the extremist. My hon. friend said a moment ago: I will tell you what we the people of Ontario—and this reminds me of the "three tailors of Tooley street" and the editors of the Orange Sentinel—expect from the province of Quebec; and he then gave his charitable advice without charge. Will he allow me to retort what we, the "potentially" good citizens of Quebec, expect from the true Britishers of Ontario? We expect that the President of the Council, who specially represents Ontario in the Cabinet, will forthwith appoint a special censor with a lucrative salary and locate him at the Sentinel office so that he may delete from that paper the incendiary articles which are being published every week with a view to inflame racial and religous passions.

My hon. friend says: But you do not know what are the aims and objects of the Orange Order. I do not care to know them. This is a free country; the Orange Order has been legalized by Act of Parliament, and I do not object to its existence. What I object to is that the Orange Order, through some of its members, should claim the monopoly of loyalty and fidelity to the British institutions. There is no such monopoly in Canada. There is as much loyalty in the St. Jean Baptiste Society, the St. George's Society, the St. Andrew's Society, the St. Patrick's Society, the St. David Society, as there is in the Orange Order. The St. Jean Baptiste Society, referred to by my hon. friend, is a French Canadian national organization. It was founded in 1834 at Montreal. Its first celebration was held in the gardens of a Mr. Macdonald, a good old Scotchman—the Scotch and the French never had any quarrels. The first president of the society was Mr. Duvernay, editor of La Minerve, and the song of French Canada—"O Canada, mon pays, mes amours"—was heard for the first time at that meeting. It was composed and sung by a young student who later became the great leader of the Conservative party, Sir George Etienne Cartier. The St. Jean Baptiste Society has on its crest the words " Rendre le peuple meilleur " to improve the people —that is to say, to educate the people, to preserve their national traditions, to preserve their language, too—the language which has been so mercilessly assailed in Ontario through Regulation 17—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —the language which was denied privileges which were given to the German minority in Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that he would circumscribe the French language to the province of Quebec. Half the words of the English language are French words. I can take the last issue of the Orange Sentinel and show him that fifty per cent of the words which appear in that paper are of purely French extraction. The English language is partly French and partly Saxon. By the way, I stand for British, not for Saxon ideals. His Majesty the King has adopted the expression " House of Windsor," instead of " House of Hanover "—and I, following the example of my King, will stand for British, not for Saxon ideals. The attitude of my hon. friend and his compeers of the Orange Order with regard to the French language is ungenerous and unBritish; they should at least during this war respect the language of Joffre and of Foch.

My hon. friend read to the House the guiding principles of the Orange Order. These aims as he read them are not in question. What I object to is the wrong use made of these principles and aims, so lofty when they are read. What I object to is that the Orange Order should import into this country the bickerings, the contentions, the miseries which have desolated old Ireland for so many centuries. Lessons of loyalty from the Orange Order? Do we not know contemporary history? When the King, Lords and Commons of England had passed an Act of Parliament in the old British fashion, by the majority of the elect of the people, what did Sir Edward Carson, the leader of the Ulster party, do? Did he not promote a rebellion in Ulster, at a time when the Germans were planning the great war which broke out a few weeks afterwards? No lessons of loyalty from the Orange Order for me. My hon. friend has given us some advice; let him accept some from me. Let me suggest to him not to make of the Pope of Rome the bogey that he is making of him every week in his paper. He should remember that in 1914, for the first time since the Reformation, a British ambassador was sent to the Vatican, and if His Majesty George V is wise enough to have an ambassador at the Vatican, to confer at times with the Pope of Rome, surely my hon. friend, as a superloyal British subject, will refrain from those innuendoes against the personality of the Pope of Rome. He should also remember that one of the leading Protestants of the Nineteenth Century, speaking of the Roman

Catholic Church, said that no one could deny that at least it was a great school of respect. My hon. friend, for reasons of his own, perhaps in order to avoid discussing the income tax, brought in the Jesuit Estates Act. I shall not relate the history of the Jesuits on the continent of America. If I had to offer a prize to my hon. friend, my sweet revenge would be to send him Parkman's History of the Jesuits on the North American Continent. He would learn there that the Jesuits were the pioneers of America; that not a hill, not a mountain, not a lake, not a river, was discovered without the presence of the black robe. At Washington, in the Capitol, under the dome —the Tories being in office trucking and trading with the Yankees, my hon. friend may now go there—would find that an overwhelming Protestant American majority have erected a monument to the memory of Father Marquette. In spite of my hon. friend—perhaps because of him, as some day there will be a reaction—I do not despair of seeing, under the roof of the legislature at Toronto a monument to the memory of the Jesuit martyrs, Fathers Lallemand and Brebœuf, who evangelized the province of Ontario before going to their martyrdom in the state of New York. Perhaps such a monument would be an object lesson for the descendants of my hon. friend.

My hon. friend knows that, under the French domination, the Jesuits received from the King of France certain estates. My hon. friend knows equally that the Order was dissolved by the Pope of Rome. Then the cession of Canada to Great Britain took place—because we were never conquered, we were ceded.

An hon. MEMBER: History disproves that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is why the treaty of Paris was so benevolent to us. After the cession of Canada to Great Britain, when the British Governors took over control of this country, the Jesuits' estates escheated to the Crown; but later on, when the Order was reorganized, and when we were granted free constitutional, responsible government, Queen Victoria, because this occurred during Her late Majesty's reign, decided to dispose as she pleased with the Jesuits' estates. In other words, the Government of the province of Quebec, under the late Mr. Mercier, undertook to divide the revenues of those estates between the two sections of our population with a view to promote the cause of education. One share went to the Catholics, and the other share went to the Protestants. The minority in Quebec accepted it quite willingly and was very grateful to the late Hon. Mr. Mercier for his action in the matter. The agitation against the Act did not arise from the Protestants of Quebec; it arose from the Order of which my hon. friend is a noble representative; it came from the province of Ontario.

Mr. HOCKEN: From the Liberals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When, later on, the question of disallowance came before Parliament, Sir John A. Macdonald, who was a great Canadian, said: "No, this is a provincial statute which the province of Quebec has constitutionally the right to enact and the Dominion Government will not interfere." The views of Sir John A. Macdonald were shared by the then highest authority on the constitution, the late Hon. Edward Blake. That is the history of the Jesuits' estates. All the agitation came from the troublesome element, from the extremists, as represented to-day by my hon. friend in this House. I wonder why my hon. friend brought again into the debate all those contro-

4 p.m. versial issues. He is, of course, an extremist. He admits that. He must therefore create trouble. The circulation of his paper would be nil if it did not contain those rabid articles against the Pope of Rome and against that French minority which diabolically intends to dominate the majority in Canada. What a great compliment to the English people of this Dominion of Canada, that Quebec might dominate the majority! Let me repeat to my fellowmen of British blood and of British ideals what that sturdy old sailor, when the Titanic was foundering, said in the midst of the Atlantic ocean: "Be British!" he said to his sailors and to the passengers on board. I say to my fellowmen: Be British! do not be Prussians, as you are asked to be by such articles as are weekly published in the Orange Sentinel. After all, the British should not be afraid of the French.

Mr. EDWARDS: They are not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Bear in mind that, on this North American continent, the French can never aspire to dominate the English-speaking people. From the Gulf of Mexico to the Polar sea—where the Orange editor should be relegated, — there are in round figures one hundred million English-speaking inhabitants, and there are not five million French-speaking persons, Lousiana included. Be not nervous.

The five millions French can never dominate the one hundred millions of English-speaking people. The British Empire, to which we are proud to belong, is ours as much as it is yours, Mr. Speaker. It is made up of a diversity of races and of creeds. No one in this free Empire should dominate, and no one should be dominated either. We are all equal before the law, and it ill becomes some people to look upon the descendants of the founders—the pioneers of this country—as domestics and inferior beings. We will not be the inferiors of any one; we are not your superiors, but we will not be your inferiors; we are all equal before the law. Possibly my hon. friend has not read the memoirs of Sir John A. Macdonald published by his secretary, Sir Joseph Pope. Let him read them, and he will find there some very ominous words. Sir John A. Macdonald was a big Canadian. He once said that in this country there was no conqueror and no conquered, that all Canadians under the British North America Act were equal one with another. Let him also read the speeches of Hon. Edward Blake—the history of his life has not yet been published, but I hope his brilliant son-in-law, Professor Wrong, will stop making Imperialistic speeches for the Round Table clubs and follow out his idea of some years ago, when he was a fervent Grit, of publishing the Blake papers—and in one of his speeches, referring to the minority, he will find this sentence:

> The measure of justice to be served to the minority of this country should be not only full, but abundant and over-heaping.

That is the proper spirit to foster if we would all be true Canadians, true patriots, and true Britishers. If my hon. friend will accept from me the remedy, the patent medicine which would cure this country of all its racial evils, he will please take a few sips now and then of the beverage known as the milk of human kindness, instead of offering me and my compatriots the cup of bitterness. Or, if perchance the President of the Council should remove the prohibition law from the Statute book and should my hon. friend revert to the moderate use of good old French wine, I would advise him to temper it with some water. It is an old French proverb, "Il faut mettre de l'eau dans son vin," or "One must pour a little water in his wine." Does my hon. friend appreciate the philosophy of that proverb? It means that in a country like Canada, with many races and many creeds, there is no room for extremists like my hon. friend. This is a country of compromise, of mutual concessions, where even prejudices as well as virtues must be respected.

My hon. friend admitted that at the beginning of the war French Canadians enlisted in good numbers at Valcartier. That the Jean Baptistes were numerous there, he granted. Was the cause in which we are engaged more sacred at the beginning of the war than it is now? Was the Empire in greater danger in the month of August, 1914, than it is now? True it is that French Canadians enlisted in large numbers from all parts of Canada; they were splendid soldiers, and my friend asks how is it that suddenly all recruiting stopped? There must be a reason. Has my hon. friend ever inquired why recruiting among French Canadians was not so popular after the first year of the war? Of course, he has made inquiries, but from his own prejudiced angle of vision. Let us have the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Mr. EDWARDS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hear the voice of the statesman from Sharbot Lake. The House of Commons is a big pond, but it is nothing when compared with Sharbot Lake, in Frontenac county. My hon. friend admits that the right hon. leader of the Opposition and French Canadian leaders generally did their duty well at the beginning of the war. The famous 22nd Battalion was the result of my right hon. leader's campaign in the first months of the war. I myself was chairman of a committee in Montreal which recruited the Asselin Regiment. We had no difficulties in raising the two regiments as the people responded magnificently. But when the Orange Sentinel and other papers kept systematically insulting French Canadians, labelling them as shirkers, slackers, and as disloyal people, they resented those attacks bitterly, and lost their enthusiasm. My hon. friend forgot that they were a rural population and had not the same opportunities for enlisting in as large numbers as the men in the industrial centres of Ontario. He also forgot that they had been separated from Europe since three hundred years, and had therefore not the same links with the old land as the British born and Anglo-Canadians. When, moreover, the French Canadians saw the privileges granted to the minority by Sir Oliver Mowat, a man of broad vision and noble ideals, being disregarded by the provincial legislature of Ontario,

they paused. Be that as it may, conscription, against the best judgment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and against the sober judgment of the country, was forced through this House by closure. The referendum was voted down by Parliament. To-day, after the campaign of hysteria which ended in the victory of Union Government on the 17th of December last, the French Canadians and all those who were opposed to conscription are at last being vindicated—by whom?

By the Ontario farmers, by the members who represent farming constituencies in this House and who form part of the Committee on Agriculture, as I shall show in a few moments. Yes, Sir, the Quebec habitant is being vindicated by the Ontario farmer. I have said, not once but ten times, and I repeat it here, Mr. Speaker, that there is no great difference between Jack Canuck and Jean Baptiste. There is this difference that Jean Baptiste thinks aloud—the French blood is responsible for that—and Jack Canuck thinks silently, but in the long run they both think alike. Jean Baptiste was against conscription and he shouted his opposition to conscription. Jack Canuck was against conscription but he was quietly told by the ministers of the Government to "produce, produce; conscription is not aimed at you; it is for the other fellow in Quebec; you will never be conscripted; therefore, vote for the Tory Government." Sir, the handclasp given to the Ontario farmer was nothing less than the handcuff. The Ontario farmer realizes it to-day and he came here the other day to protest—five hundred strong. A friend of mine from the Senate who is somewhat of a cynic and a fellow Tory senator were on their way to the committee room where the sturdy, horny-handed, tan-complexioned Ontario farmers were sitting silently staring at the Hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell). This Tory senator said to the cynical Grit senator,—if there are any Grits left, Mr. Speaker: "Where are you going?" The latter replied: "I am going to the circus; there is a delegation of French Canadian habitants that have come to ask Major-General Mewburn to repeal the last Order in Council. They say they were promised that there would be no conscription of the habitants." The Tory senator said: "No, you are mistaken; it is not the French Canadian habitant; surely it is the Ontario farmer." "No, no," replied the cynic, "it is a delegation of habitants; were they not the only ones to oppose conscription?" They reached the committee room and the cynic disappeared. But, to his awe and consternation, the Tory senator saw the chickens coming home to roost. He was heard stating after the interview: "Old Abe Lincoln was right. You can fool some of the people some of the time, you can fool some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." If my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will now permit me to repeat the language of a Unionist Grit, he said, after he had left that meeting, "After all, the old chief was right." I repeated the story to my leader, and his only comment was: "It is my revenge; I am glad of it." But, as I said a moment ago, I did not rise to discuss the Orange orthodoxy nor the Military Act. I never dreamt I would be called upon to fight the battle of the Boyne in the precincts of the House of Commons.

I shall now proceed with my remarks on the Budget speech. Let me say to my hon. friend the hon. Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who is now in his seat, that I cannot congratulate him on the speech which he delivered the other day. I do not deny his ability. You know, Sir, that every Nova Scotian is able. No province has given to this Dominion Parliament such a galaxy of statesmen as the little province by the sea. But I cannot congratulate my hon. friend on his speech, because it is not his own; he only read the speech of the real Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). As was said in days of old, "The voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was the hand of Esau." In my judgment there has been no change of Government, but I am sorry to say that on the part of my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance, there has been a change of heart. Yesterday he sat on this side of the House and he was the much vaunted financial critic, to-day he is Minister of Finance in a Tory Cabinet. I cannot congratulate him, Mr. Speaker, but I hasten to say that he has all my sympathy. It is hard anyway to quarrel with such a genial friend. The most that any one can say against him is that if his convictions are weak his intentions are honest. My hon. friend knows that I have always had in store for him much true friendship. Will he allow me to speak to him as a candid friend? Since he has taken the plunge, and crossed to the other side of the House for the time

being I hope, may I warn him against that wily financial ring which defeated the reciprocity pact of his then leader the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) under circumstances much similar to those which existed in the election of 1917? It is extraordinary, and here I quote from memory from an English historian, how dull the English people sometimes are. The French are a vivacious race; the English race is dull. I would like to inject some of that French vivacity into my fellow-members of English origin.

The member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) knows full well that the people of Canada were stampeded in 1911 with the same flag-flapping that stampeded the people in the month of December last. But yet there were Grits--political heirs of George Brown, of Alexander Mackenzie, of Blake, of Cartwright and of Edgar—who were carried away also. They are so honest that they believed what some other wily, crafty people whispered to them. I want to warn my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean), because I look for the ultimate salvation of his soul politically, I wish to warn him against that financial clique that defeated reciprocity under false pretenses. I want to warn him against the buccaneers who are already shadowing him in the lobbies of this House in the hope, or rather in the quest, of further subsidies for the Canadian Northern. He knows what happened as the outcome of many conferences which took place last year—strange coincidence—at the Chateau Laurier, between Sir Clifford Sifton and Sir William Mackenzie. Oh, what would I not give, Mr. Speaker, to get the book of the recording angel, as Mr. Dooley said, and know what passed between those two knights. Yes, I am honest and sincere in warning my hon. friend that if he wishes to live up to his reputation of sterling integrity he must take great care not to be seen with the buccaneers, whom he knows just as well as I do, because he fought them when he sat on this side of the House; he must not only not be seen with them, but must not be influenced by them in these days of stress and storm. If he should succumb during the present session to their wily arts, it may be his lot to receive what the right hon. the Prime Minister received the other day —a visit from the sturdy farmers of Ontario, and there are farmers in that province, especially among the Scotch, who know their arithmetic. Would my hon. friend allow me to say why I cannot congratulate him upon his Budget speech? It is because he has not lived up to our expectations. When he sat last year on this side of the Chamber he criticised very bitterly—I should not say bitterly, because my hon. friend is not bitter—but he criticised very severely the Minister of Finance. He claimed that there was an opportunity of administrative retrenchment which would amount to $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, and he said: Be bold and strong in the crisis! Let me ask what retrenchment has my hon. friend accomplished? I give him credit for having reduced the main estimates this year by some two, or, let us say, three million dollars in round figures, but this is very far from thirty or forty million. It is true that I have no ministerial responsibility here, but I have my responsibility as a public man and, I hope, as a patriot, and I say to the Acting Minister of Finance that it is possible at the present time, when the people are being bled white in order to reinforce the boys at the front, to repeat a homely phrase, to reduce the expenditure of this country by at least $50,000,000. My hon. friend last year spoke of a possible reduction of thirty or forty million. I say that this year, in view of the impending crisis, a reduction of $50,000,000 would be hailed by the people, Grits and Tories alike. But alas! the Acting Minister of Finance has not carried out any such policy. He said further last year that the time to secure or impose a tax on business profits is when the maximum profits are being earned. Has my hon. friend lived up to our expectations? Has he increased the revenue from the tax which he was entitled to receive from the profiteering companies? Why, Sir, I have a list which would fill a Doomsday book, of industries in Canada which before the war yielded something like seven or eight per cent on their investment, and which today realize as much as the capital which they had originally invested in their business. I say that my hon. friend should take heed of the present hour, and should not permit those companies that are piling up millions out of the agony of the nation to escape without further taxation. I do not object to the tax on tea or coffee, I do not object to the tax on automobiles, I do not object to the tax on tobacco; but my hon. friend knows that by taxing tea, coffee and tobacco he is hitting the poor man. Why should he let escape the Canada Cement Company, the steel companies, the canners, and various other enterprises that I could name? Last year the hon. gentleman advocated the removal of the surtax of seven and a half per cent on the general tariff. He

said that it did not permit the development of trade but rather impeded it, and that it involved hardship to the masses of the people. I ask my hon. friends, from the other side of the House who hail from the western provinces and who are not a party to the famous unwritten agreement—the more dangerous because it was unwritten,—has the Acting Minister of Finance lived up to the expectation which they entertained of him? He said last year that the surtax of seven and a half per cent on the general tariff should be removed because it did not promote but rather impeded trade, and that it involved hardship for the masses of the people. And yet he comes before Parliament with financial proposals intended to meet the situation, and does not remove the surtax which he formerly criticized. He blamed the Government for superseding the authority of Parliament by Orders in Council, because, forsooth, a short time before the opening of last session, the late Borden Government at last removed the duties on wheat; and the Order in Council authorizing that removal was passed a few days before Parliament assembled. My hon. friend protested because the Government assumed to govern this country by Orders in Council instead of taking the people's representatives into their confidence. What has happened since? My hon. friend is a member of a Government which not only governs by Orders in Council before Parliament meets, but he himself assents to Orders in Council passed during the session of Parliament, and to the same practice being continued after the session will have prorogued. Again, my hon. friend has stood the blow against responsible government, and in this, as in many other things, he has not been the faithful disciple of Joseph Howe, the father of responsible government in Nova Scotia.

My hon. friend advocated last year the removal of duties on farm implements to encourage and increase production. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing but a curt sentence in the speech of the hon. gentleman about any changes in the tariff: it is the last sentence. There are, he said, no changes in the tariff except the new taxes imposed on the people of Canada. The representatives of the western provinces have to be satisfied with that. My hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) smiles. He confessed the other day that there was an agreement. I think the only agreement he was referring to was that which mulcted the newsprint manufacturers, and gave to my hon. friend and the press of this country cheaper newsprint during the elections and since.

The Acting Finance Minister also advocated last year the removal of duties on foodstuffs, and he stated that every other protectionist country had done it, that ours was the only one which deliberately undertook increased taxation on the actual necessaries of life. Here, again, the hon. gentleman will not remove the duties on foodstuffs; therefore I cannot congratulate him; he has not lived up to his pledges. But I can deeply sympathize with him; his burden is heavy, indeed. The net debt of Canada is, we are told, $1,200,000,000. It has increased, and is increasing at the rate of $13,000,000 a month. These figures are stupendous.

The population of Canada is only eight millions, and the per capita debt is now $125 or $625 per family of five. In March, 1914, before the outbreak of war, Canada's net debt was $335,996,000, and the total annual interest charges were $13,353,000 including $1,371,000 towards the repayment of the principal of the debt. The cost of carrying the debt was therefore slightly less than $1.70 per capita per year, while $10 or more per capita must be raised hereafter for debt and pensions. So I can well afford to offer to my hon. friend my heartfelt sympathy. The burden will be heavy on his shoulders. I think I am well advised, speaking on behalf of my electors, and of those of the Dominion, in telling my hon. friend that he must practise the strictest economy in the administration of our affairs. Greater men than my hon. friend have been Chancellors of the Exchequer. The grand old man, William Ewart Gladstone, delivered probably his best speeches when he was presenting the Budget of the British nation, and in one of those speeches he said:

> A Chancellor of the Exchequer must be prepared to be unpopular, he must learn how to say no to many requests which are made to him, he must be cheeseparing.

My hon. friend, with this stupendous national debt of Canada before his eyes, can well afford to be cheeseparing, as the great Gladstone was. As to ways of cutting down expenditure, I will put some cases to my hon. friend. I shall not recite the many grievances of His Majesty's loyal Opposition on account of the fearful leaks in the Administration. I will only mention three concrete cases. In these I appeal to the honesty of my hon. friend. Is it fair or right that Colonel

Labatt, one of the members of the Board of Pension Commissioners, should receive a salary of, I think, $6,000 a year, plus a full pension which has been awarded to him? Is it fair or just that Colonel Bradbury, a former member of this House, who never went to the front, mind you, Mr. Speaker, but only crossed to England, who received the appointment as senator from the late Government, should, before being appointed, have exacted from the pensions board a life pension? I say that if my hon. friend has the same honesty of purpose which he had during the many years I had the honour of being his friend, he will see that these two pensions are wiped off the blue books of Canada. I say to my hon. friend that, like Diogenes of old, he must take his lantern, go into every department of the Government and cut and reduce, and be absolutely intractable on these reductions and cuttings.

The other day I happened to read the Ottawa Citizen—and I direct this matter to the attention of the right hon. gentleman in the absence of the Minister of Justice. I noticed that an expropriation case was pending before the supreme court of Canada concerning the river St. Charles in Quebec. By the way, I must congratulate my absent friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) upon the decision which he wisely took the other day to stop the works on the river St. Charles. This river St. Charles business was engineered by a few real estate speculators during the last Parliament. A few years ago a man by the name of Bélanger bought a piece of property—a beach lot; a few weeds growing under the water—for $18,200. It could not be used for building purposes, but he knew that some works might some day be carried out by the Government on the estuary of the river St. Charles. For this property which he bought for speculative purposes and which two years previous to the expropriation proceedings did not yield enough revenue to pay the taxes upon it, this gentleman, when expropriation proceedings were had, claimed from His Majesty the sum of $800,000. A judge of the exchequer court went to Quebec; witness after witness was heard. The Crown, I am sorry to say, did not follow up the case very closely, and the judge, who had to accept the evidence adduced before him, adjudicated in favour of Bélanger for the sum of $200,000, plus 10 per cent because of the forced expropriation, making a total of about $227,000. But in his judgment he said that it was with reluctance that he adjudicated for that amount. The case was appealed and came before the supreme court of Canada. My attention was directed to it because I read in the Ottawa Citizen that the judges had been astounded at the amount awarded by the exchequer court.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Was the case appealed by the Government?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, by the Crown. Mr. Bernier, a Tory candidate in one of the last elections, represented the Crown. When Mr. Bernier appeared before the supreme court with his factum, a copy of which I hold in my hand, he said that he appealed from the judgment only in respect of the 10 per cent—about $27,000—not in respect of the $200,000; he agreed that the Crown was quite satisfied to pay that amount to Bélanger. The judges of the supreme court were so shocked by the admission of the Crown, having regard to the reasons given in the judgment of the judge of the exchequer court, that they interrupted the proceedings and sought new instructions from the Minister of Justice. I do not know what these instructions were, but I thank Providence, not the Government, that the judges have their eyes wide open. I thank the supreme court of Canada for the service—the "potential" service—which they have rendered to the country. The Minister of Public Works said the other day that his department would stop the works at river St. Charles. I hope that the Crown will revert to the status quo ante and hand back to Bélanger his beach lot for which he paid $18,000, so that the Crown may keep for the boys at the front the $200,000 which was to have been paid for that property.

The Acting Minister of Finance will perhaps think that I am parochial—that is the expression he uses when he and I happen to differ. As a matter of fact, that was his rejoinder the other day when I pleaded for provincial rights in the matter of the Order affecting the borrowing powers of provincial governments. When I was pleading as a Canadian, and, surely, as a good Liberal, for provincial rights, my hon. friend answered, with a wave of his hand: "Oh, you are parochial." Since then, I moved for the papers on this subject; the return has been tabled, and I am pleased to inform the Acting Minister of Finance that with respect to that Order in Council restricting the borrowing powers of the provincial governments, Mr. Murray, of Nova Scotia, is with

me; Sir William Hearst, of Ontario, is with me; Mr. Martin, of Saskatchewan, is with me; Mr. Stewart, of Alberta, is with me; all the champions of provincial rights are with me. Has my hon. friend, perchance, become an Imperialist? Because for an Imperialist, any one who happens to be only a little Canadian is at once labelled a parochialist. My hon. friend should know to what school of thought I belong. I belong to a school of thought which in years gone by stood for provincial rights in Canada—the school of Blake, of Mackenzie, of Laurier, of Fielding, too. In 1886 the present member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), then the honoured Premier of Nova Scotia, on a parochial question such as I brought to my hon. friend's attention the other day—the question of better terms—moved for the secession of Nova Scotia from the Confederation. What is most surprising, after the motion had carried before the legislature by a vote of 15 to 7, it was approved by the people at the polls. I am parochial, like the Fielding of 1885, the Blake of the 80's, the Mackenzie of the 70's, the Joe Howe of the 50's. My hon. friend should be more generous when, taken to task on questions affecting the constitution, he happens not to share the views of his opponents.

Speaking on the tariff, the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) said that an agreement had been made that no change should take place during the present emergency. I do not know whether he used exactly these words, but that is the meaning I gathered from his remarks in that connection.

I am glad to get the ear of my genial friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar). If it is true that such an agreement exists between the western Liberal members and the eastern protectionists in the Union Government, no one should boast of it. I say further, it is an abject agreement. The western Liberal members had no right to make such an agreement because the people, their masters, were not a party to it. My hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) says that we are at war, and that because of the war we should not disturb the financial ring, the high protectionists of Toronto. We were at war last year, two years ago, and the western farmers without any hesitation advocated tariff changes. I have before me the farmer's platform of last year. Has my hon. friend from Springfield read that platform? Surely he has. Springfield is not an industrial centre. The name conveys the idea of a constituency of smiling farms. The farmers' platform of 1917 contains this plank on the tariff question:

Be it resolved that the Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing the organized farmers of Canada, urges that as a means of bringing about these much needed reforms and at the same time reducing the high cost of living, now proving such a burden on the people of Canada, our tariff laws shall be amended as follows:

1. By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff and that further gradual, uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will insure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

2. That the reciprocity agreement of 1911, which still remains on the United States Statute books, be accepted by the Parliament of Canada.

I am glad to see my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) in his seat. May we not hear from him during this debate? What better exponent could we have of the principles underlying the reciprocity pact than the gentleman who prepared it, who negotiated it, who was defeated by the stampede of 1911, organized and paid for by the same financial ring and the same buccaneers who put the Union Government into office?

3. That all foodstuff not included in the reciprocity agreement be placed on the free list.

4. That agricultural implements, farm machinery, vehicles, fertilizer, coal, lumber, cement, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils be placed on the free list.

5. That the customs tariff on all the necessaries of life be materially reduced.

6. That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.

Last year we were at war, but the unshackled farmers of the western provinces did not enter into any pact or agreement with the Tories of the East to jeopardize the tariff reforms which they advocated. They spoke plainly and boldly, and the gentlemen who to-day say: well we cannot discuss this matter; we must not change this tariff; there has been an agreement—a fifty-fifty agreement—are not the true representatives of the western farmers. I have not consulted my friends on this side of the House, and I am speaking only for my humble self, but I make bold to say that, if the representatives of the western farmers, will move an amendment along the lines of the resolution passed by their masters in the West, the whole Liberal party will stand behind them. If the representatives of the western farmers are under an agreement not to discuss the tariff, not to change it, the protectionists disclaim any

such arrangement, and they are not idle, they keep busy. The men who defeated reciprocity by the flag-flapping process are to-day entrenching themselves in their privileges. They are more active than ever. Let me read this circular:

Canadian Industrial Reconstruction Association.

We are at war. Our boys are fighting at the front. Our people are being bled white, but the protectionists of Toronto are doing business as usual. They are not idle as are the farmers' representatives in this House. Let me read some names, which are familiar:

Provisional Executive Committee: Hon. N. Curry, Senator; Huntley R. Drummond, Esq.; George E. Drummond, Esq.; J. H. Sherrard, Esq.; John F. Ellis, Esq.; W. K. George, Esq.; W .K. McNaught, C.M.G.; S. R. Parsons, Esq.; T. A. Russell, Esq.; Sir John Willison, et cetera, etc.

Yes, I may well say, etc., etc., after Sir John Willison's name. Hide-bound protectionists, all anti-reciprocity men, engineering at the present moment in the city of Toronto their pet scheme of higher tariff walls for after-war conditions. I shall not read the whole of the circular, but I must say that these gentlemen unhesitatingly speak for number one. First of all, they are against any higher taxation on profits. Secondly they say: you should raise the customs duties—in order to protect a little more their interests which are already so well protected. And finally they say: we must do as the United States will do after the war:

5 p.m.

Prices will be cut too far below the cost of production in order that the new industry of America fighting single-handed against the single-head German trust may be driven from the field. The German Government will take a practical hand in this contest, and only the combination of American manufacturers and the erection of a tariff wall of defence can prevent the Americans, if each fights single-handed and for his own end, from falling before the united, efficient and bitter assault of German trade rivals. Mr. Gerard's warning has as much significance for the people of Canada as it has for those of the United States.

My hon. friends who represent western constituencies after listening to what I have read, should be vigilant. Mr. Speaker, although there are in the Government as many Liberals as there are Conservatives, the influence of the magnates of Toronto is none the less paramount. I care for the reputation of my friends of Grit origin. They are astray at the present moment, but I hope that some day they may repent and see how they were duped by that coterie, the members of which I have just mentioned to the House.

Now a word about compulsory service. It is admitted on all sides that the Military Service Act has been a dismal failure. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), the editor of the Orange Sentinel, has spoken in laudatory terms which one would hardly expect from a rival journalist, of the Toronto Globe as the great exponent of Canadian ideals. He said that the Globe had always looked upon political questions with magnanimity and equanimity. I have nothing to say against the Globe; this is a free country, and we can hold what opinions we like. But, I wonder however, if my hon. friend read the Globe of June 15, 1916. If he did, he will know that the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and we who represent constituencies from Quebec, followed exactly the lead then given by the Globe on the question of compulsory service. This is what the Globe said:

No responsible Canadian statesman to whom the representative of the Crown could turn as a possible Premier would take office to enforce compulsory military service in the Dominion. Sir Robert Borden would not do it. Nor Sir Wilfrid Laurier. No man of eminence in either party would attempt what the recognized party leaders know and admit cannot be done. There are not less than three million people out of a total population of about eight millions in the Dominion who would resent fiercely the application to the men of military age among them of a law compelling enlistment for service in a European war.

Thus spoke the Globe. And we Liberals said Amen; the Globe is talking common sense; it is uttering a truism when it says that no man can successfully enforce compulsory service in a country like Canada. But the Globe afterwards suddenly altered its course, and we on this side of the House when faced with the issue insidiously raised by the right hon. leader of the Government, asked for a referendum. The answer of the Government was the passing of the most demoralizing piece of legislation which has ever disgraced the annals of a British Parliament. The Government forced through the War-time Elections Act, and started the campaign of hysteria the results of which we know only to well. The dice were loaded; the jury was packed. It is true that a coalition was offered to the right hon. leader of the Opposition in the dying days of last session, but we know under what circumstances. The right hon. the Prime Minister should have known that one of the attainments of the right hon. leader of the Opposition is his profound

knowledge, not only of British politics, but of English literature and British parliamentary history. The right hon. leader of the Opposition knew there had been a coalition under George III between Newcastle and Pitt, and being a great student, he had read Macaulay's description of that coalition, when "the vilest arts of corruption were wedded to stainless integrity." Macaulay says:

> Newcastle brought to the coalition a vast mass of power . . . The public offices, the church, the courts of law, the army, the navy, the diplomatic service, swarmed with his creatures . . . . Pitt, on the other hand, had what Newcastle wanted, an eloquence which stirred the passions and charmed the imagination, a high reputation for purity and the confidence and ardent love of millions.
>
> Newcastle took the treasury, the civil and ecclesiastical patronage, and the disposal of that part of the secret service money which was then employed in bribing members of Parliament. Pitt was Secretary of State, with the direction of the war and of foreign affairs. Thus the filth of all the noisome and pestilential sewers of government was poured into one channel. Through the other passed only what was bright and stainless.

I repeat that the venerable leader of the Liberal party, when the Prime Minister made his offer of a coalition Government, remembered what happened to Pitt. He knew that Pitt's alliance with Newcastle led to Pitt's downfall, and he refused the offer of the Prime Minister. There is, however, a coalition to-day, or a Union Government based on self-interest, and formed on a fifty-fifty basis. But that coalition will not last. It won the election on the shallow pretext of winning the war. I am told by my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) that in this Government there are no Grits and no Tories. My hon. friend is labouring under a delusion. There is a Tory party to-day, and the Government is a Tory Government. Otherwise we should not have the junta we have in Canada governing by Orders in Council under the War Measures Act, governing with the aid of the profiteers and the flag-flappers. But the most serious thing of all is that the Tory Government has shattered national unity in Canada, because the country has been deceived. Pledges and promises have been made to the French Canadians on the one hand, and to the Ontario farmers on the other. The Government has been riding the old pair of horses, the Catholic and the Protestant. But we know what will happen when that delegation of farmers, two thousand strong, arrives in Ottawa on the 14th of May next. I say the farmers were deceived. The Government had recourse to all the expedients of a good old Tory campaign. They first of all showed their best cards, one of them was a four-flusher in the person of Lord Northcliffe. He came to Canada and said:

> It is known to economists that the world's supply of food is not sufficient to feed the world's armies and the civilian population, too.

Right here in Ottawa he said:

> Owing to the shortage of labour caused by the war, labour has been taken away from the farm, which has produced varying harvests with the result that there is a world shortage of food.

The food controller, Mr. Hanna said:

> Labour must be supplied to the farms by the cities in time of war when labour is scarce. Canada is the base of supplies. Canada must not fail. Canada must produce.

Naturally, the farmers of Ontario said: we will vote for this Government which urges us to produce for the boys at the front. The then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Burrell) repeated the same thing in the leaflets which he issued. With all these appeals, pledges and promises, the Unionist Government carried the election. But, to-day they have changed their minds. To-day it is man-power, not food production, that is needed. Sir, it is a long lane that has no turning. Because the French Canadian habitant would not be bullied in the ranks he was said to be shirking. Because the province of Quebec is a rural province, affording no such basis for recruiting as the industrial province of Ontario, Quebec was labelled as disloyal. Because the French Canadians have been for 300 years on this continent, have no link with Europe and may not have the same reason to cross the Atlantic and join their fellow-men on the battlefields as have British-born or Anglo-Canadians, they are called slackers. It is now found after the tornado of last December, after all the flag waving, after all the money spent in insulting placards, that the Quebec habitant and the Ontario farmer think exactly alike.

Let me say one more word as to the spirit of Quebec on the question of service in this war. The people of Quebec are a God-fearing, law-abiding, liberty-loving people. They protested against the passing of this conscription measure through closure. There were a few riots, not engineered by the people of Quebec but engineered by agents provocateurs, some of whom were paid by the Department of Justice. The sober minded people of Quebec never thought of rioting or revolting. There is only one instance, in recent years not of

a riot, but of a revolt against one of His Majesty's statutes passed by this Parliament. In the eighties when the Parliament of this Dominion sanctioned the Canadian Pacific contract, there was a clause known as the monopoly clause. The people, and legislature of Manitoba protested against that monopoly clause, and when they had exhausted all their protests in a constitutional way, the people of Manitoba—the Britishers of Manitoba,—armed themselves with rifles and guns, met the sheriffs despatched at Winnipeg by the Government at Ottawa and thus resisted His Majesty. That is the only instance of revolt against a statute of His Majesty's Government. The people of Quebec never revolted. They protested, as it was their right to protest, but now that the law has been embalmed on the statute book, out of respect to the majesty of the law, the people of Quebec will obey it. They will do their duty, all their duty, and they will do it with credit to themselves and to their native land.

The arguments which were advanced by the Quebec people against the passing of conscription were the same arguments as those which are being advanced to-day by the Ontario farmers, which are being advanced sub rosa by representatives of farming constituencies in this House, and which are being advanced by the committee on agriculture. Let me read a resolution which was unanimously passed the other day by the Unionist members of that committee:

> That in the opinion of the committee on agriculture the Minister of Militia should be requested to order:
> (a) That actual farmers who have been called up shall be given leave of absence and
> (b) That no actual farmers be required to report until all others in the class affected by the Order in Council of April 20th, 1918, have been put in service; such leave of absence and delay in reporting to be conditioned upon their actual employment in farming.

So that, Mr. Speaker, Quebec is being vindicated.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is that a resolution which was actually passed by men who voted down the amendment in this House in favour of exempting farmers?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I say "yes" to my hon. friend, and what is most tragic is that the committee had put themselves into communication with the various Ministers of Agriculture, not only in Quebec—the Quebec minister was asked his opinion only at the last moment—but in all the provinces. This resolution was endorsed by the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Ontario, who said: "Yes, we want all our farmers on the farm." It was also endorsed by the Ministers of Agriculture of the other provinces which had elected Unionist members at the last election. So there is reflected in that resolution the unbiased, the unshackled opinion of the honest people of this country. Not only are we vindicated by the members of this House, by the committee on agriculture, but we are also vindicated by one of the ministers, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). The minister has lived in Quebec all his life, he was born there, and I am proud to say that his brother is one of my electors. That hon. gentleman, speaking in Montreal on Friday last, said:

> Mr. Ballantyne praised Quebec's way of answering to the call, stating that while its attitude towards the Military Service Act was not the same as that of many in the country, there was no more loyal province in the Dominion. He also paid his respects to the fighting qualities of the French Canadian, and thanked Archbishop Bruchesi—

Is my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Hocken) here?

> —for the great assistance he had given throughout the war.

I would like to sprinkle my hon. friend of the Orange Sentinel with holy water.

In conclusion, let me say that we must all help win the war and we on this side of the House are ready to accept our share of the financial burden which Canada must face. We forgive the discreditable arguments used by most of the press of the Unionist party during the last campaign. Indeed, after the battle was over, surveying the debris on the battlefield, we found here and there, many glittering stillettoes still dripping in blood, daggers, Rogers knives, etc., etc., constituting a collection which many a rogues' gallery might well envy. Those were the weapons that had been aimed at the breast of the right hon. and venerable leader of the Opposition. But thank Heaven, he is still living, and the banner of true Liberalism is still floating over this Dominion. We can well afford to exclaim: "All is lost but honour." I wish that every leader of a Canadian political party could say the same. Sir, in one of his great Midlothian campaign speeches Mr. Gladstone used the following words:

> We cannot reckon on the wealth of the country, nor upon the rank of the country, nor upon the influence which rank and wealth usually bring. In the main these powers are against

us, for wherever there is a close corporation, wherever there is a spirit of organized monopoly, wherever there is a narrow and sectional interest apart from that of the country, and desiring to be set up above the interest of the public, there, gentlemen, we, the Liberal party, have no friendship and no tolerance to expect.

Above all these, and behind all these, there is something greater than these—there is the nation itself—The nation is a power hard to rouse, but when roused, harder still and more hopeless to resist.

These eloquent words admirably reflect the attitude of the Liberal party, and, we believe, the ultimate unbiased and undaunted spirit of the Canadian people.

My last words must be essentially Canadian. I gather from the newspapers that some ministers are at the present time scheming—yes, if my information is right, scheming—an ex parte trip to London. But the Prime Minister is not going, and I am glad that he is not going, to London. At the present time he can well afford to follow the example of General Botha; his presence is urgently required in Canada as the leader of the nation. I am told that the Minister of the Interior and the President of the Council are going together to the English metropolis. Why that association? I would be suspicious if I were one of the other ministers. Is Beaufort going to London? Is the famous secretarial organization going to London? Perhaps my hon. friend from Russell may have something to communicate to the House in that regard. I have read somewhere that Caesar was always suspicious of the pale man. I also am suspicious of that pale pair travelling together, and if I were a member of the Cabinet I would ask my hon. friends, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works, to accompany them. Why give the two ministers to whom I have referred, a monopoly of the loyalty of Canada in London? Why not the Minister of Labour, for instance? Why not my good friend the Secretary of State, who doubtless would be glad to see his native land, because I know that he is British-born. I spoke with him once at a St. George's Society dinner in Montreal, when I tried to explain to him that St. George when he killed the dragon did not kill the Tory party. Sir, the duty of a minister of the Crown at the present time does not lie in joy-riding in London. We have a minister there in the person of Sir Edward Kemp, we have a High Commissioner there in the person of Sir George Perley. Lord Milner does not care to see those gentlemen, nor Lloyd George either; let them stay at their post. My hon. friend the President of the Council should rather go into the county of Durham this summer and spend his vacations there among the farmers, cajoling them to allow their sons to be conscripted. Moreover the Imperialistic dreams of the Round Table clubs and jingo associations, of which we have counterparts in Canada have had their day in England. The rising and predominating influence over there is the Labour party, and the Canadian jingoes will get very little comfort from that source. Let them read, learn and inwardly digest the following words from the leader of that great party. Speaking about the persistent jingo conspiracy against the autonomy of the Dominions, Mr. Henderson said:

With regard to that great Commonwealth of all races, all colours, all religions, and all degrees of civilization, that we call the British Empire, the Labour Party stands for its maintenance and its progressive development on the lines of Local Autonomy and "Home Rule All Round"; the fullest respect for the rights of each people, whatever its colour, to all the Democratic Self-Government of which it is capable, and to the proceeds of its own toil upon the resources of its own territorial home; and the closest possible co-operation among all the various members of what has become essentially not an Empire in the old sense, but a Britannic Alliance. We desire to maintain the most intimate relations with the Labour Parties overseas. Like them, we have no sympathy with the projects of "Imperial Federation," in so far as these imply the subjection to a common Imperial Legislature wielding coercive power, (including dangerous facilities for coercive Imperial taxation and for enforced military service), either of the existing Self-Governing Dominions, whose autonomy would be thereby invaded; or of the United Kingdom, whose freedom of Democratic self-development would be thereby hampered; or of India and the Colonial Dependencies, which would thereby run the risk of being further exploited for the benefit of a "White Empire." We do not intend, by any such "Imperial Senate" either to bring the plutocracy of Canada and South Africa to the aid of the British aristocracy, or to enable the landlords and financiers of the Mother Country to unite in controlling the growing Popular Democracies overseas. The absolute autonomy of each self-governing part of the Empire must be maintained intact.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, to have spoken at such length, but I thought that this was the proper time to utter the words which I have spoken, in order, in company with my fellow-members, to place the sentiments of my race rightly before the people of this country. As was said so eloquently the other day by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) no press has been debauched to present only one side of the case for us; no press has been bought to defend

the French Canadians. This Parliament is our only forum.

In conclusion, let me say on behalf of my compatriots that their national creed can be summed up in one sentence: Credo in unam patriam.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, we have just had a confession on the part of the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) who has resumed his seat that he is sorry he spoke so long. I think I should like to give him the assurance that he is not nearly so sorry as the House is.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are not sorry if you are.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend from Cape Breton gives at the same moment a beautiful example of his want of self-restraint and of his egotism. He mistakes himself for the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: I never mistake you for anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am sorry indeed that the chief lieutenant of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) should, so early in the speech of an opponent, who has been left only twenty-five minutes to reply to a speech of an hour and three-quarters, so far forget his duties and courtesy as to interrupt to the extent that the Speaker has had to rebuke him. I hope my hon. friend will in future exercise greater courtesy.

I am quite sure that neither the House, nor any one else outside it who knows me, will expect me to dwell long upon the first portion of the speech of the hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve. Indeed, Sir, it is not my intention to speak long at all, because I think it will be a fair criticism of his speech as a whole to say that the ideas contained in it were in inverse proportion as to number to the vociferousness with which it was propounded. I want to say in all honesty that I have never risen to reply to a speech which required so much time to deliver and which contained so little. When my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) ventured, in what I think was a very gentlemanly and courteous speech—a speech which certainly did not show any of the bitterness which he was advised not to cultivate by the gentleman to whose speech we have just listened and which was not itself quite free from bitterness—when he (Mr. Hocken), ventured to give his political opponents certain advice which he thought really would make for the unity of Canada, my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) retorted in kind and gave the hon. gentleman from Toronto advice as to what he thought Quebec might expect from Ontario. Well, if I could do it with due modesty I might, as a distant westerner, venture to give both hon. gentlemen some advice as to what would be best for the whole of Canada. I think I should do it in this way: I should remind my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, who is a great reader, that it has been established before commissions both in Belgium and in France, that priests caught by the modern Huns at the head of the greatest military force that this world has ever seen, have been stripped in passing a pig sty, and the pig has been taken out and the priests put back naked in its place. Before the same commissions it has been established that women have been outraged until they died, by man after man from the same army. And if my voice—and I say it in all honesty, Sir—could reach the remotest nook and cranny of the province of Quebec to-day, I would try to say in all kindness but in all sincerity: It is the altars of your faith that are being outraged and desecrated; it is the children learning to prattle your tongue who are being mutilated; it is the civilians of Belgium and of France who, against all international law, are being shot. I make the appeal to my hon. friend in the presence of these facts; what good can come of an altercation on matters of religious sectarianism when there is a cause like that to champion? That is all I need to say, I think, and I do in all sincerity and kindness, on the first forty minutes of my hon. friend's speech.

The men in the trenches are not bothering themselves about a single sentence or a single thought that was contained in the first forty minutes of his speech. They realize too well that the civilization and the freedom of the world are at stake, and Catholics and Protestants are meeting the foe breast to breast and not fighting with one another about matters which are not worth the wind I have spent upon them, or the tremendous hurricane which raged in the speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve

My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) said there had been no change in the Government; that the Government in power now is the old Government. That was his charge. Well, at the beginning of last summer my hon. friend was confident that he would beat the old Government, and what was

the infusion of strength which made the Union Government do to him and to his friends what has happened to them? That was some change, anyhow, from my hon. friend's confident expectations. Why, my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), I believe, was in his heart already Minister of Justice in the new Government to be.

Mr. McKENZIE: I follow my profession; that is more than you do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: There must have been an infusion of new blood and new ideas of some kind. Is woman suffrage for the whole of the Dominion of Canada an illiberal idea? If it be a Liberal idea it must have been the infusion of new blood that produced the legislation brought down this session, which was passed in spite of the almost unanimous opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. True it did not have the absolute opposition of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, because he told us, having learned at the feet of the right hon. gentleman so near to him, that he was a woman suffragist, or would be, in Alberta, but he could not be in Quebec. Well, that was a lesson which I say had been learned from some one who was well able to teach him that method of playing the political game.

I could give other illustrations to show that a change has occurred. Last summer we had an Opposition that held up the House for eight months, confident of coming victory at the polls, and this year we have an Opposition which are barely able to hold it up for eight weeks, and who have had all the fight knocked out of them. That is a change.

As I said, I would like to take the liberty, as a westerner, of saying something both to my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). They gave advice to one another. I will give them some information, anyhow. Having sat with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve for years, and having, I think, deserved the encomium, which I appreciated very much, from my hon friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) the other day, who does not agree with me on the subject of the tariff; I think I can claim the credit of what he says: that I have been a persistent and consistent advocate of free trade in this House. No honest man opposite will deny that. But what amazes me is the extent to which the opposite side has now been permeated with free trade and direct taxation ideas, notwithstanding my absolute want of success to produce any effects along these lines while I sat amongst them. They now want low tariff. They say that it is wrong to have an agreement on the tariff. Well, in the time of the Government of which my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) was a member there was an agreement on the tariff comparable to his views on woman suffrage; that is to say, the members of the Cabinet, including the leader of it, were protectionists in the East and free traders in the West. That is an historical fact; there is no getting away from it. I have to say this about an agreement on the tariff. I know nothing about such an agreement as the one that has been spoken of, but I have not the least doubt that this Government will show themselves as strong to proceed along good lines as they have shown themselves able to take good lines to start with.

If a study of war conditions as they arise leads this Government to see the wisdom of introducing more direct taxation and lower tariff, I believe that the change of Government—a change which my hon. friend denies—consists in this very fact: that they will show their strength by reducing tariff and by introducing more direct taxation. But imagine the member for Maisonneuve coming here as an advocate for low tariff. Why, Sir, I conducted a missionary enterprise of persistency and consistency for years in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. When they were in power and I sat in the colony and made attempts at their education, the moment I mentioned the rights of the farmers, or anything relating to low tariff, I want it recorded as my distinct impression that I saw nothing but frowns on their faces. And the reason was this: they came into power in 1896 practically a professing free trade party. They certainly did take the duty off cream separators. Mr. Speaker, I worked that free cream separator on western platforms until my arm was absolutely aching. They took the duty off binder twine. Sir, I threaded binder twine until there was not a fibre left between my fingers. They introduced the British preference, and as long as I could I kept trying to defend my own consistency for sitting in such a Liberal party by praising the British preference, turning the free cream separator, and fraying binder twine. That having been done, what is their little subsequent record? After their early attempts at tariff reduction, hon. gentlemen sat back, enjoying luxurious office, drawing

their salaries with promptitude, and basking in the smiles of those gentlemen whom I would never describe as buccaneers—basking in the smiles of those buccaneers and companies that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) denounced this afternoon in a voice which reared itself to the skies.

And what about direct taxation? There are only two things about free trade: one is lower tariff, the other direct taxation. What is the record of my hon. friends opposite with regard to direct taxation? I am not ashamed of my own. On August 20th, 1914, before the war was three weeks old, I stood in my place in the old House and advised the Government of the day to put on an income tax at once, beginning with incomes of $1,500, and making it a very high tax on the larger incomes. What support did I get from the Liberal party, amongst whom I was sitting? The only vocal support I got was from the labour member for South Cape Breton, Mr. Carroll, and from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works in the present Government (Mr. Carvell). These were the only sources from which I got any vocal support of my advocacy of direct taxation at that time. Yet my hon. friend begins with a criticism—with which I am in agreement; I shall never hide it—of this Government because they are not going far enough along the line of direct taxation.

There were other chances of examining into what the country had to expect along the line of direct taxation from hon. gentlemen opposite if they had carried it out at this particular time. It is to be said to the credit of the last Government that they took my advice. They were too late in taking it; they should have taken it when I suggested it, because it was good policy at that time as it is now. But there was not enough support behind me from the Opposition benches to get them to adopt it then. They afterwards introduced very drastic business profits taxes which have been largely imitated in the United States and in Great Britain. What was the attitude of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to those business taxes? Was he vociferous in their support at that time, or was he coquetting with the buccaneers and corporations? I leave the question to my hon. friend and his conscience. But we all know what the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite was. They sat night after night and smiled approval on my late lamented political friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald)—who led my right hon. friend to the edge of the precipice and then ran away so that he himself should not tumble over—they smiled approval on his opposition day in and day out to that very drastic direct taxation. I do not think I need to say any more to explain to my hon. friends where they are so far as western Canada is concerned. Western Canada did not quite believe in their sincerity, because western Canada knew their record. If there was anything outside the intense patriotic enthusiasm of the West that led to the remarkable results of the last election—in what I claim to be the most progressive part of this country, whether you have regard to woman suffrage or to lower tariff—it was a knowledge of that record, and the disbelief, which it was impossible to avoid in a reflective mind, that the present professions of these gentlemen of belief in direct taxation, freer trade and lower tariff would have any other results than followed the promises that were given before 1896. It was not for professions of that kind that the stalwart men of Canada were going to do what they believed they would be doing if they took any other course than they did—deserting the boys in the trenches for a mess of porridge—and that only possible porridge.

I do not think there was in my hon. friend's speech anything else that needs any answer, and I do not think there was much else that I do not approve of. If the House would have patience with me, I think that in a very few minutes I could get through with what I have to say.

An hon. MEMBER: Call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (resuming): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a little further criticism of the speech of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), I should like to summarize, if I am able, the points at which I hinted this afternoon. That speech in my judgment had two cardinal faults. In the first place, it was made in apparent oblivion of the great events that are happening in the world today. From anything my hon friend said from the beginning to the end of his speech he might have been unconscious that thrones are toppling, that empires are falling and that all the freest nations of Europe in conjunction with the free outlying commonwealths of the British Empire are now joined with the most pacific but perhaps the greatest country in the world, the United States of America, all of them filled

with the consciousness of the events which my hon. friend forgot—filled with the consciousness, not that the British Empire is in danger, which of course it is, but that the military power opposed to us is struggling, not for the defeat of any given one of these free nations, but for the abolition of the very idea of freedom from the face of the earth. The hon. gentleman who is suffering from such apparent oblivion—I do not want to be too harsh with him—naturally lapsed into the second great fault of his speech. For an hour and three-quarters he talked, and I appeal to any reasonable and fair-minded man opposite—and there are many of them; some of them I rejoice to know as old friends and some as newer friends, to point to a single sentence in that speech which was not saturated with partyism from beginning to end; it was purely a partisan speech. Of course, to make a party speech under such conditions as prevail in the world to-day comes perfectly natural to a gentleman who even deceives himself into the notion that he is one of the true Simon-pure Liberals remaining in the world to-day, and forgets there is one place and one place only where the battle of Liberalism is being fought to-day, and that is on the continent of Europe. My friends opposite say they are Liberals.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The remnant of them.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I object to their dreaming for a moment that they are even a remnant of the Liberal party. The fact of the matter is they are not Liberals, they are not democrats. For this simple reason—that their attitude, the attitude displayed by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve this afternoon, of pure partyism, unforgetfulness, overlooks the fact that if Democracy is beaten in Europe, Liberalism, real Liberalism, and real freedom disappears from the world. The hon. member for Maisonneuve allows his partyism to carry him so far that he tries to prove to this House, and probably wants to prove to the country, that we have the same Government in power now that we had last summer, that there has been no change in the Government, that there are still nothing but Liberals and Tories. Every one who sits with my hon. friend and votes against woman suffrage and talks as they did twenty years ago about lowering the tariff, which they did not do—everything of that sort is Liberal, everything else is Tory. If my hon. friend had been in his place I would have put a very simple test to his narrow partisan view of the events that are taking place in the world. I would have just asked him in a single sentence: "Is every member of the American nation a Tory?" Almost every man of intelligence in that Republic, whether he was formerly a Republican or a Democrat in the party sense, has forgotten that party ever existed, and they are all to-day standing together behind President Wilson. And the party sitting here are the men in Canada who forgot the same thing, forgot whether they were Liberals or Tories, and they swept the Dominion outside of one province. That is my answer to my hon. friend's taunt that there has been no change of Government. The change is one that may go further in this country, and far further in the world, than he has ever begun to dream of.

The Union Government is a new combination. It is a combination of all the best forces that have grasped the events in the world in the way I have just tried to describe, and if they will keep grasping those events, and keep studying the results that are likely to come out of them, and keep watching the events that do come out of them, they will rule Canada for many a long day. For one reason, what would you put in their place, Mr. Speaker? I trust my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will live until he is a hundred and twenty, but I cannot help my imagination sometimes enabling me to wonder what the Opposition would look like if he were taken away by the hand of Time. There is no possibility of making a Government to govern Canada or any other progressive country out of the elements that took a day to prove that woman suffrage was a bad thing, a very wrong thing according to the Book of Leviticus or something that was written even earlier than that. How far such thinkers are removed from the current of present day events, from the tremendous need of the fight that is going on in the world, from the colossal events which in some senses it is a privilege to live through, and which events will become more colossal before we are very much older.

If I wanted to illustrate how much this Union Government transcends, from the point of view I have been trying to bring before the House, the party governments which have largely ruled in this country during the past half century, I should take the simple method of referring to the events of this brief session. But before doing that, I would remind hon. members that a party

came into power in this country in 1896 and held power for fifteen years. I was not a citizen of Canada before that time, but I have talked with many intelligent citizens of this country who watched the events of those years carefully, and it is a moot point, according to the evidence I have gathered as carefully as I can, whether of the platform convention of 1893, from which the chief lieutenant of the Liberal party read at large the other night—it is a moot point whether there was no plank of that platform honoured or only one. I have never heard anybody claim that there were two. That is the way that Government honoured its mandate. Then there was a Government came into power in this country in 1911, a party Government of the other description, and they were not very strong on fulfilling their mandate either. My hon. friends around me must just take the truth in season as it comes to my recollection. That is how party government has carried out the mandate of the people. I said a moment ago that we have been in session for two months. What advantage does the Union Government show over the party government that preceded it? In these two months they have shown the most utter earnestness in endeavouring to make a fair start to carry out the mandate which was given them by the people. Take the subsidiary points in the programme that was brought before the people last autumn. There was abolition of patronage. I am glad to say that my correspondence has dwindled almost to the vanishing point because the people are already learning that the Government is going to govern in so far as patronage is concerned, and is going to govern on a very different principle from getting a member to toady around a minister and ask him if he will do this or that, because that is the definition of patronage. In other words, the Government have made a most honest start and endeavour to abolish patronage by putting all appointments to the Civil Service, and all other services in the State, upon the platform of principle and taking them off the platform of party.

There is another question which I have referred to more than once. It is difficult to believe it possible, but some members on this side of the House have chided the Government in conversation with me because they introduced woman suffrage in the first session of this Parliament. I have said to them: "Do not open your mouth along those lines, because that is the most charming thing that the Government have done." They have taken this great step in broadening the franchise in this country in the first session of Parliament after they had promised the people that they would do so. These I can refer to as subsidiary points in the platform of the Government and in the mandate they got from the people.

There cannot be any successful denial of the fact that the main proposition put before the country—as far as my part of the country is concerned, and I do not think it was different in any other part of the country—was that this war was of such transcendent and overwhelming importance that it was necessary to mobilize the man power and the material power of the country to enable Canada to do her full and proper share in the winning of the war. That policy did not appeal to the party opposite, or the method of pursuing that policy in Britain, in France, in America, did not appeal to them, which is pretty well the same thing. They opposed in reality, if in unconsciousness, the only method by which the man and material power of the country could be mobilized. It is true we had the criticism from the right hon. the leader of the Opposition that the Government was conscripting the man power of the country and not conscripting the money power. If that had been true I still would have voted for Union Government because, from what I could see of my right hon. friend's policy, he would not have conscripted anything, and half a loaf is better than no bread. But, I do not think it is strictly true. In regard to the man power of the country, the party opposite stand where they did, except that they do not fight the further application of compulsory military service with anything like the keenness they did last year, and I beg to say to you, Sir, that I think it is very greatly to their credit, it shows that their psychology has been somewhat affected at any rate by the tremendous offensive on the western battlefront in Europe. No one but a child could fail to appreciate what that offensive means to the world. We heard of this military power, ad nauseum, as the greatest military power that the world had ever seen, and can anybody doubt it? They swept into Belgium and France, to begin with, and they nearly gained their objective of Paris before being held up. On the eastern front they went through with incredible swiftness and ran the enormous Russian armies back beyond Tannenberg. That was in the first autumn of the war. In the next autumn of the war

they swept over a little country like Serbia and squeezed it like a small sponge. In the next autumn of the war they did the same with Rumania. Last autumn they hurried south and swept Italy backward in the same way. I want to put the question very seriously to my hon. friends: What remains? I will tell them. The last front of freedom in the world is that held by Britishers and equally by glorious, bleeding, but still unbeatable and triumphant Frenchmen. What are we in Canada to do in face of circumstances like that? What becomes of the strategy of my hon. friends in my own province? They had all become strategists, and they showed us that minor individuals like General Haig and Mr. Lloyd George did not really know anything about the facts of the situation, and that there was no need of men in Europe at all. "What you want is wheat." What would all the wheat in the world have done to save us from the results of that offensive if the men had not been there, and what advantage would it be at the present time if you had multiplied your production tenfold if they were not now there? You must realize that if that one last bulwark of freedom were swept aside you need not bother any more about what you are going to produce in Canada, because the Germans will direct you what to do.

Now, I admitted a moment ago that the psychology of hon. gentlemen opposite has evidently been affected somewhat, but they have still, apparently, a very small appreciation of the situation as I have tried to describe it, and as I claim it to exist, because, only a few weeks ago, we were favoured with a repetition of the arguments of last year, full of that party stuff about breaking our pledges to farmers in regard to exemptions. That does not bother me a moment, and it will not bother the western farmers, because they appreciate the situation. Why should it, in the light of the statement I have just made?—for, evidently, there will be no farming to do except under autocratic rulers if we do not send the men. That is what the Government was confronted with in the fulfilment of half of what I would call the major portion of their programme for which they got such a magnificent mandate from the people. If it were understood that the Government were going to exempt the farmers, they might turn on hon. gentlemen opposite and say they are the men who are to blame for the Government's pledge, because they told us there was no need of men. But no man with his eyes open to the course of events would argue that to-day. The need of men was obvious, it was pressing. But the Government broke its pledge, my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) says. Yes, but it kept its eye fixed on the goal of victory and the need of men.

Now I think I have made out a very good case for the fact that there is a Union Government, as distinguished from a party government, up to now—a very good case. But I have to be fair to myself and to my convictions, and to carry the actual facts of the case just a little further. I want to say that the Government was equally pledged, as far as I understood their position—I certainly was, and every man from the West was, I think—to mobilize the material power, the money power, of the country, as well as the man power, and in so far as it is made from non-party motives I appreciate the point of view that was so well put by my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) the other day, and was put not quite so well by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) this afternoon. I appreciate the point of view; I appreciate the criticism, and I am going to extend it a little. And when I come to speak of the Budget I am bound to say that, just as I have tried to point out the reasons why a very great change in the thought and attitude of hon. members opposite is necessary before they will be entrusted with power by the people of this country, so it is true from my point of view that the Government, this Union Government, which, after all, is only human, has fallen down a little on its Budget. I do not refer to the non-reduction of the tariff. Personally I hold the same views about trade matters as I ever did; I suppose I am the only man here who is really open to the accusation of being fully deserving of the madhouse in regard to them, but still they are fully shared by most of my countrymen in the little land from which I come. I have been a strong free trader all my life, and I hold my free trade views still, but I want to repeat what I said this afternoon: that the Unionist Government has given evidence already of its determination with full strength of purpose to do the best things to carry out its programme and to fulfil the orders that were given it by the people. I have so much confidence that the members of the Government are alive to the events that are taking place in the world, and so much confidence also in their intellect, that they will see

and be alert in repairing anything in regard to the tariff that needs to be repaired in the next session of Parliament, if not in this. I believe that all the countries at war will not go in the direction that some people are looking for, a war of imperial zollvereins and protection. I will tell you why I believe it. What is it we are all fighting for, Sir? We are fighting for the triumph of democracy in all the advanced nations in the world, or in all the world, and it is inconceivable in thought that the triumph of that democracy and the introduction of the principle of human brotherhood can lead the free peoples of the world in the direction of fighting a trade war after they have abolished military war forever. That is my view, and I venture to base a prophecy upon it—that you will have a movement of world opinion and world action along those lines. If that is to come about it will come about in this country at the hands of the Government, because Union Government is a reality, in spite of what my hon. friend from Maisonneuve says, and it is composed of men in whose ability and integrity I have the highest confidence. It will be quick to catch the signs of the times and the needs of our nation. I shall very likely live to see far more lowering of the tariff under a Unionist Government than I ever saw under a Liberal one—and that might not be much either.

Now I come to the point of the conscription of wealth, so-called. Well, I think a wise Government, Sir, will be led by the force of events to go a considerable direction in the way of conscription of wealth further than this Government has been led now. Because, in the first place, we will have to copy the wisdom of the other great nations with which we are allied in this contest; and in the second place, if we do not go further than we have gone now in a wise direction towards the conscription of wealth, forces will be let loose in the world, after this triumph of democracy for which we are conscientiously fighting—forces will be let loose which will be anarchistic forces, which will be socialistic forces, and instead of taking a great deal of the income of the rich man they will take all he has got. That is my contribution to prophecy along this line.

I want to say on this point candidly—and I apologize for keeping the House so long—that I do not believe the Government has gone as far as it should with its income tax. I do not believe in a levy on capital, although there are many people in the West looking to the possibility of that after the war—many people are looking to it and believe it will come to a considerable extent. I believe the proper thing is to get as much of the money as you possibly can for carrying on the war by means of an income tax, just as they are doing in the United States, and as they are doing to a very much greater extent in Great Britain. I repeat that I do not think the Government has gone far enough in this matter, and I believe public opinion will compel it to go further at the next session of Parliament. It is impossible, of course, as has been said again and again, to make anything like an equality of sacrifice possible in this war. I met a man, within the last few days, who came into the town of Medicine Hat a few days after war broke out, from a ranch some distance out in the country. He was a South African veteran, and seeing a crowd around a building he asked what was the matter. They told him there was a war on. His hired man was with him, and he said: "Take the wagon back to the farm and tell the wife I will come back after I have done my bit towards beating Germany." That was in the first part of the war, and he came back this week. He went to the war prepared to lose his life, if necessary. I know of other cases, well authenticated cases, in the northern part of my province, of men who left their rich farms with cattle and horses, allowed the horses and the cattle to roam the prairies, went to the front and have lost their lives. I know of one man in particular—and this is also a well authenticated case—who after being wounded three times returned to the battle line. He was killed—struck in the middle of the body by a shell and had both his legs blown off. There is no amount of money that we can pay, the richest of us, that will make us equal in sacrifice to what these men have done. But surely the argument is made stronger by that very consideration, for a Government going as far as it is possible, in accordance with sound economic thinking and the economic condition of the country, to make the sacrifice of those who are left at home as great as possible along the line of the giving of wealth. If we compare the Budget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) introduced the other day in a speech of conspicuous ability, with what they are doing in Britain, the comparison compels me again to think that this Government has not gone far enough. In the year 1916 Lloyd George had predicted a total revenue in England of five hundred million pounds. As the House well knows, nearly all the taxation in England is raised

directly. Well, the English people did better than Lloyd George, who at that time held the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer, anticipated. They raised five hundred and seventy million pounds—$2,800,000,000—in the year 1916, almost entirely by direct taxation.

We are, roughly, rather more than a seventh of the population of Great Britain and Ireland. A very simple sum in division, seven into twenty-eight, would have told my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance a simple method by which he could have raised $400,000,000 for next year, and he only wants $280,000,000—he is not a very greedy chancellor compared with those they have in Great Britain. He wants $280,000,000, and he proposes to raise it by borrowing from the people of Canada. If he had made his taxes as high as they are in Britain, and provided the people here are as rich as are the people there—I suppose they are richer in Britain, although it has always been a mystery to me how they could get so much wealth under the "mistaken" fiscal policy of free trade—he could knock off $120,000,000, and get all the money required without borrowing at all. If we are not as rich as are the people of Britain, it would be hard to get the money; that is a moot point; there is none of us who would admit that we are not as patriotic. I think sound fiscal thinking will lead the Government to go further along this line before another Budget is brought in.

I want to make another comparison between the action of the Government upon the income tax and the other taxes they have brought in. I do not want to say much about the tax on matches—I have a recollection that Robert Lowe, a Chancellor of the Exchequer in Britain, was nearly driven out of public life for introducing a tax on matches, and in view of that precedent I rather wondered at the courage of my hon. friend in his action. The people of Britain would not stand for it a minute. They were probably right. It is one of these small irritating taxes, and we had better wait until next year before we prophesy anything about it. But I want to make a comparison which will perhaps bring out my point of view a little better. The Government are taxing tea ten cents a pound. Now, you can get a pretty fair pound of tea in western Canada for fifty cents. That means a tax of twenty cents upon a dollar's worth of tea. A simple calculation by the House will make it aware of the fact, therefore, that this Government is practically putting $2,000 taxation upon $10,000 worth of tea—tea which the women who have sent their relatives to the front need, or think they need, to cheer their nerves three times a day, in the circumstances we are passing through. But on an individual income of $10,000, the Government charges only $392. I think they are too kind about that transaction. I have always been extremely anxious to pay an income tax of 95 per cent on a million dollars. I would like to do that just for one year to know what it felt like to have $50,000. And then if the war went on I would make a fair deal on that $50,000 afterwards, but I am ready next year, if the Government will tell me where to get the million dollars, to let them have 95 per cent of it. Of course, people living in the eastern parts would not be so rash, because they do not know the glorious freedom and independence of our western country. If the Government had gone further along this line they would have pursued the path of sounder finance, in my humble judgment. I have given them full credit for what they have done along this line. The late Government was the first which ever raised a cent of direct taxation in this country, and, after all, that is something to be rather proud of. Some of the taxation by which they raised money was very drastic taxation indeed. The business tax—I referred this afternoon to the extraordinary shynesss which those enthusiastic direct taxers opposite showed for these direct taxes when they were introduced in this House. It seemed to me self-evident—of course, I was raised and got my fiscal thoughts in the Old Country, where free trade and direct taxation have prevailed for three-quarters of a century—that it would be sounder finance for us to take more of the money from the pockets of the people as you go along, and not by way of loans. Mr. Speaker, there is no great amount of patriotism, or sacrifice either, in buying a good bunch of Victory bonds with the credit of Canada behind them and 5 per cent interest. I would do a great deal along that line of patriotism if I had the money. But he is a great patriot who says: Take the money now, and you will never have to pay either principal or interest. The Victory bond business is not one of the things which I consider to be the biggest exhibition of patriotism. As a matter of fact, the man who buys a big bunch of Victory bonds is the embodiment of selfishness. This may be extraordinary heterodoxy to the people of the United States and

Canada, but I believe what I say, and I have a habit of saying what I think. In the first place he looks over to the trenches and says: "Poor fellows, they are losing their lives; we have to support them." Then he looks at his own pocket and sees a fine bunch of money, and the Government comes along and says: "We would like that money at 5½ per cent interest"—and the beauty of the arrangement is that you may never be called upon to pay the principal, you will have to struggle with the interest, but posterity will pay the principal. This Victory bond business is not an example of sacrifice; it is an example of selfishness and shirking of duty. The man in the trenches is sacrificing, as are the people who will subsequently pay back the principal of the bonds and the interest—none of us knows how long we will carry that debt. We are really putting our sacrifices of blood, on the one hand, on the men in the trenches, and on the other hand our financial sacrifices are put on posterity. The Government have lacked courage in regard to their income tax, which should have been higher. Personally, I would die from the lashings of my conscience,—and I do not profess to have the most tender conscience in the world,—if I received anything like an income of $20,000 a year in times like these. I would like to take all the millionaires out to my ranch, build them each a shack, and let them know the pleasure of working for a living, if they would give most of their wealth to carry on the war. Since the beginning of the war business men have been asking to be taxed, and that is why, with great regret, I have to say that on this one point the Government have broken down, they have failed. There was a gentleman in Hamilton, whose name I forget now, who handed over the whole of his profits for one year, amounting to seven or eight hundred thousand dollars, without being taxed at all,—conscience money he could not take. I met a business gentleman, who, with his brother is the head of one of the biggest businesses in Ontario, the other day, a lifelong Tory, fifty years of age,—it is only an accident, perhaps, but I never met a Grit of that kind at all,—He said to me, with the utmost seriousness and in the terse language which business men use; Your income tax is all right, but you have not gone for enough with it; do it now and do it quickly; I want to pay my shot now; it is interest that is the ruin of Canada. Sir, that man knew what he was talking about and his views are representative of those of hundreds of other business men of this country.

The Government—some members of it anyhow—have with laudable energy preached economy since this war began. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has been very earnest along that line; I am told that he smokes only one cigarette a year, so it runs with his nature. To preach economy is good, but it is in the power of the Government to enforce economy. If you only take plenty of taxes from the rich they will have to be economical, and, because of its newness and its otherwise generally admirable character, it will be a blessed experience to them. How are we economizing on war accounts? I do not know why the Government went in for these petty dockages of a few civil servants who went to the front. Get the money by direct taxation, and give the men who have gone to the front the fairest show in the world—that is the view of every right-thinking man in this country. I believe the Government have actually done something in making separation allowances less; but not one man in ten thousand in Canada will approve these petty dockages.

I have said a great deal in praise of the Government and it is just as well for them to have a little medicine of the other kind. They are men of open mind and I believe they will take it in good spirit; they know that I mean well, anyhow. I do not think they have economized as much, perhaps, on contracts as they might have, although the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), has been an admirably busy man along these lines. I have said this in good part; I have said it with the utmost earnestness and the utmost seriousness. I think that Union Government is giving a splendid justification of its formation and its existence, as will be admitted by any gentleman on the other side of the House who gives reasonable attention to the points that I have raised in that connection, if he has any fairness in him and gets rid of that partyism which took such a violent hold of my hon. friend this afternoon. They have made a fair step at fulfilling their promises to the people. They are putting hard work into this business. Some people attribute to me some share in the parentage of Union Government. It would hurt me if the Government went much further along that direction of being prodigally patriotic with the sons of the rank and file in the trenches and parsimonious with the pockets of the rich. I

believe that the opinion of the people of the country is absolutely behind me in this respect, irrespective of party, I know what the people of the West want in this matter. I know them well—I know them better than some folks thought I did last fall, anyway. I think I know what the labouring men of this country want in the matter; if Canada was canvassed to-morrow they would support the view that I have tried in my own way to bring before this House, and especially before the Government. Realizing their immense responsibilities wishing them well, knowing that they are dominated by patriotism and by the desire to win the war for freedom on which we are embarked, I believe the Government will yet rise to the fulness of their duty on this the only point on which in my judgment they have fallen short.

I should like to finish with an appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), whom I love—he used to entertain me in his own house at one time, and would yet, I think, if I needed it. With the greatest political powers in the world he cannot become a real leader of a united country if he gives way to outbursts of racialism, and to what I am afraid was narrowness, as he did this afternoon; and leads a debate which betrays extraordinary imperviousness to the course of events in the world, as he did when he spoke against woman suffrage. "Coming all over the world—but we cannot have it in Quebec,"—that attitude will never produce a united country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Asquith would not have it in England, nor would Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK. Mr. Asquith has more wisdom than my hon. friend; he was not long in seeing the light. I had taken the chair for Mrs. Pankhurst before Mr. Asquith saw the light—I do not know that the accidental combination of Mrs. Pankhurst and myself at a public meeting had anything to do with it. However, the facts are in favour of Mr. Asquith, because he has changed his mind in the right direction. The fact is that war will lead my hon. friends opposite—will lead us all—to develop far more quickly along the lines of progress in one year than people heretofore have done in a generation. Half a century ago you could not have formed a Union Government in this country; it was the pressure of war that did it. Of course my hon. friend says that it is not a Union Government; that it is a Tory Government.

With the indulgence of the House, I would like to put a question to him. He still sees nothing but Liberals and Tories; he himself and his right hon. leader are the only two of the Liberal persuasion worth very much consideration. There are some good, promising young fellows behind them, and everything else is Tory. Why, Sir, everybody on this side of the House holds almost precisely the view with regard to world events that every advanced thinker in America does to-day, irrespective of party. Would my hon. friend make the charge that the United States of America—the freest and in many respects the greatest country in the world—is composed entirely of Tories? He has to get away from this to be on his old pinnacle.

My hon. friend told me the other day that I was an exile. I am not an exile from the belief in freedom; I am not an exile from the belief that the only fight for liberty and democracy is now going on on the battlefields of Europe. My hon. friend knows that; he has given a splendid young man to the cause, and I am proud of it—his only son, if I mistake not, standing with mine. They have forgotten all party strife there; they see only the danger to the world. I speak with the utmost kindness and the utmost sincerity in the last words I utter on this occasion to my hon. friends opposite. Press along; get the Government to go further in the way of conscription of wealth, but give up partyism for the moment. Get in behind the boys in the trenches. My message to-night is the same as it was last year: Realize the great object of the fight and the privilege of living through this period. Then you will have a united Canada—united under a Union which, I trust, will not be lightly broken again.

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I listened with attention and interest to the very able speech which was delivered this afternoon by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and with no less attention to the reply of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). Notwithstanding what has been said on many occasions during this debate, I want hon. gentlemen opposite to realize that we concur with them in the view that the present circumstances and the situation which we are now facing are the most serious and most inspiring that have ever existed in this country—indeed, that have ever existed through all the ages of time. On the other hand, I wish every member

of this House to understand that, no matter how great the crisis, no matter how great the issue at stake, it is inevitable, especially in such circumstances as these, that men in the same country, having the same aims, the same aspirations and tending towards the same destinies, should, on matters so momentous as these, have different views and opinions. That is the stand that I am going to take this evening in the course of my few remarks, and that is the stand which has been taken by my fellow-citizens of French origin. Future generations and ages will later show—and perhaps the time will come sooner than we expect—who was right and who was wrong; but if I am now raising the question of right or wrong, it is not because I want to contend that we alone are right and that we possess right. I do not contend that at all. I am not so strong a man as to be able, under these circumstances, to say: behold, right is ours, and hon. members on the other side of the House are wrong. But I am strong enough a man to say: We have studied the situation as it has presented itself to us; we have done our best to comprehend and understand it, and if we have arrived at a solution which is different from the solution to which our hon. friends opposite have come, our opinion in this respect, notwithstanding the greatness of the effort, should be respected just as highly as the opinion of any hon. member in this House.

One of the main arguments made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) in order to overcome the effect of the speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) was that the vigorour address which the latter delivered this afternoon contained nothing substantial and, in fact, nothing that was deserving of an answer. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for Red Deer make that remark at the beginning of his speech, for he did make it, as I took a note of it at the time, and it will appear in Hansard. For a person who can find nothing fitting with which to challenge or contradict the arguments of an adversary, it is always wise to say: The reasons you have given are worthless, and I shall not attempt to answer them. It would be folly on my part if I were not aware that I am far too inexperienced to place myself between these two stalwarts, the hon. member for Maisonneuve and the hon. member for Red Deer. Let it be sufficient for me to say, in conclusion, upon this point, that, at all events, we on this side of the House all greatly admired the speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and we are all happy that, in these times of stress, we are able to enjoy the privilege of having such a man in our depleted ranks.

It is recognized, and I can safely say, that this Budget is one of the most important delivered since Confederation. It embraces greater scope than any other measure which was ever introduced into this House. The figures are amazing. Yet the discussion of it remains a delicate subject to handle on account of the many delicate questions which are dependent upon it, and of this every one of us has had proof this afternoon and on previous days.

The feature which will at first sight strike the layman is the colossal amount of money which we have already spent, and the still more colossal amount which will be spent under the new measures and also under the old ones. In view of these facts one can hardly avoid making reflections of the most serious nature. May I be listened to by this House, however, when I say that my desire is to avoid launching into any unjust criticism or undue manifestation of hostility toward those who do not believe as we do. For I have always believed that earnestness and sincerity are the best policies for any man to follow in all walks of life—politics included—and although this disposition of mind has been the cause of many bitter deceptions I have suffered—mainly in politics—yet I still cling to these primeval principles. Because I look upon it as a boon, which tends to make a man a better man, to be given the privilege of making an address in the presence of such a distinguished body of men as I now behold. I look upon the situation as serious, and I believe we cannot emphasize this too much. If it be the policy of this Government to spend hundreds of millions, even billions of dollars, blindly and without any regard whatsoever to Canadian interests; if it be the policy of this Government to forget that Canada is a country which owes to itself preservation and survivance, then this Government is rightfully pursuing its policy. Again, if this Administration is content with the principle, once dwelt upon by one of its members, that it is proper and expedient, if needs be, to drive Canada into bankruptcy in order to assist the Allies in Europe; if such be the consensus of opinion amongst the hon. members of this House, then, again, I say we would be only following our course by adopting this Budget

9 p.m.

and pursuing the policy which the Government has adopted. If, on the other hand, sound counsel still prevails in this House; if the ideals of the Canadian people are still those which, until a very recent date, had been pursued by all political men, political associations and political parties in this country, ever since Confederation, then I say it is high time that this wild stampede which has been forced upon us should be halted, and every man in this country should now pause and meditate a moment.

If it be true that I am opposed with all the strength of which I am capable to conscription, yet I am not, we are not on this side of the House by any means opposed to Canada's contribution to this war. On the contrary, we have always said and declared that, regardless of whether or not we were compelled to contribute according to our obligations towards the Mother Country, we were willing to do what we could. But what I want, what we want, is that this contribution be made to the extent only which our means warrant.

What we want is that Canada should not be ruined, bankrupt in both men and money, in her attempt—successful, we all hope but nevertheless uncertain—to win the war by giving the Allied nations the relatively scant and meagre support which we only can produce.

I have said we all hope to be successful, but that the result is nevertheless uncertain, and I want to be well understood on that point. What does Canada's contribution represent in this war? If we are to accept as true the statement in the newspapers that there are now five million men opposing the Germans, what does Canada's contribution of four divisions or ninety thousand men amount to, relatively speaking? It represents about two per cent of the whole. If by sacrificing Canada it was in our power to win the war, I am not ready to say I would not be the first to say, Let us do it; because Canada is not as big as the whole of Europe or as big as civilization, and it might not be a bad bargain to sacrifice even our own country to save Europe and civilization. But what will be the actual result of our contribution in this war? We can add only a very small amount to the forces which are now opposing each other; I might almost say, a negligible amount when we consider the final result of this struggle. But we are taking it for granted that it is the proper thing to do, to ruin and bankrupt this country for the sake of the war. I say this is not acting on sound principles. It is not doing justice to ourselves or to the country to sacrifice Canada in order to win the war, when we all admit that Canada by itself cannot win the war and can only assist in a very meagre way in bringing that end about.

I have expressed in a few brief words what I believe to be the sentiments and ideals of my own province, and what I believe to be also the sentiments and ideals of a great many citizens of other provinces in this Dominion. Of this we have new evidence every day. What answer do the delegations get that come here from different parts of Ontario? What do they come here for? They come here, I suppose, because they accept the argument I have just advanced. If the Prime Minister said to these men, "Canada is the only country that can win the war, and if we give our whole we will win it," I credit the people of Ontario with patriotism enough to say that they would do it and I believe every one of those men would return to their homes satisfied and prepared to do what had to be done. But all that can be said to them is this, "Do your best; we are simply a drop in the bucket; sacrifice your whole for the war but be assured that your contribution is not important enough to win the war." Many criticisms have been made of the stand taken by my province. On an occasion like this, where the main if not the sole object of the Budget is the prosecution of the war according to the means adopted by the Government; the application and the enforcement of the law of conscription according to old and new methods, the payment of expenses which have already been made, which are being made now, and which will necessarily be made in the future, and, as an immediate consequence of all this, the necessity of levying enormous amounts of money upon the people—all matters about which we do not agree with the Government or at least differ as to methods—I think I should be given the privilege of explaining some of the reasons why my people have opposed, and are still opposing, the policy of the Government in regard to the different matters I have just mentioned, and I feel I will not be doing wrong or injustice to any one in expressing the views of my constituents on these divers subjects, if I do so openly, frankly, and honestly, without craft, guile, or suspicion. If I were only relying upon my own authority in reference to these reasons it would not be worth any more than the opinion of an

inexperienced man; but such is not the case. In support of my views I can quote the opinion of all the public men this country has produced, great and small, learned and ignorant, Whigs and Tories, from the fathers of Confederation down to the public men of present times. Every one in this House admits that this new policy of sacrificing Canada to win a war in Europe has always been deprecated by all Governments and by all public men in this country ever since Confederation. We are so well aware of that, that when war was declared we heard the Prime Minister say that no one in England had asked us to send troops overseas. If we had been obliged for some reason or another to contribute in this war, why did not England send for the soldiers of Canada just as she sent for her own soldiers in India and elsewhere? Of course, everybody admits we are not obliged to contribute. We are doing it simply because we are satisfied to do it, because the issue at stake is so tremendous we cannot help doing it, and we should not avoid doing it. The difference of opinion between us is not so great as some people think, and it would not be so great if the facts which I am now going to bring before the House were better known. I have just said that this is a new policy for Canada. We never contemplated a contribution in this war to the extent of conscription, and in this connection I cannot do better than refer to the declaration of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself.

In January, 1916, in the House of Commons, in answer to a question asked by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, the right hon. the Prime Minister said in the most unequivocal manner that there should be no conscription in Canada. What did that mean? It meant that the effort of Canada was to be a limited one and that it was to remain within the limits of voluntary recruiting which, even at that period, had begun to diminish to a noticeable extent. To say that Canada would not have conscription was virtually to declare that the contribution in men would not go beyond a certain limit and that, as a consequence, the moneys to be expended, being proportionate to the number of men who had enlisted, might also be limited. No other meaning could be attributed to those words.

But the course of things changed. All of a sudden conscription came, and some people are now surprised because the French Canadians did not jump at conscription, did not take off their hats and acknowledge that since the Prime Minister has changed his views, we should change ours also. But I would point out to hon. gentlemen who take this view that we had been taught otherwise for generations and generations, and no one can change the mentality of a people in a single hour no matter what the circumstances are. Since then the policy of the Government has been changed so that no one can tell now where we are going, save that we are going full speed ahead towards bankruptcy? This is just where the divergence of opinion arises. I deny the right of any member of this House or any Government to drive Canada full speed ahead into bankruptcy in order to try to win the war. That is where the divergence of opinion comes in. One group contends that we should give everything to the war, while the other group supports the idea that we should give everything we can without driving this country to destruction. It is only a question of degree and I humbly submit that both opinions, although perhaps not equally wise, are nevertheless equally sincere.

Although I do not admit the idea of those who would sacrifice everything to the war, still I can understand the sentiment and ideals of those men, and that is the reason I rose and said that I wanted to speak and to say things honestly and sincerely without craft, pretense or guile. I can understand the sentiments and ideals of those men, but what I cannot understand is that those who do not agree with our ideals should find it impossible, or should refuse, to understand our sentiments and ideals as we do theirs. The only explanation would be that these men are practical exponents of the selfish doctrine of self-infallibility.

An important question which has often been asked and which I will now seek to answer is this: Why did not the French Canadians of the province of Quebec enroll voluntarily to the same extent as those of English speech throughout Canada generally? Why did they oppose conscription, and at this present juncture why are they not willing to give their own to the war, or, to be plain, why are they not willing to give the "last man" and spend the "last dollar" for the war? This query is nothing less than the enunciation under a different form of the problem I have already disclosed. The answer is manifold, and if I take the time of this House to give the answer it is because I think earnestly and frankly that from a proper understanding between this side of the House and the

other good will come to all of us. It has been pointed out before that the enrollment throughout Canada has been by reason of inverse ratio to the time during which people have inhabited this country. In other words, those who were newcomers enrolled in much greater numbers than those who had been old time settlers. And this is only natural. The man who has left Europe recently has not yet become attached to the soil of this country. He feels himself a stranger in Canada and he has always in mind the idea that the old country is his home. The opposite applies to the old settler. He has lost interest in all things across the ocean and looks upon Canada as his real and only country. But the same condition of mind exists still more deeply with the French Canadians for historical reasons. These historical reasons are not known by every one in this country. If they were better known our sentiments and ideals would be better understood. In the year 1763, when the Treaty of Quebec established English domination in this country, history teaches us, all those noble Frenchmen who had sufficient means to return to France made their exit from this country leaving behind the poorer classes of the population, whose numbers were a little over 60,000. These people considered themselves exiles, and English domination in those days of strife between France and England was looked upon with the same terror as we now look upon the dreaded German domination. These things may seem strange, but hon. gentlemen who are listening to me now, and who are scholars, know very well that these facts as I state them are true. No French nobleman would stay in Canada to submit himself to the yoke of English domination. In speaking of English domination, I am not saying that the yoke of English domination was anything like the German domination, but that was the sentiment of the time. It was the same sentiment as that which existed at one time in England that Catholics should not have the same rights as Protestants, and it was the same sentiment as that which existed in France at one period that Protestants should not have the same rights as Catholics. Fortunately, those times have passed, but we know that these sentiments of the French Canadians have their root in these facts of history. If the French Canadians have attached themselves to the soil, if they made this country their home, having lost all hope of ever returning to France, I hope no one will blame them for this, because it has been held in all countries of the world and through all ages that the immemorial tenure of land and of estates was the very foundation of nobility.

Now let us consider the case of the new settler from Britain. The man, perhaps, arrived from the Old Country, five, ten, or fifteen years ago and settled in this country. This man's family was in England, his ancestors were buried there, his recollections were of England, his lore is that of England, the better part of his heart very often had remained in England; and it was only natural, on war being declared between Great Britain and Germany, that, forgetting at once that he was in a colony, he should flee back to England and take his place in the ranks of the British army. Such action was only natural, but how can you reasonably expect that the French Canadian whose ancestors had been domiciled in Canada for one hundred and fifty or two hundred years, who had no relations whatever in Europe, and had no interest there, should do the same thing? You could not reasonably expect it. Of course, in my remarks I am speaking entirely outside of the legal question, outside altogether of the question of the right to impose conscription and the obligations that devolve upon us thereunder. I am dealing solely with the question of sentiment, the force of which has been urged so many times in this House. So, for generation after generation, the French Canadian had lived here, his affections divided equally between love for his native village and love for the numerous members of his family for whom he had to care. He was taught to think, to believe, and to understand that Canada alone was his country, and that in the event of war his obligations did not go beyond defending his native land; and we all know that this opinion was in conformity with the views held by many Englishmen, not only in Canada but in England as well. It is recognized that this is the first time such an issue has ever been raised in Canada. If I am emphasizing the point so much it is because I see some of my hon. friends opposite smiling, but I am very serious in this matter. I argue that it could not be otherwise than for the French Canadian population of Canada to hold the views they do, bearing in mind the conditions under which they had lived here for one hundred and fifty years and more; and when people declare that the French Canadians are disloyal, that they are anti-British, that they do not want the war to be won by the Allied nations, and all such kind of stuff, they must be either

ignorant of the conditions under which the French Canadians have lived, or else they are acting in bad faith. When Canada was attacked, what did the French Canadians do? I have just stated that according to their conception of their duty it was imperative for them to defend Canada. Well, they defended Canada, and history stands as an unfaltering witness to testify that they did their duty. They were taught, and learned, that such was the limit of their duty, and I believe they were taught the truth according to the only possible true interpretation of our constitution.

Such, Mr. Speaker, was the state of things which existed when Confederation was brought about. The drafting of the Confederation pact left no doubt in the minds of the Canadian people that their military obligations were limited to the defence of this country, and if room had been left for doubt, the uncertainty would have long ago been dispelled by the teachings of Canadian public men during the last fifty years. What is Confederation? It is nothing more or less than a contract between different provinces, just as a contract is made between individuals. The province of Quebec was not compelled to enter Confederation, but she did so, and I here declare to-night that we people of that province are glad of the fact. We are not sorry that we entered Confederation, because we believe in the destinies of Canada, we believe that when these days of stress pass union will exist—not the Union Government, but a real union—between the two great races of this country once more, even if that union has been broken recently. I believe that by exerting our united efforts we can accomplish a lot for Canada; I believe we will achieve such results that in a very few years no one will be displeased, or will entertain sorrow, that Confederation ever existed. I speak from what I know of the sentiment in my own province, because that province entered as a partner into Confederation.

Taking the facts as they exist, under that compact the French Canadians have been taught for the last fifty years that they have nothing to do with wars in Europe. The man who came to this country from England, one, two, five, or ten years before the war, did not understand that condition of things here. He was supposed to know that Confederation existed, but we can well imagine that he never troubled his head about the underlying principles. That man left England and came to a "colony," or at least came here with the idea that most Englishmen have, namely, that colonies, being dependencies of the Old Country, must submit to everything that the Old Country demands of them. Of the ruling spirit which influenced Confederation they knew nothing. I am not blaming such Englishmen, I admire their patriotism, but how could it be expected that French Canadians could have the same mentality, the same point of view, as that which influenced the Englishman to leave Canada and return to England to fight on her behalf in this war?

Now let me refer to other events. About twenty years ago the South African war occurred, and lengthy discussions took place in Canada with regard to our contribution to it and the relatively small number of men who were sent on active service at that time. If I am not mistaken, Canada sent four thousand men to South Africa, but before a single soldier was despatched, it was declared in the House of Commons of Canada in a most authoritative way, in such a manner that no one could be mistaken, that the contribution of men which we were then making should not be considered as a precedent. Well, Sir, if so much care and trouble was taken to announce to the people of Canada that the despatch of that force to South Africa should not be considered as a precedent, it meant implicitly that Canada was not obliged to contribute men, and if we did contribute men it was because we wanted to render more cordial the good relations that existed between England and this country. So the people of the province of Quebec had another reason for believing that they were not compelled to participate in European wars.

But the newest, most amazing and most dissolving manifestation against out participation in foreign wars, was witnessed during the general elections of 1911 and the period which followed. In the province of Quebec, a new party called the Nationalist party was in the field. According to these men we owed England nothing, and in case of war ought not to furnish her one button for a uniform. They vehemently condemned the Laurier policy of a Canadian navy, to be Canadian in time of peace but Imperial in time of war. They denounced with still greater vigour the policy of the hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister. They denied allegiance to either of the two leaders whose policies they equally reproved. The result was that several Nationalist candidates were elected, and, immediately after, the Prime Minister whom they had de-

nounced with the utmost violence received them into the shelter of his fatherly arms just as the patriarch of yore received the prodigal son. The records show, however, that this wonderful metamorphosis was not altogether spontaneous, for, before being allowed to enter the precincts of a new Cabinet the Nationalists had to severely punish their rebellious minds with anchoretic repentance and show signs of remorse such as even the prodigal son never approached. On the other hand, it is nevertheless true that no penitent sinner ever derived from repentance such magnificent and gorgeous rewards as these men received. Oliver Goldsmith writes:

> Scarcely any virtue found to resist the power of long and pleasing temptation.

The author of the Vicar of Wakefield did not write for the men of his time alone, but rather with a prophetic instinct he wrote also for some of the distinguished gentlemen who were elected in the year of grace 1911. The temptation to which these Nationalists were subjected on the part of the hon. Prime Minister—for he seems to have been an irresistible tempter,—were indeed long and pleasing temptations which the heroic virtue of the reformers could not withstand. Both the tempter and his easy-to-win victims have been since greatly punished, the former on account of the many difficulties which he has encountered and of the bitter reproaches which ever since have assailed him from the faithful of his party; the latter by the discredit into which they have fallen among their own fellowmen, a disgrace perhaps equal to none in the political annals of this country.

But what would the French Canadians think while some of these Nationalists were playing that low style of comedy? What could they believe other than that they had been deceived? Was this a reason for them to change their ideas? Certainly, this would never change their convictions and ideas and they still remained even firmer than before in the sentiments I have already described. It is not by deceiving people that you will bring conviction into their minds. When these Nationalists had preached all through the province of Quebec that we owed nothing to England and that we should not furnish a button for a uniform if she were at war, they should never have received from the Prime Minister the recompense they did receive. That was a very bad lesson to give to the province of Quebec because it was intimating to the people that credit and confidence were being placed in men who had been preaching to them a doctrine which I believe is altogether false, because I have never thought myself that we should go to the length of saying that we owed England nothing and that we should not give her a button for a uniform in time of war. So, I say again, that was a very bad example to the French Canadians and would never change their minds or ideas upon conscription or their contribution in this war.

Let us take a more recent event. The last, but not the least event was the general elections of 1917. If anything should be held as sacred in a country which is governed on democratic principles and is under a democratic constitution, it is certainly the right of suffrage, for all other rights proceed from the right of suffrage. Yet, prior to and during the last general election, every scheme and contrivance of devilish ingenuity were set to work to defeat the right and the ends of justice. I am not going to give the details. They will be given later to the country. Let it be sufficient for the moment, however, to mention that the War-time Elections Act was a scandal and an infringement upon the rights of the people unparalleled in the annals of this country. The application of the Act was equally scandalous, and we should not wonder at this for indeed the Act seemed to have been purposely drafted with such loopholes as would invite fraud and conspiracy, and the invitation was not unheeded either because imposition, trick, cheat, and treachery even were rampant during the elections. Last Friday night I heard the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) say that in Saskatchewan the War-time Elections Act was not conducive in any degree to the success of the Administration, and that the result would have been the same had that law not existed. Sir, if that statement be correct what a pity that this precious Government, as it was ironically termed this session by an hon. member on the right, did not think fit to dispense with that ignominious law. For I do solemnly declare to this House and the country that had the elections been just, free, fair, lawful and unstained, if the verdict had not been one of part only, but a free verdict of all of the population of Canada, the French Canadians would have abided by the decision and submitted to it. This Government had, indeed, a fine opportunity to win to their cause the French Canadians or else to prove to the world that they were really unworthy and unreliable partners in the great pact of Con-

federation. All the Administration had to do was to win a fair election, and this they did not choose to do. And that is one more reason why the French Canadians would not change their opinions about conscription. It had been proposed in this House—I do not wish to refer to a debate which is now closed—by my right hon. leader that a referendum should be submitted to the people, but it was claimed that this was unnecessary. Very well, let that question remain settled. But a free election, a right election, was necessary.

This Government—I do not know whether it is the same Government or a different one, but I am inclined to accept the view of my leader, who says that it is the same Administration as the previous one, whose complexion only has been changed—this Government, to impose conscription, had only to say to the French Canadian people: We have the people of Canada behind us; if you are not now ready to follow the lead given by the majority of the people, you are unworthy subjects. Had the Prime Minister said this, he would have been telling the truth. Any class of persons in a democratic country who are not ready to submit to the will of the majority, properly and fairly given in an election, are not worthy of consideration or of the deference and respect of their fellow-men.

Such was the state of affairs when the war broke out. It was announced from the beginning that Canada's participation should at all times and under all circumstances be voluntary; that Canada would never have conscription. This was another reason for French Canadians being confirmed in their previous ideas concerning conscription. But when, in May, 1917, the Government changed its policy in a fundamental manner and French Canadians did not follow suit, the latter were and still are denounced as slackers, anti-Britishers and traitors.

I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings. I am working, not on a policy of disruption, but on coalition and union of the races of this country. It is nevertheless true that French Canadians think logically; that they have only followed the traditions and laws of their country, while those who reproach them have not. What more should we ask of the best citizen than that he follow the traditions and laws of his country? The French Canadians are without reproach in their conduct. They might have enlisted in greater numbers, but it was their privilege to do so, or not to do so. The system was entirely a voluntary one, and they are therefore above reproach for what they have done. This is only sound logic.

There is a sentiment in certain parts of Canada against my people which I cannot too deeply regret, but which we are powerless to avoid. This sentiment did not find its origin in their non-participation in this war; it has existed for a longer period—indeed, for several generations. I am sorry to say that the province in which this House sits is mainly responsible for this regrettable state of affairs. Long before this war, over twenty years ago, I learned through my own experience of the state of mind of many of the Britishers in Ontario—things which are rather sad to admit. According to these people, all other considerations being even, a French Canadian is not equal to an Englishman for the sole reason that he is a French Canadian. I have probed this problem and I make this declaration because I acquired the knowledge through the experience of my boyhood when I was attending college in Ontario. I do not say this by way of reproach; we are working to unite this country. I say to the people of Ontario: You think you know something about the province of Quebec; but you know nothing; you think you were born to teach the people of the province of Quebec what they should do and what they should not do; but you are mistaken; send your boys to Quebec, have them learn the French language, have them study our institutions, have them see what kind of life we live and what kind of people we are, and you will have more consideration for the French community than you have now. If the people of Ontario wish to confine themselves to their own province, that is their own business; but if they do so they cannot be aware of the facts pertaining to our province; they cannot be alive to the conditions which existed in Quebec long before their ancestors came to this country. If the French Canadians do not contribute enough to the war, our friends from Ontario criticise us. If there is a change in sentiment, and the announcement is made that the French Canadians are willing to contribute, our friends from Ontario want to know why. Not later than last week we were given an example of this. The Minister of Militia had said:

> I am happy to be able to report to the House many evidences of a marked change of feeling in that province.

He was speaking of the province of Quebec. Assuredly this declaration should have

been gratifying and sufficient to the virtuous men of Ontario, but it was not. One of them could not help asking the minister to what he attributed the better feeling in Quebec. When the feeling is bad, they say: Let us strike the province of Quebec. When the feeling is good, they say: To what is this better feeling attributed? If the hon. member from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) had developed his auditive sense to the same degree that he has cultivated and fostered his labouring mind in the discrediting of all that is French and Catholic in this country he would have known that the answer had already been given more than once to his query by a man who has been sitting in this House for over forty years, and who has full authority to speak in the name of his compatriots, for he is one of the most noble figures which our race and this country generally have ever produced. On April 5th, 1918 (page 410 of Unrevised Hansard) this hon. gentleman spoke as follows of the French Canadian people:

> I know the people well, and I repeat what I said on a former occasion, that there is not to be found, in any part of Canada, a more peaceable or law-abiding population.

The hon. gentleman from West Toronto will find a complete answer in this. The people of Quebec do not approve any more of conscription this year than they did last year, but they submit to the law because they are virtuous enough to do so. Let the fanatics and the pseudo builders of the Empire not forget this, even though a different announcement might be dearer to their hearts, that the French Canadians are such as represented by the gentleman I have just quoted; that they have been such in the past; that they shall continue in the future and remain forever a peaceful and law-abiding people.

The people from eastern and western Canada, although they have often disagreed with us, have, to a large extent, endeavoured, so far as I am aware, to treat the French Canadians with consideration and respect, and I cannot thank them too heartily for this. Unfortunately the same cannot be said of Ontario. Just as Germany, at the time this war began, assumed the role of the bully of Europe, so Ontario has assumed the same nefarious role towards Quebec. Time flies quickly, and the day may not be far remote when some of the people of the sister province will meet their discomfiture; they will find that in bullying the peaceful province of Quebec, they have arrayed against themselves the other provinces of this Dominion. If I am saying this, it is because I have been able to come into touch with the sentiments of people from the Maritime and Western Provinces. At the present time we do not agree with the people of the Western Provinces on the matter of conscription; but I think I may be permitted to say in this House to-night, that I have listened to many a speech from these hon. members which has pleased me greatly. They are broad-minded people. The broadness of their minds seems to bear the print of the immensities of the prairies on which they live. We of the province of Quebec have always regarded these settlers as our friends, and although we are separated on conscription to-day, we still regard them as our friends. As to the people from the Maritime Provinces, I have met several of them who still bear within themselves the old stamp of the Acadian civilization. Meekness, kindness, tenderness, are the words used by Longfellow when he speaks about those people, and we still find the same spirit, to a large extent, if not wholly, in the Maritime Provinces. Why do we not find the same spirit in the province of Ontario? I have just said that some of the people of the province of Ontario, if things continue as they are going on now, will some day or another meet their discomfiture. I feel—I hope for them I am mistaken—that the day will come when Quebec will stand like a giant stretching his powerful arms to embrace the East on the one side and the West on the other, on top and over the head of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER: Never.

Mr. DENIS: I am not a prophet, but I say now that if, in a few years, I am permitted to again address this House, I think I shall be able to tell hon. members who are listening to me to-night that I was not mistaken. What do we actually see on the other side of the House? A very big cry—win the war. That is all very well, but our hon. friends opposite cannot go beyond that. If to-morrow morning the European war should suddenly terminate, what would happen between Ontario and the West? The people of those provinces have not the same feelings; they have not the same toleration. The West is tolerant, Ontario is not. I am not a statesman, I have no experience; I am a newcomer in this House, but I am greatly mistaken if I am not telling the truth when I say that the people of Ontario have to do a great

deal in the way of improvement if they ever want to impress their opinions upon the minds of the western people.

My presentation of the case has been totally incomplete and inadequate. The description of the actual conditions cannot be defined in a few words or pages. If, however, my unworthy remarks can be of any service towards the welfare of my people and our beloved country generally, I shall not have taken up the time of this House unduly. There are facts which it is not always agreeable to utter, but which must be exposed just the same. And it is through the enunciation of these verities that often good is accomplished. The French Canadians are not by any means to be blamed. They have acted in accordance with every law of God and man. My hon. friends on the other side of the House cannot say as much of themselves, for they have committed the crime of violating the constitution of their country. That is a strong statement to make, but it has been proved in this House that they have done so. The arguments have not been controverted. It has been proven that, according to the constitution, there was no power in Canada to enforce conscription and

10 p.m.

compel a free subject of His Majesty to fight in Europe. Yet my hon. friends opposite have enforced conscription, and when they are themselves violating the constitution of the country, they say that the French Canadians are disloyal and do not deserve to be looked upon as creditable partners in this Confederation. According to that fundamental law, that is, the constitution, they have no right to enforce conscription upon any citizen of the land, and yet they have done so. They have invoked the necessity of the hour. Necessity is no excuse for breaking the law. Otherwise the Huns who invaded Belgium for reasons of necessity would equally find excuse. Conscription has been unlawfully and unjustly enforced upon our people. We have protested; we are still protesting, and I do here again protest against this injustice. Yet we shall obey the law, for the law, however unjust it may be, is the law. We believe in the justice of our cause, and we feel confident that we can without fear submit our conduct to the judgment of future ages and generations.

Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion of my altogether too lengthy remarks. I hope I shall be forgiven by this House for speaking at such length. For ourselves, for hon. members on the other side of the House, for the whole of Canada, I want, before I resume my seat, to make this last statement. The French Canadians want the good, the welfare of this country, and the happiness of its people, and they want this in preference to anything else. They want the good and the welfare of the British Empire, but not at the cost of depopulation, ruin and bankruptcy of this country. They have been in the past, and they wish to remain in the future, faithful and dutiful subjects. They want concord, peace, harmony and bonne entente to reign in our dear country. But in order to attain these aims, we want justice in full for our fellowmen. We want our ancestral rights and privileges with regard to education, our language, and our faith, to be not only recognized, but respected. We ask that our fellow citizens should act towards us with that spirit of toleration and justice which is one of the fundamental principles upon which the British Empire has been founded; for we must not be looked upon otherwise than as equal partners in this pact of Confederation, and then, when these conditions have been realized, we will be only too happy to join hands with the other people of Canada, so that our confraternity may extend from the restless, labouring Atlantic to the calm and tranquil Pacific, from the bleak and barren shores of the Gulf of the St. Lawrence to the smiling, sunny coast of British Columbia, to unite with all other people in this country and contribute with them our worthy share in the weaving of the fabric of a great and prosperous nation, so that we may enjoy all together and without heed to race or creed that peace on earth which has been promised from above to all men of good will.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to occupy the time of the House at this late hour had it not been for the position taken on more than one occasion by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House with regard to the attitude of certain members now occupying seats in the Union Government. I am not going into ancient history, for we have had a sufficient number of reviews to keep our memories fresh along that line for a considerable length of time, but I feel it is my duty to explain the position of a certain section on this side of the House in order that we may be properly understood.

When the war broke out in the year 1914, nearly all the people of Canada gave a great deal of time and thought to the issues that were at stake, to the questions involved and

the interests that had to be considered. I along with others gave some study to these matters, and two months and a half after the war broke out, at a very large gathering representative of a large proportion of the agricultural interests of the province of Manitoba, I made the statement that Canada was in this war to win, even if it involved the sacrifice of the last man and the last dollar; in it because we were defending the great principle of democracy and the great principle of liberty; in it because if we failed to defend that which had cost our forbears so dearly, nothing else mattered much. My recollection is that after full and deliberate discussion of the stand Canada should take in the war was submitted by Government to the House, by a unanimous vote Parliament decided to participate in this war. Furthermore, not only the people's representatives in this House but the people of Canada themselves in their trades unions and different organizations called together for the special purpose of making a pronouncement on this question, almost unanimously agreed that we were in this war to a finish, no other course being open to us.

I am glad to hear hon. members on the opposite side of the House profess their desire to see this war won, but putting the professions they make in this mild form alongside other expressions they have given utterance to outside this House, I am constrained to think that their ardour slackens somewhat when they reach the eastern part of the Dominion of Canada. Down there, their utterances are more like this: Yes, we are in the war, and you may do your part but it is just as you feel about it; if you like to enlist, all right; if you do not like to, it is a question for you to decide. That kind of teaching does not work up much enthusiasm in bringing men out to fight, and it seems to me it has had its influence on voluntary enlistments in the province of Quebec. While that was the attitude of that province under the voluntary system—indifference, slowness to take hold, lack of enthusiasm on the part of their leaders—when it was found that the voluntary system was not bringing the men forward as fast as the country demanded and conscription was introduced, these men who had taken little advantage of their opportunities under the voluntary system insistently cried out, "Give us the voluntary system again; let us work along the old line." There has not been as much enthusiasm shown by the leaders of the people in the eastern part of Canada, especially in the province of Quebec, as I should like to have seen.

I wish to dwell more particularly on the position occupied by those who are looked upon as formerly entertaining Liberal views, and who now find themselves occupying positions on this side of the House in a Win-the-war Government. Some of us looked, and looked earnestly, to see a united effort on the part of the East and the West to win this war. We felt there was no room for provincial lines, that Canada was in this war, and that every man, every woman and every dollar should be in it, in order that we might win. Seeing the attitude of the Opposition on this win-the-war policy, and the attitude of the Government then in power, and their aggressive mood towards winning the war, we were forced, to the conclusion that the only policy open to those who were in earnest in their determination to win the war was to get together, to stand shoulder to shoulder and to fight it out to a finish.

I have pleasure in expressing my appreciation and delight with the Budget speech as presented by the hon. Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean). It is going a long way in the direction of the teachings set forth by the large interest in the West which I have the honour of belonging to. An hon. member of the Opposition this afternoon read from a certain platform setting forth the views of the Canadian Council of Agriculture and of the Grain Growers associations, but, instead of reading the whole of that platform the hon. member only read a part of it. He stopped at the place that suited his purpose. He gave us the policy dealing with the tariff and I want to say to that hon. gentleman and hon. gentlemen before me to-night that the people in the West representing the great agricultural industry have not changed their position one iota in regard to the tariff policy. I believe it is the right policy for Canada and we believe the day will come in the not very far distant future when the principles inculcated in the platform which has been laid down by the Grain Growers will have influence and sway in this House and the country will get the benefit of the teaching and thinking that has been put into that platform.

I would like to say, and I say it with a great deal of pleasure, that the Government in power previous to the Union Government had their ear pretty close to the ground in regard to some of the planks in that platform and in the last session, when the Conservative party were in power, we

find that two important planks of that platform were incorporated in the policy of the Government.

The great issue in the last election before the people of the constituency of Macdonald which I have the honour to represent, and on which the battle was fought, was the winning of the war—the German attitude towards civilization and democracy and the conflict was therefore autocracy and democracy. The question was, which should triumph? We believed that the principles of democracy should triumph. That was the platform upon which the battle was fought. The West set forth that platform, the people stood behind it, and as a result the representation in this House is what it is to-day. That was the cry all through the West, the war was the issue.

I believe the people of Canada are behind this Union Government and are saying to it: "Go ahead and win the war; if it takes men to win the war, we will give you men; if it needs money we will give you money, but go ahead and win." I know that here and there you will find men who entertain a different view. You will find those who, because of personal interest, or personal motives, will contend otherwise, but the predominating sentiment of Canada is that there is a struggle going on that will mean much in the future history of the world, and that we must see to it that the principles for which we contend will triumph in that struggle.

Now I propose to deal with a question that I should have dealt with before I expressed the last thought that was in my mind. I want to call attention to the attitude which was taken in the West with regard to the question of the fiscal policy that should be adopted. This policy was very largely discussed on the platforms of the West and the attitude taken by myself, as well as other representatives of the great agricultural organizations, was that if the Government introduced in connection with the winning of the war the other planks of the farmers' platform, they would, through them, in a large measure, secure for war purposes the results that they hoped to secure from the tariff. I would like to see some change in the tariff, even although that change were small. If the present Government could see its way clear to removing the 7½ per cent duty introduced as a war revenue measure, and allow the money which would accrue from this reduction to go for the purpose of increased production, it would at least be a step in the right direction and the country at large would benefit thereby. Failing that, so long as the Government carry out their promise in regard to introducing a fiscal policy that would tax incomes and undue profits made under the tariff system we will give it our support, as by that means the same object would be attained and the money would reach the coffers of the Government for war purposes.

I did not intend to weary the House with a speech, but I only wanted to put myself and the people of the West straight in regard to our attitude in connection with this win-the-war Government.

Mr. L. T. PACAUD (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate for one who is not too well versed in matters of finance, that it should be customary in a debate such as this to drift from the somewhat dry and monotonous discussion of figures to the wider range of national and political issues so intimately involved with the Budget and which have never ceased to interest and to divide men of different political creeds. Whatever justification there may have been in the past for this frank and outspoken exchange of views, it seems to me, Sir, that such a course imposes itself upon us with greater force to-day in view of the unusual circumstances in which we meet. The Acting Minister of Finance, in his annual statement, has given us the financial condition of the country for the last twelve months. In perusing the figures which he presented to us a few days ago, with the care and attention which it was our duty to bring to our task, we could not help but realize still more forcibly the true meaning of war; its ever-increasing toll; the varied and complex problems which have arisen and which will continue to increase as this bitter struggle goes on. Let me summarize, Sir, what, I gather, is our present financial position. It may be said that this war has for the time being apparently made our people prosperous. Our trade has reached an extraordinary figure; and our revenue for the year amounts to $258,000,000. This is, Sir, no doubt, the brightest phase of our financial statement, and yet when we stop to scrutinize its true meaning we are quickly drawn to the conclusion, that this passing wave of prosperity, this enormous expansion of our trade, rests on a purely fictitious basis; that it lacks the permanency which alone would make it sound and stable. We clearly see that when this war comes to an end, as rapidly as our war contracts have ceased

to bring in their unusual and abnormal profits, so rapidly shall we return to the normal state of pre-war days. To convince us, Sir, of this fact, we have but to picture to ourselves our munition plants suddenly closing their doors, at least one-half million of men strolling our streets on the lookout for a new means of livelihood, the readjustment of our industrial life made necessary to meet the new conditions and, above all this, the gradual flow of 400,000 men of our Canadian soldiers returning from the fields of Flanders as rapidly as ships can bring them back, all looking for direction and advice from the State which they serve so well and so heroically.

Sir, in the face of such vast problems, coupled with the heavy financial obligations occasioned by the war—a burden which we readily accept, but a burden nevertheless—I venture to suggest that it is high time we Canadians at home should stop nibbling at each other as we have done in the past, stop sowing in this land of liberty the seeds of discord and of hatred, and recognize, late as it may be, that our work, a better or more useful work, lies in another direction.

Sir, this war is costing us over $1,000,000 a day. Our public debt has reached the billion-dollar mark. Our interest charge is estimated at $78,000,000, and when we couple this amount with the sums that will be necessary to meet our payments on pensions, we have before us the prospect of being soon saddled with a fixed annual charge of not less than $100,000,000. We cannot wave aside lightly this enormous financial obligation. It claims our best thought and our best consideration. It reminds us of our plain and paramount duty, of putting into practice that policy of economy and retrenchment, which this Government has been most lavishly preaching to others without ever living up to it themselves, as their record of the last four years so clearly demonstrates, as the expenditures of the last year, amounting to $203,000,000, has again clearly shown to us. Let me hasten to say, that I know full well, that heavy as this financial burden may be, it will not deter the people of this country from doing their full duty to the bitter end. However long may last this war, the same spirit which animated the people of the country four years ago is still intact to-day. We then unanimously decided to take our part in the fight for freedom. We, to-day, with the same unanimous voice, proclaim our determination

to stand by our allies, until complete victory has crowned our efforts. It is, Sir, in this spirit, shared alike by all Canadians, that we have put to ourselves these two questions: First, how can we best serve to-day our allies? Second, in what way can our continued and active participation in the war be most effective to achieve the common purpose we have in view?

There are those who believe that however long the struggle, the policy of Canada should be more men and still more men for the front. It was this feeling, this belief, this policy, which brought about conscription. It was apparently upon this policy that Union Government was formed. It is not my intention to dwell on the absolute failure of selective conscription. I was against that policy last year, I am still against it to-day. May I underline that by introducing amendments to the Military Service Act, so as to make it more drastic, and in their opinion more effective, the Government themselves have recognized this failure. But, Sir, there are others in this country, who though they believe that the decision that was taken in 1914, in so far as our participation in this war was concerned, should not be altered to-day, are nevertheless of the opinion, that in view of the new conditions that have arisen, we must change our war methods, respond to the call of our allies, direct our national energy, not only in getting men to the front but also in meeting the new problem that is now upon us, the acceleration of our food production as an essential and vital war measure.

Sir, We cannot minimize the vast importance of our food production at this moment. The Prime Minister in his speech on the Address, used these words:

> I cannot emphasize too strongly the absolute, urgent, vital necessity of increased production of food in Canada during the next year. The issue of the war depends on it.

Are we to remain deaf to this call from the front? Are we to minimize the importance of a policy, upon the success of which, the Prime Minister himself admits, "depends the issue of the war"? There can be but one answer to this question, and it is with this thought, prompted by this high motive, that those who have never ceased to advocate greater production have ventured not only to criticise the Government,—who went back on their policy in this connection—but again to suggest the best and only means to attain the object we had in view. Is it not reasonable, Sir, that taking it

for granted that we are all of one mind in acknowledging the importance of food production, we should also be united in a policy which tends to prevent that shortage of farm labour, by keeping our young farmers to their work, by educating them as to the importance of straining every nerve to do their utmost to produce food and still more food? And yet, Sir, the policy of the Government to-day tends to weaken, if not to destroy, this very purpose. What we are preaching to-day the Government had in mind when they drafted this Order in Council of the 3rd of December last. Political exigencies may have forced them to change their minds; national exigencies have prompted us to remain true to this very policy. Was not its importance again underlined at this very session by the Prime Minister himself, by the words which he uttered and which I have already cited? Again, if we are to have more food production in this country—the issue of the war depends on it—is it not reasonable and logical that we should endeavour to lay aside every obstacle which may curtail its success—a success without which, as Lord Rhondda says, "Victory may eventually slip from our grasp?" And when in pursuance of that policy we suggest that the duties on farming implements should be abolished, I ask you, Sir, is it fair, is it in the public interest, that our motives in this regard should be challenged, as they were challenged a few days ago by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames)? I can only say that the views that have been expressed in this House are shared by a great many Canadians throughout the country. In this connection may I be permitted to read a short article on this very subject which appeared in the Saskatoon Star. It illustrates the case most satisfactorily, and is as follows:

TWO MILLION FOR DUTIES ON IMPLEMENTS.

According to a statement prepared by the Minister of Customs, Hon. A. L. Sifton, agricultural implements entering Canada during the past fiscal year paid import duties aggregating $2,120,000. This is divided among the following items: Separators, $353,000; parts of separators, $124,000; tractors, $896,000; binders, $89,000; ploughs, $373,000; other farm machinery and parts, $280,000.

"Produce! Produce!!" is the cry that comes from Great Britain to Canada. It is echoed and re-echoed from Ottawa, from all parts of Canada.

Produce with what? Land must be broken to produce, and that means traction power, for horses are not available. Item: Tractors, customs duty, $896,000. It means ploughs, for there are not sufficient ploughs in the country to produce more largely. Item: ploughs, customs duty, $373,000. It means binders, to reap the crop. Item: Binders, customs duty, $89,000. It means separators, to thrash the grain. Item: Separators, customs duty, $353,000; parts of separators, customs duty, $124,000.

Certainly it is economic folly, but apparently our fiscal system must remain unchanged, though it put a handicap upon every laudable effort of the people of the country are making, and though it put a heavy handicap upon our greatest war contribution.

The cry for greater production, from the lips of those who are taking no part in the endeavour to get these unnecessary and foolish restrictions upon greater production removed, would be laughable if it were not tragic.

I waive the right, Sir, to comment on the force of this article. To my mind its logic is unanswerable. Be it sufficient for me to say that my conviction as to the necessity of food production in Canada grows deeper as I follow step by step the long trail of devastation and mourning which this war of nations still stretches across so many lands. During the three better years of this deadly conflict, amidst vicissitudes of varied character, which have brought to us, with the regularity of a pendulum, news which caused us joy as well as that which caused us sorrow, we have never wavered in our belief that final victory would eventually crown our efforts.

We saw the millions of Russia, barely on the threshold of their new-born liberty, forced to lay down their arms and sign a disastrous peace. The steam roller of former days had been cheated of its power by a dangerous and unscrupulous foe. But, Sir, before this downfall in the East, there arose in the West the millions of the American nation, taking up the sword to assure for the democracy of the world safety from the onslaughts of conquering empires. From these two outstanding events in the world's present tragedy can we not deduce, as certainly as is possible when unveiling the near future, these two propositions to guide us in our continued efforts to destroy the system which has been the curse of humanity; on the one hand, that the entrance of the United States into the struggle will mean the final overthrow of Prussian militarism, and on the other hand that the Russian collapse will tend to prolong the war beyond the limit of time which, previous to that event, we might reasonably have thought possible? These are, in my opinion, the new conditions which Canada must face to-day. The longer the struggle the more acute will become the food situation. We once thought that this war would be a battle of armies. We know to-day that it is a battle of

nations, in which, in addition to the fighting army, is wielded the new weapon of economic warfare, each side striving to starve the other. Sir, we cannot remain indifferent to this new fact. Our Allies are faced with a food menace. It is our duty to see to it that our farms are not depleted.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a word or two in this debate, may I say, before proceeding to the point I wish to discuss, that I have listened to many of the speeches with a feeling that they were not dealing with present-day problems, and I would like to tell some of my own experiences in politics. For some twenty-five years I preserved all the political literature on both sides of controversy in Canada, but about two years ago I threw it all into the furnace. I think it would be a good thing if some of us could wipe our minds as clean of some of the things of the past as I cleared my drawers and receptacles of that defunct political literature. In saying this I think my remarks would apply to both sides of the House. I hope the time will never come when the Ottawa river will be the Rhine of Canada, for in listening to much that has been said one would think some such result might be our destiny.

Now, we are not all meeting with the very greatest of commendation from our constituents. I looked over a couple of local papers the other day and noticed that two of the editors were of opinion that I had as much chance of another nomination as I had of being president of the United States. That was with reference to some of the actions of this House. I have no hesitation whatever in accepting any responsibility I may have incurred in respect of the recent Order in Council calling out men for military service. The Government may lose some support as the result of that, but any backward step will cost them not only loss of support, but also loss of prestige, and I cannot think that the Government will entertain any such idea. So many speakers on the Opposition side have suggested that some backward step should be taken that I may just as well state how the supporters of the Government feel on that question, and I am quite sure that the Government feel the same way. No backward step will be taken. The steps now to be taken must be founded on what is already accomplished fact, upon what is already done.

Further, in introduction, I would compliment the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) upon his Budget speech. It was compact, pointed, clear, easily listened to and readily grasped. It was the best Budget that I ever heard, but as it was the only one I ever heard there is no suggestion of odious comparison of the statements of previous Finance Ministers. However, I have read some Budget speeches, and I assure the Acting Finance Minister that it came up to my expectations formed on what I had known of his career.

But, Sir, I wish to comment upon one statement in this speech. With regard to taxation, the Acting Finance Minister said:

> Again, inevitably there must be wide differences of opinion as to the form and degree of taxation that shall prevail. One might safely say that no system of taxation should be enforced which has a repressive effect on production and trade.

I take issue with that statement. The Acting Finance Minister proceeds:

> But as some one has said, no tax should paralyse industry of any kind, hamper enterprise, or breed discontent among our people, but that none should be avoided which are essential to provide the revenue required and that will distribute the incidence of taxation as equitably as conditions and experience dictate.

It is generally known among business men that $1,000 in the bank provides a basis for an extension of credit five to seven times that amount. In other words, to-day our business is based upon a currency which is very largely credit. The basis of credit is the general wealth of the country, and it is possible at times fictitiously to increase currency and thereby fictitiously to increase prices. It is common knowledge that during the last four years our prices have increased about 150 per cent; that is, what cost us $5 in 1914 now costs in the neighbourhood of $12 or $12.50. That is due not only to the shortage of goods, but very largely to the inflation of our currency. We do not in these days inflate our currency by printing more greenbacks, as was done in the Civil War, or by issuing fiat money, as was done by the kings of long ago; but we do it through our banking system. There is a ready, automatic check upon the balance between the amount of the currency and the amount of goods in the country in ordinary times. If we increase our currency our prices increase; goods come in to take advantage of the better prices; we have a larger international balance to settle; we send out gold, and the amount of our currency comes back to a proper relative proportion with the amount of the goods.

But at present that is not being done. We are borrowing money very largely and creating credits which are reflected in our bank statements. I have before me the Canadian bank statements of 31st March, 1914, and 30th March, 1918. The total liabilities of the banks were $1,323,000,000 in March, 1914, and $2,053,000,000 in March, 1918. Their assets were $1,547,000,000 in 1914, and $2,302,000,000 in 1918. It has been calculated that on the very system which we are pursuing, Great Britain has increased her currency to the extent of £400,000,000, and that is one reason why prices have so greatly increased in that country. I would commend these figures to the attention of hon. members of the House. For instance, in Dominion and provincial government securities and municipal and other public securities, the banks were holding in March, 1914, $35,000,000; to-day they are holding ten times that amount, and that is made a basis for the extension of credit, thereby relatively increasing the currency of the country, making money cheap and goods dear. That is a consequence of our system of borrowing so largely to carry on the war. I know that there are checks upon our taking from the people all the money to carry on the war. I know that by taxing the people too heavily there is a possibility, perhaps, of driving capital from the country. Many disadvantages might result if we got out of step too greatly with the legislation and financing of neighbouring countries. But what the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) said to-night was reasonable: That $400,000,000 might have been raised by taxation of the people in this war time.

What are the principles with regard to taxation? We know that it is easier to get taxes in war time, because the patriotism of our people is excited and they will more readily pay them. Not only that, but in war time taxes are not such a hindrance to industry as they are at any other time, because there is a certain market for the goods produced. The Government is in the field, buying largely; neutrals who have made much money out of the war are in the field, buying large quantities of our produce. Our competitors—Germany, and others who had goods to offer—are shut off from the seas, and our manufacturers and producers have markets for their goods. All the time prices are relatively increasing, and our manufacturers are in a position to transfer the taxation to the purchaser of his goods—to add it to his price and to be sure that he has a market. For that reason I think we might have increased the taxes which we are taking. I am speaking not particularly for this year, because, as Sir Auckland Geddes has said, we must not make our calculations on the assumption that the war will last only three or six months; we must look three or four years ahead. In all probability the war will last two years yet, perhaps three; and we must increase the amount which we take from our people. By increasing the amount that we take in taxes we not only get a revenue, but we govern the individual's disposition of his own purchases. By proceeding as we have been proceeding, we have made money plentiful; we have left the individual in the market as a competitor against us at a time when labour is short and when there is an immense demand for goods. He is asking for the goods which minister to his comfort and are luxuries, when, by increasing taxation, we would cut off his ability to purchase these. Parenthetically, and to illustrate: The man who lends $1,000 is not in the same position as the man who pays out $1,000. The former considers that he has an asset, and so has less incentive to save than the other man has. Hence by taxation we do two things: we get the revenue and we govern the production of non-essential goods; that is, we cut it down. We have not, so far, fully dealt with that situation, and we have to deal with it now, because we have not governed it by taxation. We have to begin to govern it by artificial methods. I have again and again wondered what the Government intends to do with its registration of the labour power of this country. I am satisfied that registration is but the gathering of information for a scheme which must be worked out and laid before our people, and I have been hoping that the Government would inform the House as to what the plan was. It would help our farmers, in the present agitation and in respect to the present delegations, if they knew what the Government's plan was for obtaining labour for production. I can see only one application that can be made. You cannot go through three or four or five million names and pick out a man here or there who may be suitable for work on the farm. You have to classify the men and deal with them in classes, and I have seen no way in which to do that except the plan that was recommended a few days ago by the Committee on Agriculture; that is that we should make certain restricted occupa-

tions. We should restrict non-essential industries. I am told that a piano company in Ontario, which, before the war, was putting out six pianos per day, is, at the present time, producing and selling fifteen pianos per day. That is an absolutely non-essential industry, and that is but an instance. Pianolas, grafanolas and victrolas are being sold throughout the country. Even automobiles are in the same class, and we must in some way reduce the output of those non-essential industries if we are going to get the men to carry on our essential industries. The reason I have raised this point is that I believe, by a proper system of taxation, we would be doing something to limit the production of non-essential goods. But now I see that we must attack the question in another way, and the only way I can see is by limiting the production or, in other words, bringing about by artificial means that condition which a depression of business will bring about. At a time of depression the factories close or they reduce their output, and men are thrown out of employment and are bound, under changed economic conditions, to seek new employment. We must create those conditions. We have yet, it seems to me, in the consideration of the problems of this Dominion, to look to the future after the war is over, to the time of readjustment, to that period of dislocation which will follow when war ceases and all war industries are cut off. We have to look to the amount of money which we shall then have to raise to pay interest and sinking fund upon those large debts which we are now piling up. It seems to me that we can do much to prevent that dislocation creating a panicky condition, if we but recognize what are just and proper ways of raising the money the state requires. Finally, lest I should be misunderstood, because I have spent most of my time in urging that our taxation should be greater, I know that must be made conditional, in some measure, upon similar operations of surrounding states, but I should like to see our Government setting a lead in the measures by which it levies this taxation.

11 p.m.

Mr. J. F. FAFARD (L'Islet) (translation): Mr. Speaker, the discussion anent the budget statement presented by the Government for the fiscal year of 1918-19 has already brought forth—not always light—but often enough, suggestions of a judicious and practical character. On the whole the Government cannot help being grateful for the good advice given, and taking advantage of it. However, in order that the results should go hand in hand with the wisdom of certain observations, too much self-interest, too much narrow-mindedness should not paralyze, on the part of my hon. colleagues on the other side of this Chamber, the execution of what has been suggested to the Government.

As the representative of a purely agricultural county I feel it my duty to express my opinion in a special way on certain features of the present Budget. So I shall leave to more experienced political minds the task of exploring the vast domains of political economy. Following my custom, as a surveyor, I shall go, in straight line, and with the shortest possible delay, to the goal I wish to reach. All of which means that I intend making a few brief remarks on the important question of agriculture. My last words will have to do with the loyal attitude of the province of Quebec—and that of the immense majority of its representatives—with regard to the help given to carry on this struggle for the cause of civilization and mankind.

Now, a few words about agriculture. On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, the Government is preaching a policy of increased production. Every day, in all the newspapers of the country the Government is appealing to the population asking for an increase in our yield. We hear repeated every other moment that Canada's increased production will save Europe from starvation, consequently that this increased production will save the Allies. "Produce more," cries the Government to the farmers, "Raise cattle; concentrate on your dairy industry; preserve your perishable products by building cold storage chambers; hold big fairs to learn to perfect your methods of cultivation; see that your stock is always healthy; improve their strain finally, intensify production. Victory against Germany demands these things."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the tone of the Government talk, on the one hand. But, on the other, this same Government reduces, by $528,348.40, the appropriations that we were to vote for the furthering of agriculture and increased production. The farmers are told to produce more and then over half a million dollars of appropriations are taken away from them, in comparison with what they were allowed in the Budget of 1917-18. Out of the reductions of $2,015,-378.28 that the Government announces in the administrative expenses of the different departments, the Department of Agriculture alone has suffered a decrease of $528,-348.40. So that more than one-quarter of

these reductions were knocked off the appropriations meant to promote farming.

And when they have taken over half a million away from the farmers the Government, far from being abashed, have the nerve to ask the farmers to toil from sun-up till sun-down to insure increased production. It is not necessary to be a great logician, nor to have spent twenty years in this House in order to realize how very illogical such a policy decidely is. "Raise cattle," says the Government, and in the estimates for 1918-19 the tidy sum of $100,000 is taken away from cattle-raisers. "Give more attention to your dairy produce," says the Government and, in this year's Budget, grants not one sou more than last year. "Build cold storage plants" says the Government again, and with one sweep they knock $25,000 off the amount voted for this purpose in 1917-18; while in the cold storage establishments they let over 350,000 pounds of meat and fish go to rot. "Hold fairs; they will be a great help to you," says the Government to the farmers, and then, in the present Budget, we notice a reduction of $25,000 from the sum voted last year. "Take every means to keep your cattle in good health," still the Government exhorts the farmer; but to make the thing a certainty the Government subtracts $102,000 this year from the amount voted to help the farmers in the sanitary supervision of their stock.

If this be the way, by reducing the help given to the farmers, that the Government claims to promote increased production, you must admit, Mr. Speaker, that it is rather a strange policy. I say strange so as not to use the term guilty. Indeed, I would understand the curtailing of expenses in certain departments where the work could very well wait till later on, after the war. But it appears that the Government has turned things upside down from the point of view of enlightened wisdom and the most elementary knowledge of economic factors. The estimates for civil government have been increased $356,555.04; $6,812.50 more to the Dominion Police; $18,000 more for penitentiaries; $148,900 more for railways and canals; $52,172.14 more for ocean and lake shipping; $160,664.73 more to the Post Office Department; and similar increases in other Government departments.

But when it comes to Agriculture $600,000 are struck off the estimates at one sweep, and then the farmers are asked to increase production. It is useless, Mr. Speaker, to pile up lengthy arguments in order to persuade this House of the utter injustice of such treatment being meted out to our very large class of farmers in this country. In the face of the figures which I have just quoted and which I extracted from the estimates submitted by the Government itself, I hope the gentlemen on the Treasury Benches will give justice to whom justice is due and show themselves less reluctant to loosen their purse-strings to assist the farmers.

Before leaving this subject I wish to call the attention of the House to an item of $21,091.58 under the head of the experimental farm at Spirit Lake, in the province of Quebec. I have always understood that the institution at Spirit Lake was used as a detention camp, and I am quite positive it was utilised for that purpose, since I visited the place myself some two years ago when I was roaming up that way. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that such an item should properly come under the expense column of the Department of Militia and Defence. Why should the Department of Agriculture pay the expenses of the Department of Militia and Defence? Besides, isn't it a rather queer procedure to open up, at such a place, and at such a critical period as that we are living in to-day, what is an experimental farm in name only? The other day the Hon. Minister of Justice answered me in this House that the Government had spent $32,500 for the military organization of this so-called experimental farm, or rather of this internment camp. So to-day when I find another item of $21,091.58 for agricultural purposes at this same place I am forced to conclude that the Government has spent the pretty husky sum of $53,591.58 for the satisfaction of having an experimental farm together with an internment camp; where, moreover, there seems to have been produced not one single bushel of wheat, nor one single bushel of oats, and where not a single head of cattle was sold. All that this hermaphrodite establishment seems to have produced is pulp-wood, to the value of $15,946. You will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the experimental farm which produces only pulp-wood is some experimental farm. There were barely fifty families and 400 Indians there when work was begun on this undertaking. Who will dare tell us that these few people were in need of an experimental farm? Was it for the Indians? If such were the intention of the Government, they were mistaken, very much mistaken, on the score of the results which would accrue. When I passed through there I thought I was doing a favour to an Indian by supplying him with seed potatoes in the expectation that he would get a good crop the following autumn. Some days later I

was astonished to see the Indian digging up the precious potatoes. "What are you doing?" I asked him; and he came back with this: "Do you think I intend to wait till next Fall before using them? The crop is too long coming; I'd rather eat them now!" A man who lives within six miles of the camp, told me that only one family spent the winter at Sipirt Lake last year.

When the Government has gone to this expense they should see that the farm produces something in return. Since it has been used, so far, solely as an internment camp, the item of $21,091.58 should be paid by the Department of Militia and Defence. This amount could have been distributed with much more justice among those real farmers who deserve encouragement. Fortunately this district has undergone an extraordinary development in the last few months and these hardworking settlers will get some good out of the place when it is used as an experimental farm.

Mr. Speaker, I feel in duty bound to thank the Minister of Agriculture for the $60,000 given to the province of Quebec for a campaign of agricultural education; but it appears to me that the amounts voted for the promotion of increased production are not sufficiently generous. Everywhere we hear the cry that famine threatens us; still the Government is taking no means to seriously assist the farmer. According to my humble opinion if we spend $200,000 for food control, we should spend millions more than we do to insure increased production. We have spent millions upon millions, on the ground that the enemy threatened us and we hesitate to come to the aid of those who are alone able to save us from starvation. Let us be more generous with our help to the farmer. And one of the best ways of helping him, Mr. Speaker, would be to put all farm implements on the free list. I will not dwell upon this question which every one, apparently, admits. I understand that certain concessions have been made in the matter of tractors; but these are not used on the ordinary sized farm. With this protection, which smacks of unfairness, the Government is proving once more that it has no intention of assisting the farmers, but only those capitalists who shout "Win the War" when their personal interests are concerned.

Another means of doing justice to the farmer—and I insist on this means—would be to exempt from military service all bona fide farmers. A few days before election we saw in the newspapers under scare headlines that "Farmers were exempted by Order-in-Council;" but once the elections were over, the Government whistled a different tune. Such a step would moreover be in absolute accord with the decision reached in March last by the convention of official agricultural experts. Here is the text of the resolution adopted at the Quebec convention, the very words which were forwarded to the ministers of the Government:

> That the official agricultural experts, the agricultural representatives of the district, the professors in the agricultural colleges and the travelling agricultural instructors, met in convention to promote the campaign in favour of increased production, this 25th day of March, 1918, urge upon the higher authorities of the country the imperative necessity of decreeing clearly and effectively the exemption from military service of every agricultural worker duly engaged to labour on a farm during the present year.

It is by encouraging and protecting the farmer that we will obtain increased production. Everybody is aware that the price of an article is based on the price of production. On the other hand, the increase in production is based on the means afforded the farmer to help him in his task. Now, to encourage the farmer, we must allow him to make as much profit as possible out of his labour. Besides, that is what was understood and what was done when we sought to encourage our industrial captains to engage in munitions-making and in shipbuilding. Yes, sir, these companies were allowed profits of from 500 to 800 per cent. What is good, even excellent, for the one, cannot fail to be of advantage to the other. And I say that the farmer much less exacting than the capitalist would be fully satisfied if he could sell his produce directly to the consumer and thus eliminate the profits which find their way into the pockets of the middlemen. Has the Government acted dutifully in this matter? No, it has been lax in its duty; it has done nothing.

I wish to add, Mr Speaker, that the demonstration farms for the promotion of the increased production campaign are not sufficiently numerous. Still, they constitute a powerful means of helping the farmer and enabling him to ascertain just what results follow certain methods of cultivation on the experimental farms. From the bottom of my heart I congratulate those city people who cultivate their back-yards. They are proving their patriotism. However, at the same time we must not get them confused with the real farmers who are alone in a position to insure an effective increase in food production.

We are piling up debts and expenses in a way that would be alarming were it not for the wonderful resources of our country.

But, no matter how wonderful and how varied these resources of Canada may be, it is nevertheless incumbent upon us to exercise the wisest, the strictest economy in every channel of the public service. I believe, moreover, that a number of the public works proposed could very well have been put off till later and the money thus saved appropriated in the form of a sort of rural credit, to assist the farmer in improving his land, buying his seed and obtaining the implements he needs.

All this is so much food for thought, and I submit these few reflections without any party spirit, to those who wish to see Canada fulfil her role in the great war.

There is another matter. Why should not the Government establish shipyards in Quebec and British Columbia for the construction of wooden bottoms? Aren't the Quebec workingmen sufficiently adept at ship construction? By encouraging this industry in the province of Quebec the Government would be merely doing justice to a great part of the population which it is their mission to guide in the paths of economy and progress, and thus help, both during and after the war, the cause of the Allies, and Canada.

I promised to say, in closing, a few words concerning the attitude of the province of Quebec and of the vast majority of those who represent that province in this House, with regard to the help furnished the Government in carrying out its war policy.

Allow me, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to protest most energetically against certain attacks, born of fanaticism and ignorance and launched by some hon. member on the other side, against the Opposition representatives from the province of Quebec. Time and again, we have been slandered; and our opponents have done all in their power to throw upon our province the suspicion of disloyalty. We were pictured as being against the soldiers who are dying for the defence of our freedom. Some of our accusers, with more of blindness and less of information, called us anti-British. One amongst them—I believe it was the hon. member for Comox Alberni (Mr. Clements)—showed how limited are his judgment and his knowledge of history by declaring that the French Canadians are strangers in this country. We know the remarkable reply that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) made to this offensive language of the hon. member for Comox Alberni. It is certainly astounding that we should be called strangers here, we whom roots deeply imbedded in the traditions of centuries tie to this land which we so cherish and love.

Such insults as these are hurled in our faces, we are accused of disloyalty, because we differed, or differ still, with the opinions of a group of false patriots who—like the donkey burdened with relics, in the fable of La Fontaine—believe that all honour is due them because forsooth they style themselves the Saviours of the Empire.

Let there be no mistake about that. The attitude which we took at the last elections in favour off volunteer recruiting was a loyal and patriotic attitude, of which I was proud then and of which I am prouder still today, since recent happenings have proved us right. The recruits who have been flocking to the colours in Quebec these last few months show clearly enough which side had judged aright. If I am told that Quebec was slow I will reply that our showing in volunteers would have been much greater if one-half, if one-quarter the fabulous sums expended on conscription had been applied to promoting voluntary enlistment.

Indeed, if we consider that the machinery for putting concription into force has cost this country $1,803,581—or $45 for every soldier drafted—we cannot fail to acknowledge that the volunteer system would have given much better results if one-quarter of this sum had been put at the disposal of a patriotic campaign. Many moons ago, if the policy suggested on this side of the House had been followed, long ago, I say, we would have had at the front, fully complete, and without compulsion, the divisions promised the British General Staff by the leader of the present Government.

I repeat that I am proud of the attitude I took and I shout here to all who have ears to hear me—although it is unfortunate that all the members have not the advantage of knowing both tongues—that it is time to come to an understanding and to realize that, in order to be loyal and patriotic it is not necessary to hail from such and such a province, to sit on this or that side of the House, no to hurl impudent insults at a whole race.

What is that I say Mr. Speaker? Our common aim, the foremost wish of the members of this House, the foremost wish of the whole Dominion is the victory of the Allied armies. Who will dare to cast slurs upon us because, with the same end in view, we have counselled other means—means which appeared to us more in harmony with our

ideals and with our innate respect for the great principles of the freedom which is the right of each and every one of us?

In my calling, Mr. Speaker, which I am alone in representing here, it has often happened me to lose myself in the vast expanses of territory which I was traversing with my companions. And when I established the direction of a meridian line, by the light of the polar star—whether I were in Alberta, in Saskatchewan or in the province of Quebec—I was always working towards the same goal. Mr. Speaker, the polar star which guides us French Canadian members is patriotism well-understood, patriotism without narrowness and without rancour, the patriotism of the noblest pages of our national history. And it is also on this good star of patriotism that is fixed the gaze of all those who lay claim to the great principles of Liberalism.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I fear that those who sit opposite us have taken the wrong road; that they are guided by a magnetic needle which has been unsettled by the constant attraction of power. However, let us hope that before long they will become better Magi, and will find once more the star of patriotism—leaving behind forever the dark clouds of fanaticism and prejudice.

In this way we shall have a united country, and we shall all contribute with our utmost energy, to the great cause which is ours in common, and to the immortal achievement of victory.

Mr. WILLIAM A. CLARKE (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I feel I should be remiss in my duty to the constituents I have the honour to represent if I did not make a few remarks in this very important debate. I do not rise to criticise any of the taxation proposals of the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) but rather to congratulate him and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) on having carried this Dominion so successfully through the most trying period we have ever experienced in our history. I am placed in a somewhat peculiar position. Of course, as a representative of the people in this House, I am no more responsible for the actions of the Union Government than they are responsible for my actions. Ever since I entered the House of Commons I have been a humble follower of the present Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) both in this and the last Parliament. I consider him the greatest statesman in the Dominion, and I have been proud to vote for every measure he has introduced. We had a most trying time last session and many troublesome questions arose; in fact, I think it was the most strenuous session we have had since Confederation, and I think the Prime Minister is to be congratulated on the splendid way in which he carried us through. On many occasions he met with severe criticism, which I think was carried to greater lengths than one might have expected under the present war conditions.

We have heard a great many splendid speeches from both sides of the House in this debate, but with many of the speeches from the Opposition side of the House I do not agree. I feel it my duty to make a few suggestions, rather than criticisms, in connection with the views of my constituents at the present time. When I go home after supporting every measure that the Prime Minister has ever presented to Parliament—and it is my intention to support every measure he brings down in future, unless I change my mind or he acts in a very different way from what he has done in the past—I am confronted with the question, what is the Government doing to enforce the Military Service Act? Our county is practically denuded of all the young men who can go to the front. I have supported every measure for keeping up our reinforcements, and I have done it gladly, but yet when I go home my constituents want to know why the province of Quebec is not made to contribute men for the army in greater numbers. Every one who reads the newspapers knows that Quebec has not done her share. A few months ago it was stated that only seven thousand had been got from that province altogether. I do not know whether that statement is true or not, but it has been made on many occasions, and has never been contradicted, so I am inclined to believe it is true. When my constituents ask me why Quebec is not made to do its duty I have to give them some kind of an answer. I have to tell them that we have passed the Military Service Act. Then they want to know why it has not been put in operation, and that is the question I wish to put to hon. gentlemen sitting in the front benches of the Union Government tonight. The only suggestion I have heard is that the weak cog in the wheel in the operation of the Military Service Act is in the Department of Justice. Whether that be true or not I do not know, but I am not in a position to contradict it. If it be true I would suggest to the Prime Minister and

the other members of the Cabinet that some rearrangement be made. I have every respect for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), but if he is the barrier in putting the Military Service Act into operation some rearrangement certainly should be made. We all know he was tired after the recent campaign. He is getting to be an old gentleman, and he had to take a couple of months' rest to recuperate. I am glad he came back looking so well. But when he came back after a couple of months' rest, if the work was too much for him, or if he was incompetent to transact it in the way the people of this country wanted it to be transacted, he should have been given assistance. But instead of that being done, I understand he has had the additional burden placed on his shoulders of administering the Post Office Department. The people of this country are wondering why the Government do not take action in connection with the Military Service Act. It would be an easy matter to rearrange the Cabinet. There are lots of good men supporting the Government, all good, loyal and true citizens, who would make good heads of any department, and I think it is high time something was done to fill the offices with the best men available on this side of the House. I would not go to the other side of the House, because we cannot expect anything from those who have always been in opposition to the Military Service Act and to Canada's taking her proper share in this war. I am not alone in this experience I have with my constituents; I have spoken to other hon. members and the same question is asked in practically every constituency from Prince Edward Island clean through to British Columbia. The people want to know why there is such laxity in enforcing the Act in the province of Quebec. It is all right for hon. members to stand up in the House and say they are doing this and are going to do that, but it is no use training a horse for a race after the race has been run, and possibly lost. Our boys overseas are calling out for reinforcements. In almost every letter from the front we hear that cry for reinforcements, and reinforcements at once, and the people of the rest of this Dominion want the major part of those reinforcements to come from the province of Quebec, and I say they are justified in asking that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARKE: My hon. friends may laugh, but this is too serious a matter to laugh at. We do not blame you very much. You do not get any too much support from your leaders; you do not get any too much support from the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who, this afternoon, took occasion to lecture the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). You do not get any too much support from the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). His loyalty is somewhat questionable at times in the opinion of a great many people in Canada, although not by many in Quebec, because he always stands by them, and I give him credit for it. I must give him credit for an expression which he used in this House not long ago on the occasion of the visit of Mr. Balfour. He stated, and I was glad to hear him, that he was much more loyal to the British Empire now than he had been three years ago. We all heard him state that and I must congratulate him upon having made that statement. The question that this Government is confronted with was dealt with by the hon. member for Maisonneuve this afternoon. That hon. gentleman said that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) should go back and consult the farmers, and that the Prime Minister should do the same, and find out what their opinion is with regard to war service. I wish to express the hope, and I do it in the kindest possible way, honestly and conscientiously, that this Government will see fit to man every department with the strongest and best men they can glean from the ranks on this side of the House, because in this crisis in the war we feel that we cannot have too strong a Government. I am surprised that the Prime Minister is able to bear the burden that falls upon him and I realize that he will need all the assistance that this Dominion can provide for him.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Budget to-night, it is not my intention to join issue with certain hon. members on the opposite side of the House on the very burning question that occupied the attention of the country during the last election and which continues to occupy it at the present time. But, I cannot let the references of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Clarke) pass without making a protest against the words that he has just uttered with regard to the part that the province of Quebec has taken during the war. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that the

province of Quebec has not done its share and that the leaders of the party in Quebec have been misleading the people of that province. If the people of the other provinces would pay more frequent visits to the province of Quebec and come into contact with the people there they would find that we desire to be, and, as a matter of fact are, just as loyal to the British Crown and British institutions as are the people of any other province or as is any member of this House.

Mr. BUREAU: Our loyalty is not bought with dollars.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Certainly not. That is something that hon. members on the other side of the House cannot understand. The hon. member who has just taken his seat is the best living proof that the horse of the Orange Sentinel and the Orange Order, of which my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) spoke the other day, is not yet dead, but is still alive and kicking, and that we must be very careful if we do not want to be run down by that animal. We thought for a time that in view of the present situation these people would bury the hatchet and that we would all stand on common ground for the purpose of winning the war. But instead of encouraging us they pursue the opposite course. When we see men like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, we must have a double measure of courage in order to enable us to continue to do our share as we have done it in the past.

If the people of Quebec have adopted an attitude that some hon. members of this House do not like, they have done it because they thought that according to the constitution and the laws of the country as they at present exist they were allowed to stand by the programme of their party and say that conscription at the present juncture was not the best means of providing reinforcements for our Allies at the front. I think that the future events will prove that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was not wrong when he took that position. The facts that transpired since this law was introduced and put into force have proven that it was wrong and inopportune. That is emphasized by the fact that at this present session an amendment had to be introduced in order to try and get the reinforcements that the law as originally enacted could not get. We thought we were right in taking the stand that we had taken on that issue, and the leaders of the party on this side of the House were sincere in their motive. I, and the other members who sit around me, were sincere in our motives, and I do not think that our integrity or loyalty should be called in question by those who choose to say that we are not loyal.

Now, I am coming to the question of the Budget, which is the issue before the House. It is not my intention to deal with the subject exhaustively because the ground has been very fully covered by my hon. friend from Brome, who has criticised the Budget on behalf of the Opposition. I only want to offer to the House a few observations by way of suggestion, and as a junior member I would ask that they be received with that reserve and consideration due to a member speaking for the first time on such an important subject. I must confess that I do not approve of the new tax imposed on tea and coffee. This Government in December last prohibited the use of liquors, beers and wines. The only beverages or stimulants left, which we all know are necessary not only to hard-working people, but also to people of mature age, as well as those belonging to the younger generation, and which are within the reach of all classes, especially the poor, are going to be taxed. If there are any commodities which should not have been made subject to tariff taxation they are tea and coffee. The people of this country have been induced to use them more and more since the use of liquors of all kinds has been prohibited by Order in Council. Canadian cigars, cigarettes and tobacco should not have been so heavily taxed. As regards imported cigars, cigarettes and tobacco, I would say that these should have been taxed to the limit.

I would go a little further. For a Government that is preaching so much economy and retrenchment, I would say that they should not themselves indulge in luxuries. Is there anything more painful, Mr. Speaker, than to see some of these ministers coming forward at the Chateau Laurier, after a good dinner, and enjoying those big long cigars, as long as themselves ?

As the Government has taxed tea, coffee, cigarettes, cigars and tobacco, why has it not proposed heavier taxes on expensive foreign furs from Russia, the sale of which we see advertised every year in the foreign markets of Europe, in Chicago and New York. Let those pay who want to buy and wear these expensive luxuries, but permit the Canadian to go free of taxation who is satisfied with Canadian beaver, bear or racoon fur.

Heavier taxes should also be imposed on diamonds, billiard tables, and accessories and necessities of sporting and social life; also on all kinds of ladies' wearing apparel such as expensive hats and toilettes which are being continually imported from New York and elsewhere. These, Mr. Speaker, are the kind of taxes which could better be imposed upon the people than some other taxes which more nearly touch the poor man.

While considering the subject of taxes that the Government could have imposed, there are a few to which I will allude that might be levied in the shape of war taxation. For instance, why not impose a tax of one per cent on all deposits in the banks? Those deposits, according to the last statement contained in the last issue of the Official Gazette of the 27th of April, totalled on the 30th of March, 1918, $1,482,123,039. A tax of one per cent would give about $14,000,000 revenue, without taking into account the deposits in the hands of trust companies, savings banks, private banks and loan companies, etc., which I would estimate at over $250,000,000, and which would yield another $2,500,000 of revenue. It could not be said that this tax would be unjust, as it is a well known fact that throughout the Dominion as the country grows old and larger, the banks are getting less in number, due to the fact that so many mergers have been permitted.

From something like thirty-three to thirty-five banks which were in existence years ago, this number is now down to twenty-one, and these banks have an understanding which is certainly an interference against the law of trade and commerce, an understanding of not paying more than three per cent on deposits, and this agreement has now been in force for a great number of years to the detriment of all savings depositors. While the Government is paying 6 per cent and more for loans and the banks are charging from 6 per cent to 10 per cent for discounts, the depositors are kept down to 3 per cent, while by taxing the banks 1 per cent on the deposits their money would only cost them 4 per cent, and surely in times like these, when everything has gone up (except interest on deposits) there could be no complaint. The understanding is there, and if a bank does pay more than 3 per cent it is fined by the Clearing House Association. Such understanding is not only detrimental to the depositors but also to the smaller banks, as rates being equal the depositor is always prone to go to the larger banks, and the smaller banks who are supposed to take care of the small industries are handicapped, and such small industries cannot compete with the larger ones who are the bosom friends and very often the partners of those who are at the head of the large banks. By taxing the deposits 1 per cent it might prevent these bankers, who are preaching economy to their clientele, but who are not practising it themselves, from becoming more and more autocratic, as you will notice if you look at the palaces they are erecting as bank buildings. Such things do not exist in Europe, or any other country. Some of these banks in the city of Montreal have so many of these palaces that the small traders feel like taking off their boots before going inside. One has only to look at the bank premises in this country, which represent about 50 per cent of the paid-up capital of the banks. In March, 1916, the paid-up capital was $111,727,692 and buildings $52,388,793, at not more than cost less amounts, if any, written off. Could not all this money which is not producing have been better employed in developing this country? These bank premises are simply erected to the glorification of luxury. On a draft of say $2 we have to pay 25 cents exchange to a bank, which represents a rate of 12½ per cent, and they are only paying 3 per cent on many deposits and probably on one-third of that they are not paying interest. They are preaching economy, but they do not set an example. A number of these banks even build mansions for their managers. I therefore do not see why such a tax should not be imposed. The Banking Association is the biggest monopoly that Canada has. Look at the boards of directors of our banks. Many of the directors are interested in large companies and the latter can get all the money they need, but the small trader or manufacturer is the loser as he can hardly get anything from the big banks.

I stated a moment ago, that the banks were growing too big, that there was danger of a monopoly being created, and this is a fact. Well, if the monopoly exists as it does at present, why not tax these banks in proportion to the benefits and the profit they derive? In the province of Quebec and the other provinces when a public utility wants to obtain a franchise, it has to pay for it and contribute to the treasury of the city, town or province, a certain amount of money. Why not have the same requirements in the case of the banks? If the banks want to enjoy all these benefits and privileges, let them pay for them and be taxed accordingly.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is a director of the City and District Savings Bank, in which he takes a great deal of interest. I know that he is a great philanthropist. Perhaps he could tell me why, with all his philanthropy and good intentions, that bank has not seen fit up to the present to raise the rate of interest on deposits. I am sure that his answer will be the argument which I have just advanced, that the bank is prohibited from doing so by the Canadian Bankers Association. All the money deposited in such institutions as the City and District Savings Bank comes from the poor, the working woman as well as the working man, and it is not the small trader or the small manufacturer who benefits thereby, but the financiers, directors and managers, who are in the ring of big banks and corporations.

Now, about investments. I believe it is a fact that in England and France it has been forbidden to invest in outside securities, while here in Canada there are many people deriving hundreds of thousands of dollars as interest on stocks and bonds from corporations in the United States. If we refer to the lists of shareholders of different companies in the United States, we find that a large number of Canadians, probably patriotic Canadians, have invested huge amounts of money in that country. We know also that the large Canadian insurance companies own a great deal of securities, in some cases seventy-five or eighty per cent of the stock of certain railways in the United States. I am not far from the truth in asserting that at present nearly $250,000,000 is invested by individual Canadians, companies and trusts in United States securities. Would it not be better if a law were passed, or, as it is so easy under this Government, an Order in Council, prohibiting investments in any other but Canadian securities?

Another source from which the Government could obtain a large amount of revenue would be by taxing the foreign insurance companies, life, fire and accident, who are draining this country yearly of millions of dollars in premiums, which money is taken to the United States and invested in their own undertakings and for their own benefit. There is no reason why a tax should not be imposed on such premiums.

So far as the exchange rate on the Canadian dollar is concerned, it is not by getting a credit of about $40,000,000 in the United States, as our ministers obtained recently, which will make our credit better. That amount will be only a drop in the bucket after all, and our trade balance surely cannot be re-established with that small amount of money. It may improve the situation for a short period, for the spring or the summer, but if no further arrangements are made I predict, Mr. Speaker, that our dollar will be nearer the 90-cent mark than the dollar mark. We must not close our eyes also to the fact that the financiers in the United States are very well aware of our situation, and as some members in this House said recently, they know that we are only banking on paper, as the gold and the silver which we have to meet the Canadian notes which are being printed by the Dominion Government represent only 45 cents on the dollar, and if this policy keeps up a year longer our currency will be worth 75 cents on the dollar at the most. We are told by the Acting Minister of Finance that we should not worry, that business is splendid, that we are doing business with the Mother Country, and that we are even lending her money. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that not misleading the public, as, after all, these loans are being repaid by contra account for the upkeep of our army overseas? I would ask the minister to tell us if it is not true that these loans made to England since the war began have been repaid by contra account? Probably there is not more than $25,000,000 to $40,000,000 outstanding at present, but when the war ends we will be in debt to England instead of England owing us; we will still have a huge bill to pay her.

The Acting Minister of Finance has told us that he needs at present about $280,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the war. Why not, as has been done in England and other European countries, requisition or commandeer all foreign securities? There are millions of dollars' worth of these held by different people and institutions in this country. We know that holders of capital and the big trust companies and banks have a great number of these securities on hand invested in railway stocks and bonds in the United States. Why not, as a war measure, requisition the stocks of the Canadian Pacific railway, as was done in England at the beginning of the war? And why not ask all the insurance companies who are bound according to law to deposit with the Treasury a certain amount of securities to guarantee their policies, to substitute for their securities Canadian war bonds?

Another point I desire to touch is that, some fifteen years ago or thereabouts, the

Government granted to the steel industry, then being started, bounties to run for ten years, and which were afterwards renewed for a further period of five years. This action was taken to help to build up these industries. To-day the situation has changed. These industries are most prosperous; their directors are rich; they are paying large dividends to their shareholders and are even in a position to lend money. They are boasting that they have paid all their floating liabilities, and have vast sums to the good. It is differentiating between industries started with the help of the Government and others which got no bounties not to tax the former more than they are taxed at present.

Then why not get back from these companies these bounties in the shape of taxes special taxes, or super taxes, or other means which I have no doubt the Minister Finance can find out, because after all, as I said before, this money was well invested as it started all these industries, but did all the other industries of this country get such bounties and yet they are being taxed to the same extent. You have taxed the C.P.R., why not tax these companies and you would get back probably 50 million dollars?

I shall not say very much with regard to the matter of war expenditure. We all deplore the fact that at the beginning of the war certain mistakes were made, especially at Valcartier camp. Ice was brought from Ontario and transported to Valcartier; goods that could have been obtained in Quebec were purchased in various parts of the country at high prices and shipped to Valcartier, enormous freight and express charges being thereby incurred in order to help and promote the interests of that good friend of the Government, the Canadian Northern railway. The Government has paid huge amounts of money for motor cars and motor vehicles which have been placed at the disposal of the military authorities—so much so that in the big cities the ordinary pedestrian is in danger of being run over by these cars, because the majors, captains and lieutenant-colonels are in such a hurry to go about their supposed business that they do not care for the public. In England some abuses have arisen in that respect. Many colonels and generals have stayed there longer than they should and have drawn their salaries for doing nothing and not going to the front. It is true that many expenditures have to be made in time of war, and that they are very small when compared to the end that is had in view by the people who wish to see the Allies triumph. But I impress on the Government the necessity of greater economy in the administration of military affairs and of the avoiding of such waste as has taken place on certain occasions.

The member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) made reference recently to the use of public moneys by the Department of Justice in submitting bail for a man who was employed by the Government to detect supposed criminals but who has been organizing riots and sedition in the province of Quebec. I refer to the case of the man Desjardins. In answer to a question which I put to him, the Minister of Justice said that Desjardins had been in the employ of his department. We heard during the recent troubles in Quebec that a hidden hand might be visited upon certain people who had provoked or started these troubles, and that the Government might be at the back of it. We have proof of the astounding fact that in Montreal last year, when the Conscription Bill was in course of preparation, persons paid by the Government were trying to organize in Montreal a clique, a certain gang, a certain number of men, a certain club or association, for the direct purpose of trying to violate the law, of trying to stand against the Government to defeat the law. A number of men were arrested in this connection, among them Wisintainer, Goyer, Cyr, Bolduc, Chagnon and Paquette. The judge of the preliminary enquete found that there was enough evidence to commit these men to trial. In the case of Lalumière, who was the chief of the gang, Judge St. Cyr, who presided at the trial, went so far as to say not only that Lalumière and the others should be committed for trial, but that Desjardins, the chief witness of the Crown, should himself be arrested. The judge was surprised that this man had not already been taken into custody. An answer was given to a question put in the Senate some time ago which may be taken as indicative of the policy of the Government in this respect, that Desjardins was arrested "upon the instance of the other criminals who were connected with him in this plot, who, when they came to be indicted for their offences, accused Desjardins as a fellow-conspirator and he was indicted accordingly." I want to make a correction here. It is not true that these people had Desjardins arrested in order that they might try to save their own skins; on the contrary, they did not want him to be brought into the case at all, because they

thought they might be adversely affected. The person who swore the warrant against Desjardins was present when Lalumière was committed for trial; he is a gentleman who sat as representative of the constituency of Nicolet, if I am not mistaken, in the last Parliament. He writes to me saying that after reading the evidence he was absolutely convinced that Desjardins was just as guilty as the others, if not more so, because he had urged them to commit criminal acts which should not be tolerated by any Government, and for which he should be punished. He violated articles 523, 510, 347, 457 and 69 of the Criminal Code. What took place after that? Desjardins was indicted and was let out on bail for a time. by an official of the Government, Mr. Giroux, who supplied bail for him. Afterwards, when the trial started in November last, all the accused were to be tried together, but the trial could not be concluded because one of the jurors took sick and subsequently died. All the accused, with the exception of Desjardins, were let free on personal bail or certain securities being deposited on their behalf according to the judgment of Mr. Justice Pelletier, who said that they could go free. But Desjardins was kept in jail, Mr. Justice Pelletier did not want to allow any bail for him, because he considered his case worse than any of the other cases. I may say that Mr. Desjardins had many lawyers, Mr. Peers Davidson, Mr. Pelissier, Mr. St. Pierre Pruneau, Mr. Normandeau and other criminal lawyers in Montreal; because after a lawyer had defended him for a couple of days, he found the suit was too hot and he could not, as a gentleman of the Bar, defend Desjardins any longer. Finally, after certain investigations and pourparlers between the attorneys of the Government and the judge, bail was fixed at a certain amount, I think, about thirty thousand dollars, twenty thousand dollars being secured upon real estate and the balance in cash. As Desjardins could not obtain bail, the party who put up the bail, as we were told the other day, was the Department of Justice, the cheque being signed by Mr. Newcombe and countersigned by Mr. Narraway, accountant of the department. What happened then? The trial started some time ago in Montreal. It was presided over by the same judge, Mr. Justice Pelletier. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Justice Pelletier is a former friend, and, I think, he is still a friend of this Government. He was appointed by the Government to his present position. Not long ago he held a seat on the Treasury benches along with my hon. friends opposite. In this second trial, strange to say, the attorneys of the Government were new attorneys. They were Mr. Dagenais and Mr. Maurice Alexander. As I said before, Mr. Desjardins could not keep his attorneys very well. He had to change them every month, or every week, or sometimes oftener. After the evidence was all in, the judge reviewed the facts, and we find certain comments which are very important. The judge for instance says, in a certain part of his charge, speaking about Desjardins:

> In other words, a spotter or a spy. He tells us, in answer to one of my questions, that he induced those boys into error, and that was his object. He told them he was one of them against conscription. It was a lie, according to what he says now, it was a lie. He deceived them, and led them into a trap.

Further on the judge says:

> If a man acts in that way and is a spotter or an informer, or a spy, he has the right to do all that, and to go and inform the people who have hired him about all that took place, and that is the law too, but a man like that has no right in law, and the law is based on common sense here, he has no right to induce these people to do something wrong. Not even a policeman has the right to advise any one to do a thing which is forbidden, because he is the very man who ought to prevent it, and who ought to advise that it should not be done. Now if a man, clothed with the authority of the law, assumes the right to advise people to do things which are wrong, that man becomes guilty from the moment he has adopted that course, and I give you that under my responsibility as good law, whatever may be thought of it in any quarter.

Further on he says:

> Let us consider the stand that Desjardins is the only one of them all who tells the truth—even saying that Ranger, this young, honest boy, has taken a false oath—that all the others have taken a false oath. Desjardins tells us here of seven different heinous crimes which have been organized and premeditated at the meeting of the 27th of July. Killing public men; killing the Prime Minister of this country; killing General Wilson. He tells us there was a question of setting fire to a city and robbing and blowing up the bank. He tells us there was a secret committee of fifteen to be formed—and mind you, gentlemen of the jury, that all that is taken from his evidence as extended by the stenographer—and which I have taken great care to read as it is—the idea or suggestion of blowing up the properties where newspapers were published, or blowing up the owners of newspapers; the kidnapping of one of the ministers, the Hon. Mr. Sevigny. . . . . Desjardins also states that there were revolvers there. There were black-jacks there. There were instruments of torture, and assassination. Now, he comes and reports, and I am giving him all the credit to which he is entitled in saying that he reports one part of what has taken place, but he leaves out things in his reports—leaves out some very important information about things which he himself says

took place there. That is a fact which cannot be denied, and which no impassioned speech will brush to one side. He gives us the reason for leaving that out by saying that he made a verbal report to Colonel Sherwood. After, or, may be, even before the Cartierville outrages, these people did not trust Desjardins any more, and it would also be to his credit if these people did not trust him. They continued their organization and their bad actions without him. There is an outstanding salient fact to which I now want to call your attention, which may be an act of virtue, but which I consider a very disgraceful thing. On the 27th of July, in the year of our Lord, 1917, all these bad things, theft, murder, destruction of property—are prepared and talked about and are, to a certain extent, organized. On the 28th of July, the following day—twenty-four hours afterwards—Charles Desjardins, who knows all that, goes to this crowd and gives them the sum of twenty-five dollars. Now it has been said or it has been insinuated here that the Government of Canada approves of that.

And this, I may say, was referred to as being approved by the Government, by the attorney who defended Desjardins, and who said at the trial that he was defending Desjardins at the request of the Government of Canada. Judge Pelletier goes on to say:

I do not believe it. It would be shameful all the same, if a hundred Governments had approved it. It is so shameful that I do not believe any Government, Liberal or Conservative, would approve of it. This was so disgraceful that Inspector Giroux himself has felt it his duty to enter into this box and tell you what he thought of that. I shall not repeat his words, you still have them ringing in your ears. Now, Desjardins did that. Was that putting money into the hands of these people whom he knew, and he must have known, were not rich men; but where young men just beginning life. They have received this contribution of twenty-five dollars, and they had plotted all these things. Would you have done that? There is the true test. Would you have gone to those people knowing they were going to do these dastardly things, and opened your purses to them? I have too much faith in your honesty and your common sense to think that you would even have thought of doing this. He said he did this "in order to be friendly with them, in order to have their confidence."

This is what this creature of the Government says. Judge Pelletier continues:

Did you ever hear of anyone gaining the confidence of a gang of blackguards and criminals by opening your purse to them? You would perhaps have to give it up if he were holding a revolver to your head and saying: "Your purse or your life," you might have had to give it up, but you men do not volunteer your money to him. I do not think so.

Further on, at page 40, the same judge in the same charge, says:

There again I find fault, and serious fault, against Desjardins, because this is the third time he has given money for unlawful purposes . . . . I want to make a distinction here which is perhaps necessary for the interests of the impartial administration of justice. I want to tell you that it is not wrong in law to pay to become a member of a society, bad though it may be, in order to know what is going on there. It is not wrong in law, but it is wrong in law to give money to dangerous people when you have not to give it, when you are not obliged to give it, and when you know that that money helps or will likely help for the commission of a crime—of a crime which you know is going to be committed.

Further on he says:

I shall not discuss that at length, because Desjardins admits that they were not complete. They were far from being complete. For instance the blowing-up or intended blowing-up of the Gazette, the Star, La Patrie and La Presse is not mentioned in the report. This is a most serious thing. If Desjardins heard of these things, and he admits that he did, and did not report it, he was not only wrong in that, but he was absolutely derelict in his duty. He understands that, because he takes great care to tell us that "What I did not put in my report I told verbally to Sir Percy Sherwood." If he did not do that, it was a very serious matter for him, because when you know of anything of that kind and hide it knowingly, you become an accomplice."

The same judge, in the same trial, says, page 43:

Why was not Sir Percy Sherwood brought down here? We have the unsupported evidence of this boy that he told Sir Percy Sherwood, and he is trying to-day (and he is supported by a lawyer who claims he represents the Government) to blacken Sir Percy Sherwood's fair name. That is one of the things which I do not understand in this case. It is either one of two things; either Desjardins told Sir Percy Sherwood about this Three Rivers outrage, and then Sir Percy Sherwood should not have waited until the fourth of August, but would on the twenty-eighth of July, the same evening, have informed Chief of Police Berthiaume or Sir Percy Sherwood closed his eyes and allowed this gang to go to Three Rivers if they wished. Now, I am not here to defend Sir Percy Sherwood, but I am here to tell you that in order to save this fellow Desjardins, Mr. Alexander has no right to put Sir Percy Sherwood in the awful position in which he has tried to put him in this case.

Further on he says:

What do we see next? It is on the twenty-eighth of July that he goes to Ottawa. He has sent in his report on the twenty-seventh: he writes on the twenty-seventh another letter which must have ben received on the twenty-eighth, and who does he write to? Does he write to Sir Percy Sherwood? He knows that Giroux is not in Ottawa. No; he writes to a man whom he knows is not there, about a crime which is going to be committed.

On the twenty-ninth of July, another letter in which pretty serious matters are mentioned is written—to Giroux again.

The judge says further on, at page 46:

Desjardins has told us that he gave a revolver to this man Paquin, a worthless thing, not much more perhaps than junk; an old thing; valueless. The revolver is found, and it works. A very bad position—a very bad

situation, indeed . . . . What is important is the fact that Desjardins went away from Lalumiere's place and got a revolver and gave it to Paquin, and he told these young men that he was prepared to supply them with fire-arms. That is proved against him, and is corroborated by his admitting that he left Lalumiere's place with Paquin in order to get a revolver for him. Now, what inducement was that to these people? That is the real point of this revolver matter. What inducement were these people given, when they saw this man giving them money and giving them fire-arms, and helping to give them tools and the means to accomplish their evil purposes? We are told by Mr. Alexander we must approve of that.

Further on he says:

And yet Desjardins gave Paquin (whom he calls a conspirator) a box of cartridges in good working order—a nice thing for a police officer to do.

On page 48, speaking of Ranger's evidence, the judge says:

He has given evidence like a man who wants to be fair to every one; he stated that this revolver was offered to him for a seditious purpose, and Desjardins does not deny that either. Now, we have one revolver given, and one revolver offered. We have cartridges given, and that by a man who comes before you and says "I am a Police Officer, and I only did what was necessary." . . . . I do not say it was the necessary result, but I am afraid the other accused have got the right to say that they were to a certain extent encouraged to do what they did do by what Desjardins said and did. After all is said and done, when these boys saw that man amongst them, handing over money, and fire-arms, and ammunition, don't you think that this was of such a nature as to encourage these people to go further than they might have done without that? If that is not fairness, then I do not know or understand what fairness is, or means.

The judge says further:

We are told that we should accept the theory that all this was all right. My stomach refuses to swallow that. If yours are robust enough, alright. Mine is not. I am an older man than you, and that may account for it, but my stomach cannot stand it.

If the stomach of the judge could not stand that—a man who obtained his position through his allegiance to the former Government—how can the people of this country stand it? The Government of this country must have a pretty strong constitution to be able to stand it, and a very good physician in attendance in case their stomach refuses to swallow it. The judge says further, on page 50:

But bad as they are, nobody, and particularly nobody representing the powers that be—the authorities—had the right to go and give them encouragement, give them money, give them fire-arms. You have been told that the Government of Canada is going to be sorry if Desjardins is not approved by your verdict.

The judge was there referring to a charge previously made by Mr. Alexander. This is most important. The judge goes on:

I do not believe that, but if it were so, let justice be done, and let them be sorry, and Mr. Alexander is fully authorized to tell them that I, at least, do not approve of it, but the Government when they read the evidence will not approve of it, I am sure.

That is the reason why I have encroached on the time of the House in putting this evidence on Hansard. The judge goes on:

I do not think that if the Minister of Justice (whose political opinions all the people do not approve, but who is considered even by his political opponents as an honourable man and an upright man) had heard the evidence in this case, he would, like Inspector Giroux, have told you that he disapproved of Desjardins' actions, or I don't know him. You were told, and you were told in a frantic way, that all this was said to you on behalf of the Government of Canada! I was sorry to hear that.

It is a friend of the Government who is speaking. The judge goes on:

I think it was a great mistake for any gentleman, even though he be a member of the Bar, to come and practically place the Government of Canada here in the box, in a case prosecuted by the Provincial Government. I think it was a big mistake. The view I take is that nobody had the right to come here and tell you that. I do not know whether you are Conservatives, or Unionists or Liberals.

I presume you are all on one side or the other, unless perhaps a few of you are Nationalists—but I do not approve of anybody coming here and telling you these things in order to influence your verdict. This case has to be decided on the evidence and on nothing else.

These are the main remarks of the judge in his charge to the jury. The case was left to the jury. What happened? The jury disagreed. They stood eleven to one in favour of convicting Desjardins, and in the case of Lalumière, who was tried at the same time they stood 9 to 3 in favour of convicting him. A new trial was ordered and Desjardins asked for bail as in the first instance. He was allowed ont on bail and he was allowed out the second time but a larger sum was required than that on which he had been allowed out in the first instance. A cheque for $10,000 signed by the same persons, the Deputy Minister of Justice and Mr. Narraway, the accountant, and bearing the heading of the Department of Justice was deposited in court. I saw that cheque myself; it was made payable to the clerk of the court. Mr. Desjardins is still free awaiting another trial that is going to take place on the 15th of this month. There is more. There is a case which seems to be in a different category but which is still amongst these cases. I refer

to the case of Blackwell. That man had been doing certain work in connection with the manufacture of shells; he was a shell turner in one of the big factories in Montreal. He was working in conjunction with these others, he was arrested and when he came before the court on the last occasion certain evidence was adduced. I was told that some people who would have been able to have proved the facts against him were removed or taken away and the result was that the judge advised the jury to discharge him because there was not sufficient evidence. I know something about the facts of this case. This man was employed by the company owning this factory. I do not know if they knew anything about it, but the fact is he joined that band of blackguards that tried to raise sedition and riots in Montreal. But I do know that this company paid a lawyer, using their own money, to have this man defended, to see that the trial should not continue to the end and that he should not be convicted. I do not know if this man was hired by authority of the Government or not, but these seem to be the facts and they certainly have a very peculiar appearance. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) has stated the position in a somewhat similar way to that in which I have stated it now. He asked a statement from the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) in reference to this matter, and I think that before this session is over we should have a statement from him as to how and why the Government of Canada authorized the employment and payment of a man of this kind to stir up sedition and riots in Montreal at a time so inopportune, when the conscription law was being discussed in this country, and when a spark would have set fire to the province, nay, to the whole country. These expenditures for hiring lawyers and depositing money to defend criminals I take exception to, and I think that I am right in criticising them in the present situation when the war is on.

There are numerous other things which I have been very much surprised at since I have been a member of this House. For instance, there is the use, if not the abuse, by the Government of Orders in Council since this war has been on. We know that by the War Measures Act this Government was authorized and empowered to do everything by Order in Council, but although the Government has the right to do those things, I do not believe it is a wise policy or that the Government should exercise this power at any time or any moment, especially when this House is in session. On three occasions recently resort has been had to Orders in Council. An Order in Council was issued at the time of the recent disturbances in Quebec, another was issued to amend the Conscription Act, and again another under the War Appropriation measure that we have passed. We have passed this measure authorizing the Government to spend, by Order in Council, any amount of money, and to take whatever precautions they think fit without consulting this House. In doing so we violate the principle of control by Parliament over all public expenditure. The British system is for Parliament to vote and appropriate sums of certain amount for the different services of the Government, and then Parliament supervises, through its own committee and by an audit controlled by Parliament, the actual use and application of such appropriation. The measure sweeps this system away and introduces a species of administrative absolutism, a veritable czarism, with no possible control either at the beginning, in the vote and appropriation, or at the end, the use and spending of the money of the people.

There is the same tendency to use this power to pass Orders in Council to control the press of the country. Only recently we saw an Order in Council passed preventing the newspapers from making comments upon, or certain statements in relation to, the war, or criticising the way in which certain things were done in connection therewith. There is a natural tendency, while we are striving after efficiency and promptitude of governmental operation, for us to turn this country more and more into a bureaucracy wholly controlled by a group of ministers and department heads whose responsibility to Parliament becomes more and more indistinct and unenforceable. Their acts come before the representatives of the people only when presented for ratification after the facts; and the representatives of the people are then told that they might ratify or lose the services of the only Government that can really win the war. In this way irrevocable decisions are constantly being reached by the Cabinet, and, by individual ministers, are being imposed on the country without any real consideration by the public or its representatives. Many of these decisions are only remotely connected with the conduct of the war, and the consequences of most of them will be felt for a generation after peace is declared.

While we should strive to do our utmost to win the war, we should not lose sight of the conditions which will need to be dealt with when the war is over. The Government should be prepared to avail themselves of any advantages that will then present themselves for the development of commercial intercourse with other countries, as well as in our internal trade, and now is the time to prepare ourselves with that object in view. We were given to understand that many public works had been stopped, the reason assigned being that we were not able to obtain the necessary money to carry them on and that the works in question were not urgent. For example, work on the St. Charles River improvements was brought to a standstill. But, Mr. Speaker, if that work was deemed necessary a few years ago for the improvement of existing conditions in that part of the country the necessity surely is as great to-day. The few million dollars of outlay involved will not render our financial condition very much worse, and if the undertaking was a necessary one before the war broke out, it is just as necessary to-day and should not be discontinued.

There has also been a stoppage of work in the harbours of Montreal and Quebec. Although it is necessary for us to practice economy, we must also be keenly alert so that we may take advantage of the opportunities which will present themselves when the war is over. It is very necessary to provide proper harbour facilities for our overseas trade and to maintain adequate transportation facilities between the different parts of Canada. With the completion of the improvements contemplated at these harbours we should be in a far better position to handle a greatly enhanced volume of trade, at those places.

Some years ago, the project for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal was inaugurated and was strongly supported by several members of Parliament. At that time the Government deeming the enterprise too big, did not feel themselves able to recommend the appropriations necessary to bring it to a successful completion. Had the Georgian Bay canal been commenced at that time it would by now have been well under way, and although perhaps not completed it might be available later for trade purposes. That canal would have afforded very important transportation facilities for our trade and commerce, and would have been regarded for all time as a great achievement for Canada. We have been told that public works have been stopped because the cost of material and labour is growing dearer all the time. In answer to that I would say that the Government has been able to find the material, the money and the men necessary to reconstruct the Parliament buildings. I do not criticise their action in that regard, but I would ask if these works were absolutely necessary in connection with the carrying on of the industries of this country. The Government has emphasized the necessity of making sacrifices now that we are at war. Would it not have been better to have made the sacrifice of remaining in the present building until after the conclusion of the war, and have devoted the money which is now being expended on the Parliament buildings to other public undertakings, which would be of greater assistance in developing our commercial position when the present great world conflict is at an end?

My reason for bringing forward these suggestions now is that the Government and Parliament might take up and deal with the situation before it is too late and provide for the conditions which will arise when the war comes to an end. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) stated to-day that there exists in Canada a certain association whose object is to promote the reconstruction of this country after the war. That organization is called the Canadian Industrial Reconstruction Association, and the hon. gentleman gave the names of certain prominent members of the provisional executive committee. These gentlemen, who are Tories, or Unionists, and are friendly to the Government, and cannot be taxed with being opposed to the war, and at their meeting in Toronto, as well as at their meeting in Montreal recently, they advocated the present as being a most opportune time to provide measures for the improvement of trade and commerce, and to meet industrial conditions of Canada after the war is over, and they suggested that we should get into touch with the people of other countries in order to take such steps as may be necessary to that end. It is held that the war will certainly bring new forms of taxation, although the customs duties will continue to be the chief source of revenue. But it is doubtful if all the forms of taxation that can be devised will meet the interest upon the war debt, to say nothing of providing for the pensions and other war obligations that will have been incurred during the present war. In under-

taking their reorganization programme, the members of this association have not been accused of being unpatriotic and not being good supporters of the cause of the Allies, so the accusation cannot in justice be levelled against them with others who came forward with similar suggestions.

Then, a few months ago, the Imperial Government appointed an Empire Resources Committee to consider a resolution adopted by the Imperial War Conference of 1917, which declared that the time had arrived when all possible encouragement should be given to the development of Imperial resources, and especially to making the Empire independent of other countries in respect of food supplies, raw materials and essential industries. It is important, they say, to any such inquiry that the interest of the Dominion should not be prejudiced by neglect or want of knowledge. There is no necessary conflict between Canadian and Imperial interests if the situation is clearly understood. Each portion of the Empire must maintain the industrial policy which its conditions demand, and the more clearly that is recognized, the stronger will be the bonds of sympathy which hold the parts together. Beyond legitimate protection of local interests there may be Imperial preferences in control over raw materials, in direction of immigration, and in charge of transportation, which will tend greatly to unify the Empire, enhance its strength and security and increase the general average of prosperity alike in the Mother Country and the Dominions.

This Government has announced its purpose in aiding in bringing the war to a successful issue and looking after the interest of our soldiers who are returning—which two objects we on this side of the House would like to see carried out. But as I have already said, the Government should do its utmost so that the resources and the trade and commerce of Canada may be developed to the fullest extent when the war is over.

To these, Mr. Speaker, to other immediate problems, and to new problems that will arise during the war and the period of reconstruction, the Government should give its immediate attention with the single desire to assist in their wise solution, to assure equitable dealing with all classes and interests, and particularly to develop the natural resources of Canada for the national advantage, and maintain in strength and efficiency the industries of the country upon which labour and agriculture, town and township, so greatly depend.

Mr. DESLAURIERS (St. Mary's, Montreal) (translation): Mr. Speaker, seeing the hour is so late and that we must sit again to-morrow, I have the honour to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the hon. gentlemen had better go on for a while.

Mr. DESLAURIERS: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the many and elaborate speeches delivered on the budget by those who spoke before me, this House cannot expect me to bring any new light to bear on the subject; however, I intend in the course of the few brief remarks I am going to make, to protest against the extravagance and the nefarious enactments foisted upon my country by our hon. friends on the other side of this House, whose sincerity can be nothing other than questionable.

If my memory serves me right, a man took the floor of this House, one day, and addressed the following language to those who are now his friends: "When the Conservatives were in Opposition they never let pass the opportunity of criticizing the Government for its expenses, even taxing as extravagant the lowest budget, the most appropriate to the business needs of the country. Since coming into power, the spirit of economy has disappeared and been replaced by such extravagant methods of spending the public money as have no precedent in Canada. Never was there seen such a dance of millions spent strictly among friends. The present Government have broken all their election promises, have set aside all the principles they so proudly proclaimed when they occupied the Opposition benches, and have brought down to Parliament a budget demand for 200 million dollars, while the former Government, with great national undertakings to its credit, never went beyond 149 millions." The man who spoke these admirable words was my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean). On this occasion how well may we exclaim: "O tempora! O mores"! Two hundred million dollars got on his nerves in those days, and now he brings down a budget for 980 millions, assuring us, meanwhile, that we have not yet reached the last penny alluded to by the Hon. Minister of the Interior. So he must not feel surprised if we, in turn, are inclined to be irritated by this fabulous or rather this ridiculous sum. His opponents of yesterday, his friends of to-day, have broken their election pledges; they promised volunteer recruiting, they pro-

mised the selective draft, they promised exemption to all those whose work was in the national interest. What hon. member of this House does not recall the patriotic (save the mark); orators shouting to Ontario that conscription was for Quebec; and in Quebec, on the other hand, didn't we hear these topsy-turvy patriots howling that conscription was not as bad as it was painted, that the population consisted mostly of farmers and would hardly be touched? What man does not know the name of the hon. gentlemen on the Government side who assured His Lordship, the Rt. Rev. Archbishop of Montreal, that conscription was being put in force by the Government as a means to clearing out the places of amusement and the pool-rooms; of getting hold of the shirkers, of making a general clean-up in society? Are those the Government's claims to-day?

No, Mr. Speaker, we meet the very contrary; through these Orders in Council and like measures—a form of administration which I despise and which every citizen respectful of the constitution of his country must also despise—hasn't every exemption been annulled, is not the Government laying hold, indiscriminiately, of the best we have in the country, leaving behind the sickly, the unwholesome, the effeminate, in a word all those who are incapable of shouldering arms for the defence of the Canadian race, and then we are told that this is a national Government! Didn't they promise the farmers that their sons would be exempted and, is it necessary for me to add, was there one member on the other side of this Chamber who was not elected on this condition? Have they or have they not been false to their word? Lately when the Molloy amendment was moved, demanding the exemption of farmers, and the Lapointe amendment, demanding the exemption of both farmers and those other classes of society who would be of more service to the country here at home than they could be overseas, did the Government have the courage to insist that what they had promised to their respective constituents be respected?

As to those who were not present at that solemn moment, how are they going to face their electors? And those who voted for the Molloy amendment and, a few minutes later, upheld the Government's Bill, thus contradicting their first vote, what will their explanation be? I will say to the Hon. Minister of Finance that what was true of his friends in former times, what was reprehensible in them, is none the less true and reprehensible to-day; he cannot help acknowledging that, and what I regret is this mental shuffle of the hon. minister whereby he looks upon the business of the country to-day in the same manner as his present friends were wont to do in olden days. Why this strange conduct? Is it because Canada has fallen below her true status? I do not hesitate to deny that, when I see Ireland which has over 100 members of Parliament at Westminster, and has given nothing in the present war, while Canada, with no representation whatever in the Imperial Parliament, has already contributed 6 per cent of her total population; when I see India who, with a total population of 300 million people, has not given as many men as has little Canada, a country of 7,000,000; when I compare the efforts of Japan, a rich, powerful nation, directly interested in the present war, whose military efforts has been practically nil; when I compare the efforts of Italy which hasn't accomplished half as much as Canada having regard to population; when I compare Canada with the United States, that nation whose resources are inexhaustible, and which has not done one-tenth as much as we; and even England herself, can England compare her showing to Canada's? When I see that all these nations directly interested in the war, have not seen fit to make the supreme sacrifice, I say that Canada, engaging in this war through sympathy, because a noble and sacred cause was at stake, should not follow the road of national suicide.

Why does the hon. member for Halifax come before us with such a monstrous and irrational Budget? What are the motives behind this manner of carrying on the business of the country? I will not repeat them now; they are known to every one, especially to our hon. friends on the other side of the House. I shall be told that the Government is acting in defence of Canada; that, in this war, Canada's border line is in Flanders.

Mr. Speaker, not very long ago I was reading in a daily paper that Judge Benton, I think it was, of Ontario, at any rate a man likely in favour of conscription, had a case up before him. The matter concerned a life insurance company, one of whose members had fallen on the field of honour in Europe. The company were being sued because they had refused to pay the insurance policy on the ground that a clause in the policy exonerated them from paying for a demise in a foreign land. Now, plaintiff's counsel argued that Canada's Parliament had declared that our frontiers were in Flanders, consequently that the family should be paid.

The outcome was that the company won their case, since the judge brought the boundaries of Canada back to their normal position. So I am not alone in thinking that in the present war, we are combatants solely through sympathy. Some one might make reply that Germany is liable to attack us in the future. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not hold that opinion; I have before me an article in Overseas, a monthly magazine published by the Overseas Club, an English Imperialist association; they publish a map of the world under the heading: "What Germany Wants," founded on the demands formulated by Berlin through their principal authors and publicists. Here is what we find on this map: Tannenberg, in Gross Dutchland, claims for his country, Holland and her colonies; Angola; the Congo; Turkey's possessions in Asia; the river basins of the Yellow river and of the Yang Tse Kiang, in China; Cuba; Central Africa; Asia Minor; Syria; Mesopotamia, Warner Sambart wants Germany to have Dover, Malta, the Suez region; the Deutcheschaften of Paul de Lagarde suggests that Berlin take over a part of Russia; Bernardi looks upon German possession of Denmark as essential; Ernest Haase speaks of Scandinavia; Fritz Bley claims that Germany by right should rule over all the basin of the Rhine; Wolf-Politik Haase suggests that Germany should have supremacy over Luxemburg, Switzerland and the Balkans; General von Shellendorf demands the annexation of the whole of northern France as far as the Loire; Frederick Lange's patriotic ambition asks for nothing less than the suzerainty of his country over all the republics of the South; Maximilian Harden wants Morocco, Egypt, India, Belgium, Calais; Paul Rorchbach wants all Austria Hungary, while the Industrial Association of Germany are asking for all the Meuse basin, Briey, Longwy and Lorraine. After several examples of this kind, we find that, outside of Cuba, the territory of North America remains intact, Canada and the United States are not affected. Therefore those who claim that Germany is after Canada are in error.

Has Canada done reasonably well in the present war, in comparison with those nations which most resemble her, through their situation, their interests, their sympathies and the principal elements of their population: England, France, the United States?

Let us take for granted—and this falls short of the truth—that we have enlisted 420,000 men in the different army services; now, setting Canada's population at 7,000,000, which is very near the true figure, for since 1914 a great many foreigners have returned to their own country—this figure represents the total population, including children, women and old men—so that we have put 6 per cent of our population under arms. This is equivalent to an army of 2,400,000 for France; an army of 2,700,000 for England. Nevertheless, despite the number of her troops on paper, England, so far, has not sent that many men to France.

It will be admitted that we are aware today of Germany's intention to get hold of the French forts along the English channel; that England has at least just as much direct interest as we have to prevent the Germans from accomplishing their design.

If we estimate the military effort of each nation, taking into consideration, at the same time, the population, the number of soldiers and the cost of maintaining the army, the comparison is still more striking. Once more, let us take for granted that Canada spends on her army three times more than England, and four times more than France, for each soldier; if we make allowance for the difference in pay, in pensions, in transportation, etc., these figures are moderate indeed. In this way we must multiply by four the comparative figure for France, and by three that of England; so we find that Canada's present army costs her as much as would England an army of 8,100,000 men; or an army of 9,000,000 men in France. That is more than our two mother countries will put on a war footing during the entire conflict, even if it were to last two years longer. Now, France and England are, subsequently to the United States, two of the wealthiest nations on the globe while Canada is one of the poorest.

The comparison with the United States is, in certain respects, still more impressive. The situation of both countries is identical and the danger of an attack by Germany is at least as great for them as for Canada. The American nation is fourteen times as big as ours and its wealth seventy-four times as great. In order to equal Canada's showing, therefore, the United States would have to put on a war basis, and transport to France, an army of six million men. Moreover, they would have to spend at least one hundred billion dollars. Now, we have never heard that they intended creating an army of more than three million, and the more conservative place it at one million. So that, if they sent three million men they would contribute only one-half as much as Can-

ada, while if they send but one million, Canada's showing will have been six times as great.

Estimated in dollars and cents the disparity is still greater. The United States pay $1.00 per day to each soldier; Canada pays $1.10. Basing our assumption on Canada's figure of 420,000 soldiers and a possible army of 2,000,000 men in the United States—an average generally accepted—every Canadian ratepayer, every man, woman and child, pays $24 a year for our army, while the American pays only $7. Should the war keep on into 1919, the Canadians will be spending $120 and the Americans, $14. These figures have merely to do with the soldiers' pay. If we take into account officers' salaries, indemnities, pensions, transportation and equipment, the difference is much greater. So we must conclude that we are contributing ten times more than they in every respect and their newspapers are decidedly out of place when they heap insult upon us as they frequently do.

Now, have we the necessary means of transportation to carry on a policy like this? In a magazine published in the United States. The New Republic, I read a short time ago, that millions of tons of foodstuffs and munitions—which are absolutely necessary to carry on the war, especially to-day—are piled up on the wharves along the Atlantic seaboard, with no immediate hope of being able to transport them, and that, in any case they will be transported under hazard of the hardest kinds of difficulties, such as submarines and floating mines,—because there is a shortage of bottoms. On the 18th of last October the Tribune of New York stated that what tortured it most was the thought that the Allies might be struck down dead before the United States had been able to send them help, because there were not enough ships. And M. Tardieu, High Commissioner for France, sent on a mission to America, stated in the American papers that his greatest fear was that the United States did not have the ships necessary to forward, at the proper time, the food and munitions bought there, the need for which was becoming more urgent as the days went by.

To me it is permissible to think that since the Canadian government have an official representative of the cabinet in Washington, they should be well aware of this shortage of ships and that, in consequence, they should energetically promote shipbuilding in this country so as to help the Allies and allow them to strike with their full strength. We all acknowledge that it is useless to transport splendid soldiers to France if we have not also the wherewithal to feed them and to fulfil their requirements in the matter of munitions, since we are suffering from a scarcity of the means of transportation. Besides, when we have before our very eyes the statements of eminent men, like Lord Reading Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Rhondda, Mr. Hoover, Lord Northcliffe and Mr. Kemp himself, urging upon us the imperative necessity of shipping them food, while it is common knowledge throughout the world that France is put on rations and that the bakers of England and Italy have not sufficient flour for baking bread; when, finally, we read the reports of eminent men like Dr. Robertson, Hon. Mr. Fisher, the Hon. Mr. Caron, of Quebec, and the leaders of all our agricultural societies, demonstrating, figures in hand, that the present Administration is rapidly heading the country towards famine; when we know that Canada, to-day is face to face with a shortage of 60,000 hands for getting in the next crop; when we know that, thanks to our excessive contributions of men, hundreds of acres suitable for cultivation and ready to be planted, will fail to be, on account of the scarcity of farm labour; is it practical, is it reasonable for the hon. Minister of the Interior to bring down legislation concerning our Indian reserves which have never been cultivated, while we have so much more land already for seeding? Is it really opportune, from a national standpoint, to amend the Military Service Act so as to recruit from our farmers and our farm workers?

It is not with theories of that sort that a country is governed wisely.

For my part I find irrefutable evidence that our friends on the Government benches entertain an entirely false conception of their duty to the State; they cannot expect to convince this House that we must ruin Canada, bring starvation upon our European allies and thus win final victory!

In the name of liberty, honour and patriotism, interpreted according to their own light, they seem free to do anything at all, except what is right. In certain provinces they have succeeded in deceiving the people, but to-day the people have grasped just what this patriotism of the hon. gentlemen amounts to, and to-morrow the people will brand upon the foreheads of

these hon. gentlemen a stigma which through all eternity will torture their souls.

We of the Opposition are in this war to the very end, taking heed of our strength and our resources. No one detests Prussianism more than do we who have met with a few transitory samples of it in this country. Our ranks hold none of those emboldened talkers who on every occasion mouth the august name of liberty and then erase it wherever they find it emblazoned on the walls of our country. We have known what true freedom is and we would like to see the people of Canada continue to enjoy this true freedom.

A few words of recapitulation, Mr. Speaker, and I will have done. I maintain that the Government should, first of all, build ships so as not to be a burden to any one else; next, develop agriculture in every possible way so as to sustain the vital forces of Europe and of Canada. Finally I say that, so far, Canada has done herself proud, in men, in money and in food; and that Germany has never designed an attack upon Canada.

Mr. A. B. HUNT (Compton) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take steps under the rules of the House to ensure that the debate would be ended to-morrow, as it has lasted a very long time, but I have an arrangement with the chief whip on the other side which will obviate that necessity, and therefore I shall consent to the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 1.25 a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, May 8, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

REPORT.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Sir Robert Borden.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES FOR FLYING CORPS CADETS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House inquired a few days ago regarding the opportunities afforded to men training for the flying service to attend religious services. A telegram was sent to the officer in command at Toronto, to which the following reply has been received:

Toronto, Ont.

General Gwatkin,
Ottawa, Ont.

Reference your letter May 2nd. Applied to Military District No. 2 on 30th April for six chaplains of suitable religious denominations for service in various units. No religious services held at School of Aeronautics, Queens Park, Toronto. This not considered necessary in view of excellent church accommodation in Toronto. Cadets and men of this school are given every facility to attend any religious Sunday service they wish and are free from 10.45 a.m. each Sunday.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—EXEMPTIONS.

Mr. MACNUTT:

1. What is the number of volunteers for Military Service exempted on account of physical unfitness?
2. What is the total number exempted for the same cause, including the men who were called up under the Military Service Act, to 15th of April last?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. There were no records kept for those rejected for physical unfitness under voluntary enlistment.

2. There have been 118,772 men who registered and claimed exemption examined by military medical boards and placed in a lower medical category than "A." These men have been automatically granted a temporary certificate of exemption on account of their medical unfitness. An exemption certificate granted on medical grounds automatically expires immediately the men in the medical category under which the certificate has been granted are called upon for military service.

BARGE BENMORE.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Did the Government own an iron barge called the Benmore?
2. What are her dimensions and tonnage?
3. Has this barge been sold? If so, when?
4. What is the name of the person who purchased said barge?
5. What was the amount received by the Government for said barge?
6. Does the Government know for what purpose she is to be used?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Length 242 ft., breadth 39.2 ft., moulded depth 24.9 ft., registered tonnage 1,355, gross tonnage, 1,477.

3. Yes; the 22nd September, 1917.

4. J. A. Farquhar, Halifax.
5. $22,500.
6. The Department of Railways and Canals has no information.

ST. CLAIR WEST.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. What rank did St. Clair West, No. 68,113, hold in the 25th Nova Scotia Battalion?
2. Did he proceed overseas in said Battalion?
3. Did he see active service in France?
4. If not, what duties did he perform?
5. Was he wounded in France?
6. If not, by what authority does he wear stripes on his uniform usually worn by and designating wounded men?
7. Is he still engaged in military duties?
8. If so, what are said duties?

Major-General MEWBURN: The information asked relative to this man is not available in Canada. It is being requested, by letter, from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.

HON. ALBERT SEVIGNY.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has the Government entrusted the Hon. Albert Sévigny, former Minister of Inland Revenue, with any mission?
2. If so, what is the nature of such mission?
3. What remuneration does the Hon. Albert Sévigny derive from this source?
4. How long ago was he appointed, and what sums have been paid him to date?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Sevigny has not been entrusted with any mission by the Government, and he is not in receipt of any remuneration from the Government at the present time.

CHAMBLY-VERCHERES ELECTION DOCUMENTS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): moved:

(a) For a copy of envelopes No. 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 39, 53, 56, 59, and 99 polling booth No. 9 Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Elections of 17th December last, and placed in Military bag No. 446 of the North American Continent Military Votes and now in the boxes for the Electoral District of Chambly and Vercheres. (b) A copy of the envelopes number 65 and 70 polling booth No. 4, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of the 17th December last, and placed in Military bag number 451 of the North American Continent Military Votes, and now in the boxes for the Electoral District of Chambly and Vercheres. (c) A copy of envelope number 80 of polling both No. 2 Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last, and placed in Military bag No. 453 of the North American Continent Military Votes and now in the boxes for the Electoral District of Chambly-Vercheres. (d) A copy of all statements, polling books, papers, documents relating to said polling booths 2, 4, 9; bags No. 451, 453, 446, sent to the Returning Officer in the said bags or separately.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Stand.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Since the Government does not seem disposed to grant this motion, as I believe they should, I shall withdraw it. But I give notice that I will bring this matter up before the House at the first opportunity.

Motion dropped.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY HOLIDAY.

On the Government notice of motion that the House do adjourn over Ascension Day, being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is this motion not to be passed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not intend to move it at present. I will speak to my right hon. friend about it. It is probable that the Senate will sit to-morrow, and it is very desirable that this House should sit unless there is very great objection. I might point out that we are faced with one or two alternatives. This House will have to prorogue not later than Saturday, May 18th, or else adjourn until about the first of August. I am not saying this with a desire to in the slightest degree restrict discussion. I am only stating the fact. If it is desired that further discussion with regard to any matters of public business shall take place, I am perfectly willing that the House should be adjourned until the 1st of August. All I desire to point out, and I do so with all respect, is, that unless this House can prorogue by the 18th of May it will be necessary for us to come back about the first of August.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That view of the case has nothing at all to do with the question of the House sitting to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has in this way, that we could make some progress to-morrow, and it might assist in enabling us to prorogue on the date I have mentioned. I desire to say, however, that I do not wish the House to sit to-morrow if there is any grave or serious objection. I thought I would let the motion stand for the present, and we can return to it later. In the meantime I will confer with my right hon. friend about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It will be called again to-day?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Oh, yes, if necessary.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

VISIT OF THE PRIME MINISTER TO ENGLAND FOR IMPERIAL CONFERENCE AND IMPERIAL WAR CABINET.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Before the Orders of the Day are called, and in view of some remarks made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday about the Prime Minister not going overseas this summer, but that other ministers of the Crown would; and in view of the remarkable statement just made by the Prime Minister that we must either prorogue, or adjourn by a certain date to come back later, is it the intention of the Prime Minister to give to this House and to the country a statement as to what the ministers are going to do when they go overseas; whether they are going to do any more than they did last year, and whether they are going to get the overseas forces in order? We want to know what is going to be accomplished by this trip to England, and why the members of this House should be called back here on the 1st of August, if matters stand as we understand they do.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought the hon. gentleman was aware that members of governments from all the Dominions of the Empire had been summoned to attend an Imperial War Conference, and also to attend sessions of an Imperial War Cabinet. The date has not yet been fixed. I believe the ministers from other Dominions have already started. The correspondence with regard to the matter, in so far as it is not of a confidential nature, can be brought down and laid upon the table of the House. It is the intention of the Prime Minister of Canada to be present at that conference.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I heard it was not.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend must not believe everything he hears.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I believe I read it in the minister's own organ.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does the hon. gentleman refer to me?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I read it in the Evening Journal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman refers to that or any other paper as my organ, he is transgressing the bounds of truth.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He is not transgressing the bounds of truth at all. He is not in the habit of transgressing the bounds of truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I desire to ask another question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member must resume his seat when the Speaker rises.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Speaker must not rise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member must be amenable to the rules of the House, as must any other member of the House, and it is my duty, charged as I am with the responsibilities of my position, to see that the rules of the House are carried out. The hon. member is not in order in entering into any discussion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: When I am charged with stating an untruth, I am within my rights.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was not charged with stating an untruth.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I rise to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, take your seat, please. The point I want to get at is this, if Canada is going to be committed—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is out of order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is not in order in entering into a discussion, and I must rule that he is out of order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am asking a question. I am within my right in asking a question, with all due regard to the chloroform that has been administered here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. member to resume his seat at once. If by using the word "chloroform," he has reference to the ruling of the Chair, I must ask him to retract that statement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I desire to ask the Prime Minister a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member, in using the word "chloroform" has reference to the ruling of the Chair, I ask him to withdraw that statement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not in the habit of answering hypothetical questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member may not proceed unless he withdraws that statement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will not withdraw the statement. I am perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member persists in refusing to withdraw that statement, I shall name him.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is the privilege of the Speaker to name me if he wants to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would suggest to the hon. member (Sir Sam Hughes) that he is too old a member of this House to defy the authority of the Speaker. The reason I made the reference to him that I did was that he had stated, without any warrant, that a journal which he described as "my organ"—

Sir SAM HUGHES: A Government organ.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member said it was my "organ." I think the hon. member said it was my personal organ. I resent that statement, because I assure him and the House that I have no personal organ in this country, nor have I control over the editorial utterances of any newspaper in Canada, nor have I sought to have any such control.

Mr. FIELDING: Except the Canada Gazette.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That has no editorials.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And Orders in Council.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I accept the explanation of the Prime Minister. I desire to ask him this question. Is it the intention to discuss with this House and with the country the questions that are to arise at the Imperial Conference as to the future of this country in connection with the Empire? If we are to judge by the statements that have been made concerning what transpired at past conferences, I do not agree with those, and I would ask the Prime Minister respectfully—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would ask the Prime Minister respectfully if he purposes to lay before this House and the country—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: —the facts in connection with the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member does not make himself amenable to the constituted authority of this House, I shall have to take the proper measures to see that he does.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have asked the Prime Minister a question, and I purpose asking: Is it the intention to bring before the House the subject matters that are to be discussed at the conference in Great Britain, or is it not?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. member will put his question on the Order Paper, it will be answered.

THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means (resumed from May 7).

Mr. A. B. HUNT (Compton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make the remarks which I believe it is my duty to make on the present occasion, I wish to say that, at this stage of the debate I intend to be as brief as possible. I do not wish to take up the time of this House in wandering far from the question which we are now called upon to discuss. I shall, therefore, not attempt to discuss many of the questions that have been brought up by members on both sides of this House.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the only important questions before us at the present time are men, munitions, ships, food and the financing of this great war, and, in my opinion, the most important of all is food. I believe this Government should move very carefully and study well the great question of the shortage of food. I feel, after they have weighed the question from all sides, they will come to the conclusion that the young men should not at this critical time be removed from the farms. It must, however, be clearly understood that the farmers in our part of the country are ready to do their share, either at the front or on the farm, in winning this war, and I dislike hearing the slurring insinuations that are thrown across the floor of this House at Quebec, because nothing but harm can come out of such statements. You cannot produce more food and, at the same time, take the men from the farms. You must choose what you consider the most essential at this time, and then carry out one plan or the other. You must not endeavour to do both with the same class of men. I consider a great deal of time has been lost and a great deal of harm has been done by discouraging the farmers and young men of this country by pulling them from one exemption tribunal to another and not giv-

ing them any satisfactory answer as to where their best work may be carried on in order to win the great struggle which is now being waged. If those young men are wrongly directed by this Government, the ministers of the Crown and hon. members supporting the Government will be held by the people of this country to be responsible for the action they have taken and the method they have used in carrying out what I consider an unnecessary law. They say that we can replace those farmers by sending out men from the cities. It is absurd to think that anything of the kind can be done. How many men can you get out in the morning and milk ten cows and do the same thing at night? If they were willing, not more than one out of ten can milk, and not more than one out of twenty is willing. And when you stop the dairy industry of this country, you stop the production of cheese, which is a most essential and necessary food for the soldiers at the front.

What advice do we get from our food controllers, both in Canada and in Great Britain? Are we carrying out their views by taking men from the farms? Let us see what they say. Although this has already been placed on Hansard, I feel it is of such great importance that it cannot be too carefully considered. We even have the statement of the Prime Minister of Canada that food may be the winning card in this war. We also have the opinion of Lord Rhondda, the British food controller, who, from London on the 10th of April, cabled the Canada Food Board as follows:

> In these stern days it is inspiring to learn that Canada is tackling the food problem with redoubled energy. The terrific pressure on our military front makes it all the more imperative that those behind the lines should strain every nerve to defeat the enemy's avowed object of destroying the British Empire. Germany hoped first to starve the Old Country by the submarine campaign and then to smash her land forces. She has failed to starve us and she will fail to smash us but we cannot achieve victory without food. There never was a time when it was more needed. The Canadian farmer and the Canadian farm hand now have the opportunity to make an effective reply to the enemy's present onslaughts by bending their undivided energies to the increased production of those food supplies for which we depend to such vital extent on your great Dominion.

We also have our own Doctor Robertson, who has assured us that the world faces a food situation that is nothing short of appalling.

The increased dependence of our Allies, France, Italy and Belgium, upon us for food production is shown by the following facts: In France the average yearly production of wheat for the five years preceding the war was 317,000,000 bushels. In 1916, the production had fallen to no less than 214,000,000 bushels, and in 1917 the crop was estimated at 161,000,000 bushels. Likewise in Italy, the average pre-war production for five years amounted to 183,000,000 bushels. In 1916 this had dropped to 176,000,000 bushels, and in 1917 the estimate was 147,000,000 bushels. In Belgium the average pre-war production was almost 15,000,000 bushels. It fell in 1916 to almost 12,000,000 bushels. The estimate for 1917 only amounted to 9,000,000 bushels. The total reduction in those three countries amounted to over 198,000,000 bushels, representing a reduction from pre-war production of nearly thirty-eight per cent. In view of these facts Canada finds itself one of the most important factors, if not the most important factor, in the food situation. Supplies from Eastern Europe no longer exist. Supplies from Australia and Africa are too far away to be moved. As Lord Rhondda has said: What we ask from the United States and Canada we cannot procure elsewhere. As between ourselves and the United States we have a far larger exportable surplus of wheat than she has. In the past year our exportable wheat surplus amounted to 154,000,000 bushels, while the United States had only one-third of that amount. Canada is called upon to be a factor in saving the world which is face to face with starvation. Now, Mr. Speaker, you can see by this shortage that Canada and the United States are looked upon to save the situation. We have, in our great West, vast prairies and wheat land which can produce an immense quantity of all kinds of grain, if we can only get the help to cultivate those vast fields. We also have, in our own country, a large quantity of land not cultivated on account of shortage of labour, and if the Government takes away many of our boys, the situation will be still more serious.

The Government must be congratulated on the stand they have taken in removing the duty on tractors to assist in greater production. Should that increase production, as I am ready to admit it will, would it not have been wise, under the same Order in Council, to go further and absolutely eliminate all the duty from farm implements? No doubt there would have been some objections from manufacturers, but the Government could have called the measure a war-time measure and waved the old flag, and it might have passed with-

out any serious objections being raised. Some years ago there were brought up in this House cases where manufacturers sold farm implements to dealers in the United States, paying the duty, and those dealers sold them back again to our western farmers, another duty being paid, and even then those implements were sold for less money than the price at which our dealers could sell them. Does any hon. member think that those manufacturers still require protection on the part of the Government? This is an opportune time, when the war is on, to remove the duty on farm implements altogether.

A pledge was made by members of this Government to the farmers of my county that the latter would not be taken from their farms, that the object of the compulsory service legislation was to get at the slackers in large cities, such as Montreal. The same statement was made by some clergymen on public platforms, and no doubt they had authority to make such statements. If not, they should have had authority before making such statements on public platforms. I believe the Government should be in a position to tell the farmers what they really intend to do. They should settle down to some kind of a policy whereby the people of this country will know what they have to do, and in that way the Government will prevent all this trouble that is now going on. They should call off many of the officers who are, without any reason, arresting young men. Judgment should be used, and when a young man is ready and willing to go he should not be taken as a criminal and locked up. All he asks is to be notified when he is wanted and where he has to report.

In my constituency, on the 16th of April, two young men were arrested; they were marched four miles down the track that evening and placed in jail. Two other young men, one only nineteen years of age, were asked to come to a village, and when they drove up with a team they were taken away from the team, not being allowed to drive the team home again, and put into jail. The next morning a man was taken from a field where he was working and also put into jail. He was not allowed even to go home and change his clothes. The men who were put into jail in the evening were taken out in the morning and given breakfast, and then they did not receive anything more to eat until night. They went without dinner. They had no chairs to sit down on, and there were no sanitary arrangements. They were locked up in one room, being treated worse than criminals. At night they were given supper and were again locked up. The Government should see that the proper men are authorized to bring these men wherever they want them. Everybody is willing to help to win the war, but what the young men want is to know when they are wanted and where they have to report. A letter with a three cent stamp on it would have brought any one of those young men wherever they were required to report. They were later on taken out of jail, and four or five officers took them to Sherbrooke or Quebec. It is no wonder riots occur in Quebec when young men are treated that way. It must have cost twenty or twenty-five dollars to round up each of these men. I did not intend to bring this matter up; but I have received letters from many of my electors requesting that this should be discussed in the House of Commons, and I hope nothing of the kind will happen again.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, this debate has already continued to such a considerable length that it is not my desire to prolong it unduly; but a consideration of the Budget touches upon the national interests at so many points that I believe it provides a suitable opportunity for the discussion of national affairs as would be provided under possibly no other circumstances. While, Sir, it gives occasion for constructive criticism, and also perhaps criticism of the opposite kind, I may say that I do not propose to approach the questions which I shall briefly discuss from the point of view of party politics at all. I believe that to-day the people of this country are not particularly concerned with party politics. They are interested in the war. They are interested in the heavy financial responsibilities that they have to bear, and in all those things which result from the conduct of the war.

The national interests are to-day already so delicately balanced that it would be nothing short of criminal on the part of the members of this House to attempt to make this the occasion for the making of party capital or for the securing of any purely party advantage. We have arrived at the most critical stage of the war. Our financial responsibilities are extremely heavy, and the harmony which ought to exist, but which, unfortunately, does not exist amongst the members of the various races which go to make up this Dominion, deserves, to my mind, a different treatment

from that which was accorded to it yesterday on the occasion of the speech delivered by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken).

It is true that nearly all of us on this side of the House differed and still differ from hon. gentlemen opposite on the question of conscription. It is not my intention or desire to re-thrash old straw. We were and are honestly opposed to conscription, and I believe we are right. I believe further that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) showed the only statesmanlike course we should have pursued in that matter. Now the Act has been tried out, and since we have heard hon. members of the Government admitting it has been a failure and have amended the Act within the last two weeks, I think I am absolutely correct in saying the leader of the Opposition will not be required to await the verdict of history, but that he is vindicated already in the opinion of the majority of the people of this Dominion. While we cannot support the Government in all its measures—I think every member on this side should realize and does realize he has nevertheless a responsibility to his constituents, and that it is his duty to support whatever legislation may be brought down by the Union Government which is deserving of support. It is no less the duty of hon. members on this side of the House to offer suggestions and criticism, constructive wherever possible, and to do all they can to advance the interests of the people of this Dominion.

Those of us who are new members have observed the proceedings of this House with a great deal of interest, and particularly with a view to observing how the Union Government will reconcile in a practical way its protestations of democracy with the actions of the executive branch of Parliament, so far as it relates to the members of the House at large. I admit, as a new member, that we have a great deal to learn but after all the new members come here with certain very well defined convictions. Among these, first of all, is the duty we owe to our constituents; we must not forget that we should represent their views. Secondly, we have the conviction, just as strong, that the Cabinet owes a direct responsibility to and derives its powers from the members of this House, and through them, from the people of this country. Believing that, I have observed, if not with surprise, at least with considerable disquiet, the undoubted tendency of the Government to arrogate to themselves powers that I believe should never be surrendered by the members of the House of Commons. We have to-day, as has been stated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, Government by Order in Council. I do not profess to have any great knowledge of constitutional history or practice, but I have always had the impression that the Cabinet of a democratic country was supposed to employ itself more in the way of administration, and that the legislative function belonged to the House of Commons, directly representing the people. I believe I am right when I say that to-day, to a grave degree, the Cabinet has usurped the legislative functions which ought to rest entirely with the House of Commons. While I should like to enlarge on that point, time does not permit, and I will pass on to the Budget itself.

It had been my intention if the Acting Minister of Finance were here, to congratulate him on the very clear and comprehensive address he made in presenting the Budget. But after hearing the speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) I hesitate to do so, because he stated that the speech of the Acting Minister of Finance was really the speech of the Minister (Sir Thomas White). If that be true, I fear it will be a matter of considerable grief to the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) who told the House that it was the best Budget speech he had ever heard. If the speech was really the brain-child of the Minister of Finance, it would be " the most unkindest cut of all " for the hon. member for Victoria thus to compliment that best beloved friend of his, Sir Thomas White. However that may be, I am inclined to give credit to whom it is apparently due. The Acting Minister of Finance has the honour of pre enting what I think is the largest Budget ever presented in the Dominion of Canada. It is a billion dollar Budget. Four years ago, a Budget of this size would have been thought not only absolutely impossible, but entirely ruinous to the Dominion. To-day we are spending millions where formerly we were spending perhaps thousands, and conditions are such that we must go on. But I trust that in raising the money that is required we, the representatives of the people of Canada, will not ignore entirely the principle of financial conservation. To-day Canada is prosperous, and she is prosperous because we are living on borrowed money, and because of the abnormal conditions resulting from the war. But the reckoning will come, and with that in mind I am sure it will not be considered unpatriotic to be practical, or

disloyal to count, in some measure at least, the cost. If ever a Government and if ever a Parliament had a tremendous responsibility, it is this Government and this Parliament. Economy must be the order of the day, and the members of this Parliament are justified in asking the Government itself to set an example. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) the other day showed that even in the Finance Department there is room for improvement, and in his own humorous yet practical way he told how the Minister of Finance had squandered public money on "movies" in connection with the last Victory Loan. But after all, if we could tempt some other members of the Government to go into the "movies" and could be guaranteed the same results that accrued in the case of the Minister of Finance, who is now missing from the Government benches, it might not be altogether an unmixed evil. If, for example, we could have the hon. Minister of Labour pictured in the act of seizing those bloated capitalists, the three cobblers of Chatham, and with all the strength that animates the protector of the people shaking their ill-gotten wealth from the pockets of these three plutocrats, would it not be a tremendous object lesson for our Flavelles and others of that ilk, and show that this Government means business and is not to be trifled with?

The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), in his excellent speech the other evening, made an estimate of what he thought should be a sufficient annual expenditure in the years to come after the war. He summed it up as follows:

Expenditure on revenue account	$100,000,000
Pensions	15,000,000
Interest on debt	60,000,000
Sinking fund	15,000,000
Deficit on railways	10,000,000
Total	$200,000,000

While I have great respect for the opinion of the hon. member for Brome, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not quite as much of an optimist as he appears to be. The expenditure on revenue account for the transaction of the ordinary affairs of this country was in the past year $120,000,000. I do not believe there has been a time in the history of Canada when the expenditures were ever reduced. They have been consistently increasing, and if I placed that account at $125,000,000 instead of $100,000,000, I believe it would be more nearly correct. A pension fund of $15,000,000, I believe, is entirely inadequate in the light of experience of other nations and I am of the opinion that it will be more nearly $50,000,000 a few years after the war ends. If we send over half a million of men to France, that amount averages only $100 per man. Interest on indebtedness he places at $60,000,000. Our indebtedness at the present time is about $1,300,000,000. It is not probable that the war will close before the lapse of at least one year. The expenditures in connection with the bringing home of the men will continue for a considerable time after that, and I think that I would not be overestimating if I stated that at the conclusion of the war it is altogether likely that our indebtedness will be at least two billion dollars. As we are borrowing money now at the rate of five and one-half to six per cent per annum, and as the last loan of $100,000,000 placed in the United States costs this country at the rate of nearly eight per cent, it seems to me that we must count on an interest charge of something like at least $100,000,000 after the war closes. The two other items, a sinking fund of $15,000,000, which would wipe out the capital expenditure in something over one hundred years, and the deficit on railways, I allow to stand. If then we take the figures as I have given them, and I believe there are good reasons for so doing, we must look forward to expenditures at the rate of $300,000,000 per annum.

There is one item here in regard to which I would like to make a suggestion, and that is the item of pensions. We have before us the example of the United States following the Civil War, sixty years ago. We know that the amount of the pensions in that country continued to increase for some fifty years after the conclusion of the war, and it is only a few years since they began to diminish. They constituted a heavy drain upon the resources of the United States, a much richer country than Canada. They have in that country at this time a new scheme which combines the advantage of a pension with that of the insurance of their men. It is worked out, I understand, in something of this fashion: If a young man aged twenty or twenty-one desires to insure for the sum of, say, $10,000, he can do it at very small cost—something like $6 or $7 per month. The Government itself conducts the insurance scheme and itself carries the additional risk which is imposed as the result of a man engaging in hazardous military service. After the war, the young man, if he desires to do so, can keep up the insurance by continuing the payment of the premiums. That scheme is intended to replace

the old pension scheme formerly in force in the United States. It seems to me that it might very well be looked into, if it has not already been done, on the part of the Government.

To-day in Canada the matter of insurance of the men is left almost entirely in the hands of municipalities with results that are unfair and inequitable. In some towns and cities the men are insured for $500 or $1,000 as the case may be. In some other towns they are not insured. The point is that it is being left practically entirely to private or municipal initiative to insure the lives of the soldiers. Since conscription has been adopted, we find that in many instances municipalities can no longer carry the burden. I contend that, when the state takes men by compulsion to fight its battles overseas, it becomes the duty of that state not to place the responsibility of the insurance of the men on municipalities, but to assume that as a national obligation. The same holds good of the Patriotic Fund.

Where shall the Government obtain money to take care of these heavy expenditures? We have two great principles of taxation. One, which is generally applied in the municipal scheme of taxation, is based on the service rendered by the taxing power. It works fairly well in municipal government, but is not adapted to national administration. The other idea is based on the ability to pay, and in the final analysis the Government of Canada, I believe, will find it necessary to fall back on the principle of collecting its taxes from, and imposing its levies upon those who have the ability to pay. They must go and find the money where it is to be found. That brings me for a moment to the income tax. I am quite in accord with what the Acting Minister of Finance has done, in so far as the principle of the income tax is concerned, but I agree with almost every member who has already spoken, that he has not gone far enough. If a man enjoys an income of $10,000, there is no real sacrifice involved in making that man give to the State practically all that he receives above that figure. That is not unfair, because, after all, I contend that a man whose income is in excess of that, makes it because he is living in a country which gives him the opportunity of making that income, and in that case he may well give back to the country that which he has received from it.

I would not tax industry, or I would not tax it very heavily, because industry at the present time has a great deal to contend with. Our manufacturing industries, with the shortage of labour that exists, together with the high costs they have to meet, already find the burden a very heavy one to carry, and I, for one, would regret if the Government were to place too heavy a strain upon those industries. Let us leave them in such a condition that at the end of the war they will have sufficient resources to continue in the way to which they have been accustomed, because, after all, the future prosperity of Canada and her power to recuperate from the effects of the war will depend on the manufacturing industries and the farming industry as well.

There is one other point, Mr. Speaker, in that connection I would wish to make, and it is a criticism of at least one form of taxation which has been placed in the Budget; that is the tax that falls upon the poor man. I know it is the fashion to advocate the cause of the poor man, but I am not making the criticism with that object in view. One hon. gentleman stated yesterday that he approved of the taxes on tea, tobacco and matches, because the poor man would be made to feel that taxation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the poor man already feels abundantly the burden imposed by this war—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. EULER:—and it is quite unnecessary to place any further burdens upon him to make him realize that to the full. We may speak as we like of the high wages that are earned by the workingmen in these days, but I want to say that the working people with their big families, and it is usually the workingman who has the big family, already have all that they humanly can do to make ends meet. I believe it was hardly worthy of the Government to place the taxes which they have placed upon tea, and the little luxuries that the workingmen have in the form of tobacco and matches. I would like to see those taxes cut off altogether when the Bill is considered in Committee, and provide for the raising of money from other sources which can very well afford to pay.

I am quite in accord with that provision of the Government's proposals which grants an exemption of $200 for every child under the age of sixteen. I thought that when the Acting Minister of Finance made that announcement he would receive most hearty commendation from my friends on this side of the House

from the province of Quebec, where, we are told, the families are very large. In that connection I can remember a certain occasion, about a year and a half ago, in the city of Hamilton, when I had the honour and the pleasure of attending a meeting in connection with the Bonne Entente movement, which, by the way, has ended so suddenly and so unfortunately.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Godfrey's Tory speeches killed the Bonne Entente.

Mr. EULER: At that meeting I can remember the mayor of one of the cities of Quebec rather proudly acknowledged that he was the father of a family of twenty-five.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. EULER: I wish to ask the Acting Minister of Finance whether, in cases such as this, where the family is so large that the exemption of $200 per member of that family will wipe out the excess of income upon which that man might otherwise have to pay, the minister would not consent a bonus to those people.

I realize that I am, perhaps, trespassing on the arrangement made to confine the length of speeches to some twenty or thirty minutes, and therefore I shall endeavour to bring my remarks to a close very soon. There are just one or two further observations I would like to make.

With regard to the question of production, the ground has been very well covered, I think, and yet I believe the Government do not realize the gravity of the situation which they have created. Those of us who have been among our constituents during the last two weeks, have a very much more accurate conception of the feeling of discouragement and consternation, and the lack of confidence that to-day exists among the farmers of the province of Ontario. And when I read a few lines from a cablegram sent on April 13 to the Canada Food Board it seems almost the sheerest irony in view of the nature of legislation that has been placed upon the statute book in the form of amendments to the Military Service Act:

"In these stern days it is inspiring to learn that Canada is tackling the food problem with redoubled energy.

"We cannot achieve victory without food. There never was a time when it was more needed. The Canadian farmer and the Canadian farmhand now have the opportunity to make an effective reply to the enemy's present onslaughts by bending their undivided energies to the increased production of those food supplies for which we depend to such vital extent upon your great Dominion."

That cablegram was sent by Lord Rhondda, Food Controller of Great Britain. The member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) the other day made reference to what he called a "vicious circle." I believe that the legislation that the Government have passed in conscripting the farmer will result in another vicious circle: No men on the farms, no food, and ultimately, if there be no food, there will be no men.

I was going to comment, Mr. Speaker, on another phase of the subject, which has already been touched upon, and with which I will deal very briefly. I was somewhat surprised yesterday when the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) gloried in the fact that the pledge given to the farmers had been violated. I hope, Sir, I am no Pharisee, but it is difficult for me—as I am sure it is for many other members of the House, some of whom sit on the other side, if they speak their convictions—to understand the mental attitude that permits any man, or any responsible body of men, to violate a solemn promise given to the farmers of this country. As the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) stated the other day in the House, a pledge is a pledge. In my opinion a pledge can be obviated only by the consent of those to whom it was given. The Government urge military necessities as the ground for their action. Those military necessities may be very great, but that was the doctrine that was invoked in another case, to which I need not refer, at the beginning of the war, and which doctrine meets with the condemnation of the whole civilized world.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. EULER: I trust, Sir, that we have not adopted the vicious doctrine that "the end justifies the means."

I have not noticed in the speech of the Acting Minister of Finance any reference to the claims of the letter carriers of Canada. I do not know what the intentions of the Government are with respect to this deserving class of Government employees, but I read in the press a few days ago that it was proposed to give them some recognition in the form of increased remuneration.

I believe the Government would be justified in giving to these men a very substantial increase in pay. Their work is difficult and responsible, and they have not been paid in accordance with their needs. While I say that, I would also make a plea on behalf of the country postmasters, and the

men who are in the service of the Government driving vehicles on the rural routes, whose case, I believe, is just as good as that of the letter-carriers. While we should exercise economy, the people should not forget that the labourer is worthy of his hire.

One thing more, Mr. Speaker, and I am through. We are told that it is desirable that this House should adjourn to give opportunity for the Prime Minister, the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), and, I believe, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), to proceed overseas to confer with the representatives of the Imperial Government and of the other Dominions. While I do not begrudge the trip, to the President of the Council,—and I would like to remind the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) that this time the President of the Council will go at the expense of the Government—and while I believe that the Minister of the Interior is well worthy of any consideration, because we have been told, and I believe it is true, that during the last session at least he was the hardest worked member of the Government, it seems to me that if the consultation pertains to the carrying on of the war the Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) and the Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne) should rather be members of that delegation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. EULER: Some one near me mentions also the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) and I might say that that is a good suggestion. We have an Overseas Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) and it would be quite in the interests of the country if the two Ministers of Militia were able to get together once in a while to compare notes. The Minister of the Naval Service in presenting his estimates, I can say without flattery, earned the approbation of members on this side of the House. He handled his work and his figures not only courteously but in the most businesslike way, and with great ability. His department has in charge a work of great consequence to the people of Canada, the construction of ships, which, in itself, is a large factor in connection with the war. It seems to me that these two ministers, in any conference pertaining to the war, might very well accompany the Prime Minister across the sea.

Now, Sir, a last word. We know there are members on the other side of the House who are not altogether in accord with some of the actions of the Government. We know that is the case in connection with the exemption of the farmers, we know that they desire free implements, and they are setting that desire aside for the time being in the interest, as they say, of the winning of the war. We know that they do not altogether agree with the recent increase in freight rates. But we have the disappointing experience, and the disappointing spectacle of having the protests on the part of these gentlemen made, not in the House where such protests count, but in the corridors of this House and in the Committee on Agriculture. Let me say that so far as I am concerned, and with all due deference to my right hon. leader I propose to exercise a very considerable degree of independence. We have been told that the Union Government created the opportunity for the exercise of a measure of independence by members on that side such as never existed before. For my part, so far I have failed to see it in a practical way, or in any way that counts. I would say to these gentlemen—and I do not know that it is quite fitting that any advice of this kind should come from a humble back-bencher, a man new to this House—that it is their duty to represent their constituents, that we should all realize that, after all, the Cabinet, the Government, the executive power, should be the servant, not the master, of this Parliament; and that these members will find if they do follow their convictions that they will maintain not only their own self respect but they will not in any way prejudice the winning of the war.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I listened very attentively on Tuesday of last week to the most interesting address of the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) also to the speeches made by the various members in the course of this debate. It is not my intention to pick holes in the Budget or to make a long speech at this stage but simply to draw attention to certain sides of the question which might be of some interest.

Last year, when the healthy, but now convalescent, Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) introduced the income tax measure an article appeared in a newspaper in Montreal on July 31, 1917, of which the following is a translation:

> Nobody will pretend that the father of eight or ten young children can easily take away from a salary or income of three or four thousand dollars, the same amount that the head of the

traditional American or Ontarian family, composed of Monsieur, Madame and Toutou the favourite dog, will be able to do with the same salary.

From the moment we admit the principle of exemption in ratio of family responsibility it should be applied with method and economy.

It would be much better to reduce by half the initial margin of exemption, and fix the first degree of taxation at $2,000 and exempt each individual in the ratio of the number of persons he has in charge. A married man would pay a tax if his income is $2,000, he would pay on $2,250 if he has a child, on $2,500 if he has two, and so on. If the objection is that it is too complicated I answer that it is of the nature of the income tax There will be fewer false reports from the honest fathers of large families than from the wealthy business men and their wives who have already conspired to defraud the divine and human laws in holding down the number of their children.

That article appeared in Le Devoir, and its author is Henri Bourassa. When the Acting Minister of Finance introduced this year an amendment to the income tax, not only as suggested by that article, but copied from it, I was at sea to understand why a certain organization well known to everybody in this House, and sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, did not rise as a body to protest vigorously against adopting even suggestions from the enemy. I thought perhaps the old alliance of the Conservatives and the Nationalists was not dead yet. Anyway, the adoption by the Government of such a suggestion shows that there is a little bit of good even in a bad man. I congratulate the Acting Minister of Finance on the amendment; it is tardy justice, but it is justice. But I do not believe that the amendment goes far enough. If we admit the principle that taxation should be imposed in proportion to the number of a man's dependents, why not extend the principle to bachelors and widowers with dependents? The married couple without children are not asked to pay any tax if their income does not reach $2,000 a year, while the bachelor with parents and relatives to support must pay a tax if his income is only $1,000. I express my earnest hope that when the House goes into committee on the proposals of the Acting Finance Minister, the Government will find a way to make the same provision respecting income tax on bachelors with dependents as they have made with respect to married men.

With regard to the exemption from income tax of amounts subscribed to patriotic funds, I may point out that there are other charities besides the Red Cross Fund and the Patriotic Fund which, if not as spectacular as these, are as deserving and are giving assistance to the poor and destitute, modestly but effectively, without any display or advertisement. I do not see why contributions to such charities should not be exempted from taxation as are contributions to the Red Cross and Patriotic Funds.

The Acting Minister of Finance referred to the last Victory Loan. Although I have not had much parliamentary experience, I may venture to give a little advice to the minister with regard to the next loan campaign and to warn him that the unfair and outrageous use of the Victory Loan campaign for the success of the Union Government has probably put in jeopardy the success of other loans in the province of Quebec. While the leader of the Opposition and the Premier of Quebec joined in stirring appeals to their compatriots to subscribe to the loan, and while their appeals were used to advertise the campaign in Quebec, in every English-speaking province—even in English papers in Montreal—the success of the loan was heralded and played to the limit, unscrupulously, and unfairly, to foster the interests of the Unionist campaign. Let me first read to you the stirring appeal of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Sir Lomer Gouin, published in the French papers; I shall give my own translation. In La Presse of November 20 there were displayed pictures of the leader of the Opposition and of Sir Lomer Gouin. I quote the following:

Let us follow the advice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Lomer Gouin for the good of the province and the whole of Canada.

Then followed this letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Sir Thomas White:

Dear Sir Thomas White:

I am happy to join my voice to yours to recommend to the people of Canada the loan you are placing on the market. You are appealing not only to the business sense, but to the patriotism of the country, and I hope the answer will be spontaneous, universal and enthusiastic, because from all points of view it is preferable that we should borrow at home instead of in a foreign market. I particularly approve of your intention to appeal to this class of the public who does not generally place money in the public treasury. Everyone can bring their contributions, everyone, even the humblest. Their contribution will find their place on the altar of a grateful country.

In his speech on November 12, Sir Lomer Gouin said that the Government had the right to expect more than $150,000,000. He continued:

England has spent more than $1,000,000,000 in Canada since the beginning of the war.

Every farmer, every manufacturer, every clerk, should subscribe their savings, and if they have none, tell them to economize and save in order to invest in this loan.

After using this appeal it seems to me that it would be only common decency and good manners not to use the Victory Loan as a political step-ladder. What happened? The Montreal Star did not wait until the last day before the election, but on December 4, shortly after the conclusion of the Victory Loan campaign, under the caption "Well Done Canada," published a cartoon showing a soldier with fixed bayonet addressing the Kaiser in the following words:

Put that in your pipe and smoke it—and on the 17th we will blast another of your hopes and give a Union victory to smoke with it.

On the same day an editorial appeared in the Star, from which I quote the following:

The Canadian people themselves have shown the measure of their concern in the war. Asked for a war loan of $150,000,000, they have given $401,530,100. Canada has begun to march to the relief of the heroic lads in France. The Victory Loan result is a prelude to the certain election of Union Government and the forwarding of new troops to help win the war.

These articles appeared not only in the papers of Montreal, where they could be contradicted; where we could go before the people and proclaim their truth or falsehood, but in Ontario as well. I quote from the Toronto Daily News of December 6:

If Laurier and Bourassa were returned to power French Canada would have the spending of $400,000,000 contributed by English-speaking Canada. Is French Canada, which contributed 5 per cent of the Victory Loan to spend the 95 per cent subscribed by English-speaking Canadiens? Do the English-speaking Canadians who contributed 95 per cent of the Victory Loan wish the $415,000,000 to be spent by Laurier, Bourassa and their corrupt associates? Do English-speaking Canadians who have just raised $400,000,000 for war purposes wish that vast sum to be spent by the corruptionists of Quebec for the enrichment of a province which has done little in the war? Are 2,200,000 French Canadians to spend the $400,000,000 subscribed by 5,000,000 English-speaking Canadians?

And this is not all. On December 15, 1917, another Ontario paper said this:

Six hundred thousand Canadians have subscribed $401,000,000 for the further prosecution of the war to victory.

The spending of this vast sum of money will pass into the hands of a man almost 80 years of age, if Union Government is defeated.

This aged man is under the thumb of Quebec. He has turned against Canada's solemn pledges to the influences of the French Canadian province.

The control and direction of this four hundred million dollars will really, therefore, pass into the hands of the anti-British Lemieux-Bourassa-Lavergne group.

Quebec has not contributed to this fund. She has given neither men nor money in any proportion. On the contrary she has even violently attacked soldiers and members of the war Government.

A vote against a Union Government candidate is hence a vote to take Canada out of the war and to give nearly half a billion dollars to the French-Canadian separatists with which to thoroughly establish a French Canadian regime at Ottawa.

I could take up all the morning citing articles of that kind—slanderous and insidious falsehoods and ramblings. I submit most seriously to the Acting Minister of Finance that if he does not desire to make a complete failure of the next Victory Loan campaign in the province of Quebec he will have to devise some means of muzzling his dogs. How could you expect the province to subscribe largely to such a loan when its success was used for political purposes?

This Budget calls for a larger amount of money than has been required in any previous year of our history—more than we ever dreamed of. The people will cheerfully impose upon themselves new sacrifices for the triumph of civilization, but under certain conditions: First, that the Government wage a merciless war on food profiteers; second, that the means of producing more food be not taken from the people. Our motto should be: Get rid of the food profiteers and encourage the food producers. It is not my intention to discuss the dismissal of Mr. W. F. O'Connor; I hope that the Government will set apart a day this session when we may bring out exactly what took place on the occasion of that dismissal. The big interests and the profiteers have been after this faithful and fearless servant of the public for a long time; they were bound to get him. For over two years Commissioner O'Connor had done most effective work—a war work—in exposing the outrageous practices of food spoilers. In this connection an Ontario newspaper said :

When Mr. O'Connor took charge of the office the profiteers were up to the arm-pits and over. They were wallowing in their work as a hog wallows in his wash. But to compare these men with the pig is to inflict an injustice on the pig, who would really serve in the capacity of a benefactor of mankind if the people who control its destiny did not want to make so much out of the mere handling of its carcass.

Mr. O'Connor had done good work. He had exposed the great losses sustained by the unsuspecting people who were led to

believe that the prices of these commodities were rising because of their great scarcity. He was the Nemesis of the profiteer. But everybody knows that he was practically forced to resign. Charge after charge followed in his reports, but despite all this he had to resign; the situation made it impossible for him to carry on his work successfully. Who possesses the power to minimize the effective work of the food investigator? This is a proper question to ask and I hope the Government will answer it. But Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Mr. O'Connor did not come to me as an extraordinary shock, because at the beginning of the session, when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) brought down his estimates he gave the House a foretaste of his policy. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) was questioning the Minister of Labour about the prehistoric chickens of Winnipeg, and the minister replied—(page 212 of Unrevised Hansard):

> As soon as I heard of the chickens that had spoiled in cold storage in Winnipeg, I wired the manager of that concern, and he referred my wire to the head office in Toronto, who wrote me at once concerning the matter. A few days later I got an explanation from the manager of the concern in Winnipeg, which satisfied me there was no intention of wrongdoing.

I was told before I came to this House that I should expect some surprises from the Minister of Labour—and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I got a surprise at the start.

Why, the people of this country are buckling their belts tighter and tighter every day. While the Government is asking the people to economize and conserve food for the Allies, profiteers and food hoarders like the William Davies Company when caught in the act—and not their first offence—are allowed to go scot-free by simply writing a letter that tickles the ear of the Minister of Labour. I had always thought that we, the representatives of the people, had something to say in these matters, and may I add these people would not have got off so easily if their explanation had reached this House instead of the well-seasoned and trained ear of the Minister of Labour. We might have been more suspicious of this wonderful hypnotic letter which so easily convinced the minister.

I said that the second condition required by the people of this country to accept cheerfully the pecuniary sacrifices involved in the Budget, and a condition essential to winning the war and avoiding famine, is the maximum production of food. Everyone admits that, so I will not take the time of the House in demonstrating it. I might, however, remark that when we on this side of the House were urging this fact during the last election we were accused of disloyalty and called traitors. The great economists of the world—David F. Houston, secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, Prof. Arthur Richmond Marsh, Director of the Economic World, Mr. Boret, president of the French Commission of Agriculture, Sir George Paish, Mr. Prothero, Daniel Bellet, Georges Blondel, Victor Cambon, Edward Lyall Fox, Austin Harrison—all agree that famine is at our door. We are now facing a crisis, and it is imperative that production be increased. Remember, Mr. Speaker, the plough will be the gun that will fire the last shot in this war. Appeals for greater production have frequently been made by the Canada Food Board in their bulletins. That appeal is made on practically every page of the Bulletin of February 23, 1918. I am glad to say that the province from which I come is doing wonderful work in that respect. All authorities in the province are bending their energies to that end. The Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec, Sir Horace Archambault, appealed to the people of the province through the newspapers. Archbishop Bruchesi has also made an appeal to the people of Quebec, and if I were not afraid of scandalizing some of my friends opposite I would read what he said. However, I do not see present the hon. gentleman who would be scandalized, so I will read his letter, which was read in every church of the province of Quebec on Ash Wednesday:

> At the present time, other voices than her's (the Church's) imperious in their demand for the practice of abstinence and economy, have been heard. These are the voices of governments dismayed by the disastrous consequences of the war, and who foresee perhaps the awful spectre of a universal famine.
>
> Appeals are becoming more urgent day by day. We must, it is said, come to the aid of our soldiers by sending to them the food which they ask for. The most urgent question of the day is the question of assistance. We must look forward to the eventualities of the future; let us therefore economize; let superfluity be banished from our tables; deprive ourselves every day of some bread and some meat. In certain quarters leagues are formed. Citizens are asked with insistence to sign cards pledging themselves to conform to these measures called economical, but which are, after all, real measures for the practice of penance.
>
> Restaurants and hotels must abide by laws of privation, the infraction of which entails severe fines. These rigorous rules, these pressing recommendations, are inspired by sympa-

thy towards our brothers, by public interest and the fear of evils ever menacing us.

What is solicited or prescribed by the stress of circumstances and for merely human motives, although praiseworthy and legitimate in themselves, let us continue to do for the supernatural motives recorded in the Gospel, and recalled to our mind by the Church.

This doctrine is for all times; it should especially be understood and accepted during days of suffering and mourning such as those we are now traversing. How can we give ourselves up to pleasure, how can we speak of banquets and worldly feasts, when we think of the thousands of men, women and children who lament and weep, without food or shelter, submitted to all the sadness of a cruel exile; and above all, when we think of those poor soldiers agonizing in the hospitals or dying on the field of battle.

I think every one in this House will say that that is the kind of appeal that should be made to our people. I think it was a splendid effort on the part of the head of the church in Montreal. But it is not only the ecclesiastical authorities in the province of Quebec that have made these appeals. Mr. J. A. Grenier, Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the province of Quebec, made the following special appeal:

Our first step was to organize an educational campaign. For lecture purposes the Province was divided into twenty-five districts. In each of these districts we placed two lecturers, one an experienced agricultural attached to the Provincial Department of Agriculture and the other a practical farmer. These men were made responsible for visiting every parish in their respective districts, and at the present time nine-tenths of the parishes, both French and English, have been covered in this way. The staff of Macdonald College have helped in our campaign in certain constituencies and have given much information to the agronomists of these districts.

We are supplementing this series of lectures by publicity in the Journal d'Agriculture and other newspapers, and also by circulars addressed to the parish priests, mayors, postmasters, bank managers, railway station agents, and others. The first circular letter addressed to the parish priests was read in the churches. The letter to the mayors is being sent out and the others will be issued from month to month in order to maintain the interest of the public.

Up to the present time we have purchased 540 choice sows, which will be distributed in the spring. We are making arrangements with the abattoirs for the purchase of an additional number. The Department has bought several car-loads of shorts which will be sold to the farmers. We are also planning to buy corn as soon as supplies are available.

We are awaiting the decision of the banks upon the question of exhibition of hogs. At these exhibitions entries will be received from young people, the object being to organize our own hog contests. We are counting upon an increase of 20 per cent in the number of hogs this year over normal production if the province can obtain a sufficient quantity of feed.

The Federal Department of Agriculture has assured us that the province of Quebec will receive the necessary seed wheat to cultivate 700,000 acres and to produce 12,000,000 bushels of wheat, which would be enough to provide for the consumption in this province. As this wheat is sold only in car-load lots, we have made arrangements with the more important co-operative societies to provide seed wheat in small quantities in localities where the farmers are not able to buy a whole car load. The Agronomists and Agricultural Societies, and agricultural circles are taking orders at the present time. We have good hopes of being able to treble our normal production of wheat this year.

We have taken the necesary steps to ensure to the farmers seed peas and beans to meet all their requirements. We are confident that the production of these two products will be double the normal crops.

Here is a short article in the Canada Food Bulletin reporting the pledge card campaign in Quebec:

Quebec Pledge Campaign.

Splendid meetings have been held and card canvass is going well.

The pledge card campaign in Quebec is going well. Splendid meetings have been held under the auspices of Chief Justice Lemieux, Hon. Mr. Caron, Minister of Agriculture, and Hon. Mr. Chapais, a member of the Legislative Council. The first housewife in Quebec to sign the card was the Mayoress, Mrs. Lavigueur, and the second was the President of the Housewives' League, Mrs. Tanguay.

We are not confining ourselves to appeals or preaching, but we are also getting results. Let me compare the agricultural production in Quebec in 1916 with that of 1917. The figures are:

	1916.	1917.
Sheep	497,711	849,148
Pigs	531,303	712,087
Cows	639,805	911,023
Other cattle	535,693	958,010
	Bushels.	Bushels.
Wheat	960,000	3,883,600
Oats	24,411,000	32,466,200
Barley	1,456,000	3,063,600
Peas	302,000	797,500
Beans	78,000	827,400
Buckwheat	1,919,000	2,699,000
Potatoes	14,672,000	18,158,000
Turnips	2,650,000	15,759,000

I take these figures from the Journal of Agriculture of the province of Quebec dated February 15, 1918. But when we are asked to produce food and when we are bending our efforts towards that end, we are stunned by the announcement of an Order in Council passed by this Government calling off the exemptions from military service of men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two inclusive who are engaged in agricultural production. This was followed by voting down an amendment proposed in this House exempting farmers. This amendment was voted down on the 19th of this month, and the Canadian Food Bulletin of the month of March, issued by authority of the Government, stated that

we were short 118,500 farmers. The publication in question, at page 5 of its issue of 7th of March, 1918, states that the shortage of farm hands in Alberta was 13,000, in Saskatchewan 25,000, in Manitoba 17,000, in Ontario 35,000, in Quebec many thousands, in New Brunswick 2,000, in Prince Edward Island 500, and in Nova Scotia 2,500. Assuming a comparative proportion for the province of Quebec I might put the shortage there at 20,000, which makes a total shortage, as stated, of 118,500. What will be the result of this policy? It will mean that we will miss our best opportunity to help the Allies. It will mean that if the Allies lose the war on account of the food shortage, the Government, whose short-sighted policy has always been to render not the most effective but the most spectacular aid, will be partly responsible.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: (Resuming). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was trying to impress upon hon. gentlemen the absurd and illogical reasoning of the Government in refusing to exempt farmers from military service, while at the same time declaring in an official publication, the Canadian Food Bulletin, that there was a shortage of 118,500 farm hands this spring. By this short-sighted policy we are missing the opportunity to render effective aid to the Allies and are running along the road to suicide at a tremendous pace. You may open the newspapers every day, Mr. Speaker, and find advertisements by farmers offering to sell their land because they cannot get help. Delegations from every province, except perhaps Quebec, are pouring into this House protesting against the folly of such an enactment. Meetings of protestation are being held everywhere from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Why is the province of Quebec not protesting so strongly, why are there practically no delegations from that province? The reason is very simple. The people of ny province were prepared long ago for the reversal of the promises of this Government. When the candidates of the Union Government in my province told the farmers that they would be exempted the electors did not believe them, and they are not surprised at what has happened now. But the electors of the other provinces, whose votes the Government obtained under false pretenses, are beginning to realize the hollow

ness of its promises; they know how the Government got their vote. On December 3 last, fifteen days before the election, an Order in Council was passed exempting farmers, and on the following day a message from the Government appeared in the press announcing that even those farmers who had already been drafted could apply to the Minister of Militia and be returned to their farms. On December 7 a case was submitted to the Central Appeal judge, that of Mr. Rowntree, and the judgment was that a person who is habitually and effectively engaged in labour essential to the production of food should not be conscripted. Why, there was a paper published in Montreal, which lived only during the campaign, called Le Vrai Patriot—the True Patriot—in which appears an article which I have translated as follows:

The Central Appeal Judge has rendered a decision in favour of the exemption of farmers' sons, which the Liberal press does not acknowledge. In order to maintain the Military effort of the allies, it is essential that Canada should not lessen its agricultural production.

Farm hands are not superabundant in the country, they are rather insufficient.

Here are two important principles enunciated by Judge Duff, who constitutes the central appeal tribunal under the military law, on an appeal from the judgment of an exemption tribunal, which had refused an exemption asked by a farmer. The exemption of the farmer was immediately granted.

The decision in this test case will bring happiness to all the farmers of Canada.

A short-lived happiness, Mr. Speaker, after the last announcement.

It will reassure them not only for the present, but for the future.

A future which ended last week or two weeks ago.

Their status has been fixed on a definite unequivocal question. By this decision the farm hands will not be taken away from their work, no matter how hard pressed, we may be by our participation in the war.

The national interests and the Allies interests are served by the farmers continuing to work on the land. Although the law theoretically does not exempt them from military service, it does exempt them practically.

Here is assuredly something that will disappoint the poor Liberals, who were so happy in trying to convince the farmers that they would not escape military service. This judgment of Judge Duff will fall on them with much more vigour than a sunstroke. Any way, these good Liberals never thought for one moment that the farmers would come under the law. They knew that the intention of the government was to exempt all farmers and all farm hands.

This article is from a paper published by the Unionist organization in Montreal. I find on the third page portraits of the hon. Mr. Sevigny, the hon. Mr. Blondin, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), the

ex-vice-president of this House, Mr. Rainville, all good supporters of the Unionist party, as well as portraits of all the candidates endorsed by the Union Government in the province of Quebec. And talking about the ex-vice-president of this House, here is a letter which was sent to every farmer in my constituency by Mr. J. H. Rainville, my opponent in the last election, I will translate.

Dear Sir,

I am pleased to inform you that the regulations of the military law exempt the bona fide farmers—

It will be observed that he went further than the election paper to which I have referred, and further than the Order in Council.

—exempt the bona fide farmers, their families and industrials. I have at last succeeded in winning this point, and it is only justice. You can, then, send without any fear your sons to the tribunals. Special instructions have been given to that effect.

I hope that the farmers will do all they can to ensure greater production of all that is necessary to feed the population.

With the assurance of my best wishes, believe me,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) J. H. Rainville.

But that is not all. In order to get the vote of the farmers, which was slipping away at that time, the whole of the Unionist Press, in elaborate articles, insisted that the Military Service Act did not threaten them; that they would remain on their farms—and similar arguments were addressed to those engaged in national industries. In its issue of August 30, the Montreal Star, referring to the Military Service Act, said:

It is merely a scheme for raising a definite number of new recruits—one hundred thousand. This is less than one-fourth as many as we have raised already. It proposes to raise these recruits among the young men in the community who have no domestic responsiblities and who are not usefully employed in war-winning work. It will take only young men who should have gone long ago or who have not before reached military age.

It is, in short, a scheme of selective recruiting.

If the recruiting officers had continued to get volunteers in sufficient numbers, this Act probably would not have been proposed. But the country would have suffered. Voluntary recruiting—as we now know in Canada and as they learned even more bitterly in Britain—is a wasteful and mischievous way to get men. The working men volunteer very often. That is, a man who is needed for some essential war-work at home offers to go; and he is taken. In Britain, they were compelled to weed tens of thousands of these skilled workers out of the army in France and bring them back to the factory, the foundry and the farm. If these skilled workers had properly known their own value, they would have known that they had no business to volunteer. For them to volunteer was to desert. But they could not know. That is a matter for the expert organizers of war services. So these expert organizers got a law in Britain which enabled them to simply tap the right young man on the shoulder and say—"You go"—and shake a prohibitive finger at the wrong young man and say—"You stay."

Not only did the Star make these assertions on its editorial page, but papers generally from other provinces were full of similar messages. On December 4 the following article appeared in the Star:

The Military Service Act will be no hardship to Alberta farmers. A short time ago H. W. Wood, President of the United Farmers of Alberta, representing 150,000 farmers, issued an interview to the press stating that it was most unwise of the Government to rob the farms of the producers, for military service, and stop the production of food for the Allies. On hearing of Premier Borden's anouncement and on receipt of a letter from the military registrar, Mr. Wood has decided that the Military Service Act will not impose any hardships on the farmers of Alberta, pointing out that appeal can be made by all farmers against decisions of tribunals and arguing them to take action in accordance with the modified Government regulations to get exemptions.

On the same page, the Star says:

Ontario has 82 seats and Unionists are confident of carrying 70 of them. That there has been some unrest in the rural parts owing to the anomalies in the ruling of exemption tribunals is not questioned, but the steps taken by the Government a few days ago to ensure that a bona fide agriculturist will not be interfered with neutralize effectively any adverse tendency.

What were the papers of the other provinces saying? I read in the Toronto World of December 10 the following:

General Mewburn announces that all farmers coming within Class A called out for military service under the provisions of the Military Service Act who are actually employed on a farm in the production of foodstuffs for Canada and her Allies, and whose services are necessary in the work of such farm, will be exempted from military service. If such a farmer is drafted in the army General Mewburn feels that it will be his duty to relieve him from military service on the condition that he returns to the farm and continues to be so employed.

The Canadian Thresherman and Farmer, of Winnipeg, dealt with this subject under such heads as the following: "Vote for Union Government," "Agriculture, Canada's prime industry, must carry on, unchecked by the draft." "Farmers' sons needed on land." "Sir Robert Borden's guarantees." "General Mewburn's explicit statement in regard to the sons of farmers needed on the home farm." "Necessity of selective draft." This paper says:

Class A men will suffice, and will be placed where they can give most value to Canada and the cause, whether in the ranks, on the land, or in the factory.

No reasons have been brought forward for the changing of the law; the Government is simply going back on its word. Before the election I was against the Military Service Act; I conscientiously believed that we could give better aid to the Allies and to our own country by continuing the system of voluntary recruiting, by encouraging shipbuilding and by increasing food production. I am still against this law; I conscientiously believe that it is a failure, and, if it were possible to do so, by constitutional means, I would repeal it for the sake of harmony and unity. But I have always been a law-abiding citizen, and when this Act became law I held meetings in my constituency explaining the Act and urging my fellow-citizens to obey it and register. Other hon. members on this side of the House did the same thing. The result was that the province of Quebec had the highest percentage of registrations. Nevertheless, I must confess that the last Order in Council, abolishing exemptions for a certain class of men, is mere national suicide and will not help to win the war. It will reduce production and create, throughout this country, a feeling of unrest.

I must apologize for having taken up so much of the time of the House, but I felt it was my duty to-day to explain my opinions frankly, without prejudice, in accordance with the dictates of my conscience and to the best of my ability. I believe I am expressing the sentiments of hon. members on this side of the House when I state that, since the beginning of this session, we have felt there has been a distinct effort on both sides to bring harmony between the two great races comprising this Dominion. It is true, a few hon. members on your right, Sir, have to have their unavoidable attacks of nettle rash after a bad digestion. Some of them will never take a polish. Even for the sake of unity, they will not stop their ramblings; but, thank God, they are the minority, and the true Canadians on your right are just as sick as we are of their exaggerated expressions. Let me, in conclusion, read a short article, published in the Toronto Saturday Night of the 27th of April, 1918, regarding one of those hon. members who do not stop attacking the province of Quebec:

> The present session of the House of Commons cannot wind up any too soon to suit the average intelligent Canadian, and last week we noted with pleasure that thereafter Government business was to have the preference. This, it is to be hoped, will give the Administration more control over the debates of the House, and the public will be spared some of the imbecile and mischievous oratory which has marked the discussion of almost every question that has come before the Commons this session.
>
> Of all the speeches, perhaps the most mischievous was that of Mr. Clements, of Comax-Alberni, B.C., who went so far as to propose that 50,000 or 75,000 French Canadians be carried away from Quebec and forced to work in the forests of British Columbia. It is nothing short of damnable that such a proposal should be made on the floor of Parliament in times like these. Everywhere, the Prussian policy of forcibly conveying Belgians into the heart of Germany to do war work has been denounced; yet Mr. Clements has the coolness to propose that we adopt the same course toward a group of fellow Canadians. He added insult to injury by stating that this policy would make better citizens of its victims, which is a good deal like the German boast that it will make better citizens of the Belgians to place them under the yoke of German "kultur."

To this school of thinkers we shall say that on this side we are well able to tell them what we think of them, and I can assure you, Sir, that our opinion of them is a hundred times worse than their opinion of us. But we keep ourselves under control for the sake of harmony and unity. We understand in a practical and patriotic way that we are at war. To the others—and they are the majority—we are glad to say that, through their behaviour and their evident disgust of these intolerant and ill-natured attacks, we foresee the near return of the bonne entente, the harmony, union and prosperity which will make of this Canada of ours a better place to live in, a better place to thrive in and a better country to fight for.

Mr. J. E. O. GLADU (Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, the debate which has taken place in this House has so far, I think, produced the very desirable results called for by that article which my hon. friend (Mr. Archambault) has just quoted from the Toronto Saturday Night. It is true that, in the first part of this debate, very harsh expressions were hurled from one side of the House to the other. It seems now, Sir, that such attacks have practically ceased, and that the members of this House, representing the people of this country, have come to the conclusion that, after all, there is something more important than insulting French Canadians or English Canadians.

There is now, I think, a feeling that we must treat every question as Canadians, independently of creed and nationality. I was especially impressed in that way when

I heard yesterday afternoon and evening the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). I frankly admit that I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman could not be characterized other than as being a kind of fire-eater. Yesterday, he was exceptionally moderate, and I wish to congratulate him. No one would think that the hon. member for West Toronto is the same gentleman who, a few years ago, was anxious to fight over again the battle of the Boyne, on the boundary line between the two provinces of Quebec and Ontario. I think, and I hope, he has dropped that feeling for all time. If the hon gentleman continues to treat this question of the province of Quebec in the Orange Sentinel as he has done in the past, and if he spoke yesterday his sincere convictions, then we must believe that there are in the hon. gentleman two personalities, one spreading oil on the fire in Toronto, to make it burn more viciously, and the other spreading oil on the troubled waters in the House of Commons, to quieten and calm the storm. Let us hope that the new light he shed here yesterday, may dispel the gloom of his harsh attitude towards Quebec which for so long has overshadowed him.

I shall not refer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. W. A. Clarke) who last night thought it was his duty to distribute the insults which we in the province of Quebec are accustomed to receive as our daily bread from certain of our evil disposed fellow countrymen.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) in his remarks yesterday said, "The people of Ontario are especially sensitive about loyalty to the Mother Country." Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people not only of Ontario but of the whole Dominion are sensitive about that, and I hope we have heard for the last time in this House that any one province is especially sensitive about loyalty. My conversion to loyalty is perhaps not so recent as the conversion of the hon. member for West Toronto to moderation in his sentiments. If I may be permitted, I should like to quote two extracts from speeches which were delivered in the province of Quebec, not a week ago, not a month ago, but two years ago, at a time when we in the province of Quebec were being accused by practically the whole English press of the country of disloyalty to the British Empire. I must first apologize for quoting from myself, but it will show our friends on the other side of the House, especially those to whom French Canadians have been represented as anti-patriotic and anti-English, what kind of gospel we Liberals have been preaching, not only on the floor of this House, but in the city of Montreal when the time came to tell our fellow-citizens what was their duty. The extract is rather long, but I quote it to give an exact impression of what we think and have been preaching in the province of Quebec. Addressing the Young Liberals of the city of Montreal two years ago I said:

Gentlemen,—There is not at this moment one single colony, whether it be an English or a French colony, which has the right to remain neutral in this world conflict. Let France or England fall in defeat and the fate of their colonies is immediately decided, and for you specially my compatriots, were you to remain disinterested spectators, deaf to the call of duty in the face of such a deadly conflict, and if, as the result of such a dangerous course, your country became a German colony, your prerogatives and your liberties, conquered through the supreme sacrifice of your martyrs, would be forever lost to you; lost in the dishonour and the infamy which would have resulted from your lack of patriotism and most unexplainable prejudices.

It has been said, I know it, that we owe nothing to Great Britain; that what she has done for us has at all times been prompted by her own interest. To this, Sir, I could answer by recalling to you the elequent words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier—"I love France which has given me life; I love England which has given me my liberty."

We owe nothing to Great Britain. Very well, gentlemen, name me a country in the world which enjoys more liberty than we do ourselves; name me a country in the world where religious freedom is respected to such an extent as our own, where collectively as a people or individually as citizens, we can adore our God in the creed in which we believe in, as freely as we can ourselves. Name me a country in the world, outside of Canada, where freedom's spech is more highly respected; that freedom which allows us, you and I, to speak the language of our forefathers without encroachment.

Let us not forget that it is within the shelter of the British Flag that we as a people have grown; that our marvelous development has steadily advanced without hindrance. Let us bear always in mind that it has been at all times through British capital that we have been able to exploit our inexhaustible natural resources. Let us engrave in our minds that if this country has been spared the ravages of invasion or the bitter pill of conquest, it has always been due to the incomparable British Navy.

Sir, however strong may be these reasons which I thought my duty to enumerate to you, I hesitate not in saying that did they not exist, our plain duty would still be to participate in this war.

We are met, Sir, by those who do not share our views—nobody ignores it—with the persecution of the French language in the province of Ontario. There is, Sir, but one answer to this. The jingoism of a few Canadians, equally narrow of mind as they are bitter in their prejudices, do not represent the English people

and less again do they represent Great Britain. It is the wound which imposes upon us the sacred duty of healing as quickly and as energetically as we can, but, Sir, it is childish to maintain that such a situation, however grave and pitiful it may be, materially changes our general situation, our obligations as a people at all times, conscious of its honour, its dignity and its liberty.

I love sufficiently my country, Sir, to be moved by the keen desire to see it fulfil its duty to the end, confident as I am that by these means, and this means alone, it will assure for itself the material prosperity which it deserves coupled with the future and the honour of its children.

Gentlemen, whatever you may say or think, rest assured that alone in the triumph of the Allied Cause will we find the remedy to the evils from which we are now suffering and the guarantee of our future peace and happiness. To attain, Sir, that lofty purpose it is above all others essential, that we should bind together the individual energies of each of us, direct them as a whole towards that supreme object which constitutes the programme of the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Briand, a programme unique in the world's history, and which can be summarized in one word "Victory".

Gentlemen, I do not wish a change in the political status of my country; let it grow and prosper in the future as it has done in the past; let the link that binds us to Britain remain as it is, imaginary in fact but strong in reality. This is all the liberty that I ask for Canada.

Sir, that is the kind of disloyalty I have been preaching in the province of Quebec. I am proud to say that at a later day in Quebec I preached the same gospel. I am proud to say that in speaking in the way which I have indicated I was but following the advice, of my right hon. leader. A year later I addressed some young Liberals in Montreal but it is not necessary for me to quote what I said then because my observations on that occasion were along the same lines. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), in concluding his speech yesterday said: "I want the province of Quebec to respect the constitution and to recognize it." I would ask the hon. gentleman if the fact of spreading hatred of one race against another, as he has been doing in the past in his newspaper, is respecting the constitution. We have heard much of late about respecting the constitution but would it not be fair to ask those who are so anxious to have the constitution respected to show some respect for it themselves? I would not like to say anything disagreeable to anybody on the other side of the House, but if the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred desired to be disagreeable to his own leader he would never have spoken otherwise than he did yesterday, because I contend that since 1911 no one has shown more contempt for the constitution than the right hon. the Prime Minister himself.

Let us have a glimpse at his political career since 1911. There is no use trying to make people believe that we are not respecting the constitution when those who are supposed to have the constitution in their special charge do not themselves respect it. When the Prime Minister was called to office in 1911 his first act was to commit a breach of the constitution. We all know that according to our constitution the members of the Cabinet must be in accord, that they must all feel and think the same way. Is it necessary to remind the House that the right hon. gentleman, unable to count on a majority elected by the people, was forced to appeal to gentlemen who had been elected to combat his Administration and his policy? In 1916 every body remembers perfectly well that the right hon. gentleman sent a message to the people of Canada in which he stated: "I have promised 500,000 men to England and have promised them without consulting any of my ministers." Would the Kaiser himself dare to do the same even in the autocratic country over which he rules? In 1917, the Prime Minister, after having asked for an extension of the term of Parliament, obtained that extension under the distinct agreement and understanding that no contentious measures would be brought before the House. During the session that followed we had the Canadian Northern measure which was brought in against the will of the members of this side of the House, and which was more than a contentious measure. It was not exactly a violation of the written law of the country, but it was a violation of the law of honour.

In that same year, 1917, we had another measure brought forward. As I was not in the House at that time, I would like to discuss that question at a certain length, because I think that at an early date it will have to be discussed in this House, and, if not this session, certainly at the next session. I refer to the War-time Elections Act. If there is in our statutes a law which deserves the condemnation of the people of this country and of the members of this House, it is the War-time Elections Act. This Act was passed for what reason? Because we were at war? To win the war? No, Sir. The reason that measure was passed in 1917 was that the Government did not dare face public opinion on its own merits, and it had to disfranchise hundreds of thousands of British

citizens who were entitled to vote and who were not favourable to the Government at that time. The worst feature of this legislation, to my mind, especially for those who are always boasting of their loyalty and devotion to the British Empire, is that the Government has adopted measures which are a dishonour to this country and to the British Empire. When men of German and Austrian origin came to this country several years ago, they came, as the Prime Minister stated himself in 1914 and 1915, because they were invited to come here knowing that this was a free country, that their rights would be respected, and that they would be treated as British citizens. They took the oath as British citizens. They knew when they took that oath that they were binding themselves to respect the King and Constitution of this country. When these men were disfranchised, those who did it simply repudiated the King's signature and dishonoured the Crown of England. They gave that legislation retroactive effect going back as far as 1902. This is an abuse of a serious character. I intended to quote what the Prime Minister said at that time, but I shall just read two or three lines of it. Speaking of the Germans, in 1914, the hon. gentleman said:

> Nearly half a million of the very best citizens of Canada are of German origin, and I am sure that no one would for one moment desire to utter any word or use any expression in debate which would wound the self-respect, or hurt the feelings of any of our fellow citizens of German descent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GLADU: The hon. gentleman added:

> We have no reason to doubt, and we do not doubt, that these people will be absolutely true to the country of their adoption.

Sir, if the Germans in Canada were true to the country of their adoption in 1914 and in 1915, when the Prime Minister spoke of them, they were equally true to their adopted country in 1917. But the very reason why the Prime Minister and his colleagues changed their attitude towards those Germans who were then British citizens was, as I said a moment ago, that they had no faith whatever in the Government of that time, any more than one-half the ministers who are now sitting on the other side had faith in the late Government.

In a copy of the Current History Magazine, published by the New York Times a year ago, I found this article:

> Germany's Form of Government

Strange to say I found in this work the very principle of the legislation which was submitted to the House last session, and which is called the War-time Elections Act. So that not only was this legislation not British legislation, and legislation in which, of course, there is no British fair play, but it has been borrowed if not stolen from Germany. That is a reason, Sir, why that very legislation, especially from the point of view of the ultra loyalists, should be considered a stain on our statutes and should be expunged from them. Sir, when you think of the way in which the hon. the Prime Minister is trying sometimes to impose his views upon this side of the House, and upon the country, it is very interesting to notice that there is another man in the world who uses practically the same language, and here is what he says:

> It is a tradition in our House to consider ourselves as designed by God to govern the peoples over which it is given us to reign.

Just as those gentlemen opposite sometimes tell us, we do this because we want to win the war, and we are the only ones who want to win the war.

> My grandfather placed, by his own right—

In our case the hon. gentleman cannot say that he has been placed by the people's right or voice, when he has been placed only by this outrageous and scandalous legislation, the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I regret that I have to call the hon. member to order. It is not competent for him to speak in disrespectful terms of an Act of Parliament, namely, the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. GLADU: Mr. Speaker, I very willingly abide by your ruling. I do not contend that this legislation is absolutely bad, because it has produced some good results so far. I cannot say that it has produced only bad results, lest I forget, Sir, that we owe to it the great privilege, and the greater honour, of retaining your services as presiding officer of this House. I quote further:

> My grandfather placed, by his own right, the crown of the kings of Prussia on his head, once more laying stress upon the fact that it was conferred upon him by the Grace of God alone, not by Parliament, by meetings of the people, or by popular decision; and that he considered himself as the chosen instrument of Heaven, and as such performed his duties as regent and ruler. Considering myself as the instrument of the Lord, without heeding the views or opinions of the day, I go my way which is devoted solely and alone to the prosperity and peaceful development of our Fatherland.

Sir, it was the Kaiser who uttered those words, and he says further on:

More than ever, unbelief and discontent raised their head. It may happen, though God forbid, that you may have to fire on your own parents and brothers. Prove your fidelity, then, by your sacrifice.

Would you not think that had been written for the present situation in the Dominion of Canada? Sir, knowing, as you have reminded me, that I should say nothing against the legislation which has been passed by this Parliament, let me say at least that I regret its enactment. To my mind it is not only a violation of the rights of the people, but it is unpatriotic, anti-Canadian, and anti-British.

4 p.m.

We have been told, Sir, on several occasions, that we do not show enough loyalty. We have been told that we were not fulfilling our duty as we should in the present conflict. We have been told also, that there were many in this country who have given the best examples of loyalty. I remember a few years ago sitting in the press gallery, a post of honour from which, according to circumstances, I was forced to step down to where I am to-day, that a discussion took place in this House, and we heard of several men specially mentioned for their loyalty. I will only mention by name a few of those men, because I want to be brief. I remember that the then Minister of Militia gave us as an example of loyalty and of devotion to the British Empire the name of a man who had refused any salary to work for the Empire's interests. That man was doing the Empire's work, it is said, from mere patriotism, and his name was Mr. Allison. I remember, also, that at that time they were boosting the name of a man, Sir Joseph Flavelle, who was also refusing any salary, or refusing to accept any money from the British Empire. No, Sir, that man would not accept any money from the British Empire; he was giving his services on the ground of loyalty and nothing else. Think of Joseph Flavelle giving his services without any indemnity! The man whom we know now would apply the methods of Shylock to his mother's breast if by doing so he could pile up a little more money. There were other men—and I hope, Sir, that I am not speaking disrespectfully when I am not speaking of an Act of Parliament passed by members of this House—who boasted of their loyalty and devotion to the British Empire, and they were the two greatest scoundrels this country has ever produced—Mackenzie and Mann. It is rather surprising to learn that these very men are still before Parliament asking for more of the people's money. There are others I could name, but these are sufficient for to-day. These men have been held up to us as examples of loyalty and devotion to the British Empire. Well, if to be loyal to the British Empire it is necessary to follow in the steps of these men, I will never be loyal to the British Empire. And I will say further, that if all those who have made the British Empire great and glorious, as it is, if all those who have immortalized England,—Nelson, Wellington, Wolfe, Roberts, Kitchener, and those who are making history to-day—were told that such men as those I have mentioned have been branded as examples of loyalty and as descendants of their blood, they would simply tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they were not descendants of their blood, they were not even the foam or the slime of it.

I listened the other day to the Budget speech of the Acting Minister of Finance, and, as was stated yesterday by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), I think the acting minister was more of a mouthpiece than anything else on that occasion, I think that that speech was framed up in the land with which we were to have no truck or trade, and does not represent the personal opinions of the hon. gentleman. I cannot understand—I may be wrong—how the amount of our national debt could be specified with exactness by the acting minister. I remember that, two years ago, the Hon. Mr. Pugsley forced an answer from the Minister of Finance. We were told what our liabilities to England were in the present war, that we would have to contribute in proportion to the number of men we sent to the front, compared with the number of men sent by England. We were also told that not a shell would explode on the front without Canada paying her contribution. I do not know whether I am misinterpreting what I heard at that time, but if I am right, it seems to me impossible for the Acting Minister of Finance to state exactly what our debt situation is to-day. We are told that we will have to pay proportionately to the number of soldiers we have at the front compared with the number that England has. If England has five millions, and we have five hundred thousand, would it be wrong to think that we would be liable for one-tenth of the war expenditure? We are bound certainly to pay a certain part of it. How can we know exactly to what proportion we are bound? Is there any understanding

which has been communicated to the House as to exactly where we stand on that question? I do not think so. I think that we are living in a desert absolutely on that question, and that neither the Acting Minister of Finance nor any one else can state where we stand. I say that not to find fault in any way with the Acting Minister of Finance, but because it is the right of the people of this country to know exactly where we stand. The Government is asking the people every year for hundreds of millions of dollars. They tell us the money will be loaned to England, that it will yield a good rate of interest; and that some day it will come back to us. The Prime Minister stated the other day that he thought there was a little balance in our favour; but there is nothing certain about that. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, it only fair that the public should be informed of the exact situation?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For the past year or more the arrangement with the Imperial Government is that we pay the British Government the equivalent of, I think, $1.25 per day per man for the upkeep of our troops, and that arrangement has not been interfered with, so it is an exact amount. That includes also the equipment required for our men and our proportion of the munitions.

Mr. GLADU: That amount covers the whole thing?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. GLADU: I did not understand it that way when the Prime Minister referred to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not speaking definitely of the exact amount per day. It is either $1.20 or $1.25, but which I do not pretend to say exactly.

Mr. GLADU: The only point in my mind was whether the amount covered all expenditures for munitions and so on. I understand by the answer of the acting minister that we will not be called upon to pay any more than $1.25 or something like that.

Coming to another point, the Government claim that our credit stands good. May I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that I do not agree absolutely with that statement. Not a month ago, the Prime Minister and the acting Minister of Finance went to Washington. For what purpose? We do not know exactly; we can only suppose. How is it that immediately after their return the cost of exchange between the two countries, which was at seven-eighths of one per cent when they left for Washington, jumped to two per cent? Does this not indicate that they had to show their cards before the officials of the American Exchequer? The member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) suggests that it would be better for the country if those hon. gentlemen had stayed here.

It is represented that the cost of floating the Victory Loan, which amounted to over $400,000,000, was about one and one-quarter per cent, or $5,000,000. Papers supporting the Government expressed the view that that was a fair and honest cost, and that the people ought to be satisfied. With that I do not agree. It must not be forgotten that this cost of $5,000,000 was incurred in floating a loan not for $400,000,000, but for $150,000,000, and that if the people had subscribed only $150,000,000, as they were asked to do, the cost would have been the same. The cost, therefore, of floating a loan of $150,000,000 amounted to $5,000,000, or three and one-third per cent, and when the Government float their next loan for $500,000,000 in a few months, the cost, if they proceed as they did with the last loan, will be $16,666,000, at three and one-third per cent, rather than $6,250,000 at one and one-quarter per cent.

Just a word with regard to the coal question, in which the people of the province of Quebec are specially interested. In past years the freight rates on coal coming into Quebec from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was $1.80 per ton. In 1916 the rate was increased by the then Minister of Railways to $3.20 per ton, making it prohibitive for the people of the province of Quebec, to import coal from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. This condition is unjust to the province of Quebec, and should be remedied at once. The Acting Minister of Finance knows as well as I do that an extraordinary situation exists with regard to soft coal. The Intercolonial is using and will probably require large quantities of soft coal. This coal has been brought in from the United States where it was formerly purchased at the rate of $10.25 per ton f.o.b. Montreal. This year a quantity of that coal was bought at $7.85 f.o.b. Montreal, and hauled from Montreal to Campbellton, a distance of 464 miles. The cost of that haulage should not be more than $3.40 per ton, making the cost of the coal $11, whereas if the coal had been bought in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the cost at the mine would not exceed $4 per ton, and the cost of hauling, as fixed by the former Minister of Railways, $3.40,

representing a total of $7.40 per ton, and a saving to the country of at least $3 per ton. Why has this matter not been taken into consideration? The province of Quebec is entitled to protection in this respect as well as any other province. If proper steps were taken to safeguard our interests with regard to this coal, hundreds of thousands of dollars, which the Acting Minister of Finance so badly needs, would be saved. We have hired the services of a fuel controller and of an American expert whom we have been paying $24,000 a year—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are not hiring the services of the fuel controller; these are absolutely free.

Mr. GLADU: Well, it is fair to say that we have been hiring the services of an expert on coal.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did not deny that.

Mr. GLADU: We have been paying this expert $24,000 a year to bring coal here which we could produce in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where there is a coal belt three hundred miles long. We could produce coal which would cost the country at least $3 a ton less than coal coming from the United States. That is a point that ought to be considered. Besides that, instead of decreasing our output, as we are doing by importing coal from the United States, we would increase our output, and further than that, help the proprietors of the mines and our citizens generally.

As regards our financial situation, nothing too stringent can be done by the Government to arrive, if possible, at a financial level which would be satisfactory to the country. I shall not say that at present we are in a desperate situation, but I think, Sir, as has been said by hon. members who have spoken before me, the Government should endeavour to reach all those who are unduly benefited by the war, as I think is the case in regard to the question of coal which I have just mentioned. If we are paying for coal imported from the United States and delivered in Montreal $3 a ton more than we would pay for coal coming from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, I say that those three dollars are lost to the country and are going somewhere —we do not know where. I am not making any insinuations, but the question deserves consideration, if the Government is as anxious as it says it is to put the finances

of this country on a better footing than they are at present.

I regret having spoken so long, and I must apologize to the House if I have been daring enough to use a language which is unfortunately unfamiliar to me. If, however, I have made use of any wrong expressions, I hope I shall be forgiven, as I think we shall have to forgive many things to those who may be disposed to criticise us.

Mr. R. H. BUTTS (South Cape Breton and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Gladu) when he was called to order for his statement in connection with the War-time Elections Act, although I think his assertion was intended as a retort, I really regard it as a very high compliment to yourself. I have no doubt it was intended to refer to the soldiers' vote, and if the soldiers' vote was instrumental in electing you, I think the hon. member's assertion was a very high compliment, for I assure you, Sir, I would sooner take my seat with a very small majority contributed by the soldiers' vote than come here by acclamation from a constituency of slackers. I do not intend to make any reference whatever to many of the somewhat excited remarks that have passed from one side of the House to the other in regard to both racial and religious matters. I have long ago come to the conclusion that such a course is anything but wise. Such remarks may be carried on as long as may be, but in the end, racial and religious matters are about the only victims. It is, therefore, somewhat out of keeping in this House that such remarks should be hurled across the floor and it would be well if they were discontinued for all time.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), in his speech the other evening, referred to some secret—I think, mythical—agreement between hon. members, both Liberal and Conservative, on this side of the House, as to the tariff. I have only to say that, if such an arrangement was ever made, I never heard of it previously to the opening of this House or to debate upon the Budget, and it is hard for me to understand why such an agreement should be made. As far as I can see, we are all tariff men, we are all protectionists when in office. Even on the other side of the House, hon. members are protectionists when they are in power. It is only when they are in Opposition that they talk free trade. I remember some years ago when, previously to 1896, the last Conservative Government was in power, I was

then in the early days of my political inclinations, and I was an ardent free trader, I read the speeches of the then right hon. leader of the Opposition, the late Sir Richard Cartwright, and of many others, and from their speeches on free trade and their denunciation of high tariffs, I was led to believe that, on their accession to power, we would have a free trade Government, and that, under such a regime, great manufactures would grow up in this country; that the Northwest would be opened up with a rapidity unknown before; that small villages would become towns; that towns would become cities, and that cities would extend their borders. In fact, we were led to believe that, under the benign influences of this almost heaven-born policy, old men would be rejuvenated and old maids made marriageable. My hon. friends did not come into power altogether on their trade policy, but they did come in on a side issue; and if we are to take the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) they, during their regime, reduced the tariff by 71-100ths of one per cent. That was the degree of free trade to which they were prepared to go. When they were defeated in 1911, they immediately again became free traders. This reminds me very much of the old couplet:

When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he.

From my constituency over 4,000 young men volunteered for the front, and before conscription was spoken of they were in Flanders. Many of them are now home maimed. Many of them have made the supreme sacrifice in Flanders. I have heard from those who have returned many an interesting story about the condition of affairs at the front, about all the hardships they have had to endure. The other night, while some free trade speeches were being made, I was thinking of certain stories that I had heard, and I was picturing to myself some of the scenes that had been depicted to me by those returned soldiers. I could see before me the condition of affairs as it had been described, and I was picturing those young men there in the trenches with the great cannons booming all around them, with shrapnel bursting in the air over them, and with machine gun and rifle bullets whistling on all sides. Perhaps at the gray of the morning the order was given for them to scale the parapet and take the front trenches of the enemy, and in No Man's Land he that fell and was instantly killed was perhaps not the unluckiest. Others lie bleeding the whole day long, suffering agonies compared with which the Cross itself, if I may say so without irreverence, was mercy. In the midst of my reverie, when I was thinking of the sacrifices made by parents such as those in the county of Cape Breton, where five mothers have sent twenty sons to the trenches, where two mothers who had sent four sons each, had each lost three, I was aroused by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) deploring the five cent tax on the poor man's pipe and the ten cent tax on the old lady's cup of tea, and I thought then what different conceptions some people have of the sacrifices we are called upon to make in this war. Ten cents a pound on tea is surely an awful sacrifice for one old lady to make, when compared with the sacrifice of four sons by a mother. Did the terrible disparity, the awful misproportion, never occur to my hon. friend as he talked about the poor man's pipe and the old lady's cup of tea, and about these old ladies having been a factor in electing this Government?

He preached free trade, but it was not the kind of free trade hon. gentlemen opposite practised when they were in power. He said the Liberals had reduced the duties on steel during their regime. That is quite true, but if protection can be corrupt, they resorted to the most corrupt form of protection when they removed, or partially removed, the duty on steel, for they granted a bonus on a sliding scale to last for ten years. Let me give another example of how sincere hon. gentlemen opposite are in their professions about free trade and protection. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said in 1897:

If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians would have given many things to obtain the American market. There was a time when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had, but those days are passed and over now. We are not dependent on the American market now.

In 1907, in a speech at the Imperial Conference, he said:

There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes on the British trade.

And justly so. I do not think the right hon. gentleman ever made a truer pro-

nouncement on the question of trade. Under protection as we have had it in Canada since 1878 we have built 29,000 miles of railway; we have spent a little over $200,000,000 in the construction of one of the finest canal systems in the world, connecting up the St. Lawrence river with the upper regions of the Great Lakes, and giving us a great waterway right into the heart of Canada for a distance of twenty-five hundred miles. All this has been done under protectionist governments, and it was done simply because the treaties we had previously entered into with the United States had been denounced by that country at the earliest possible moment, and because Canada realized that instead of looking for trade channels running north and south, the proper thing to do was to build up an interprovincial trade in this Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot possibly be sincere when they talk about disturbing this trade, which has been built up so successfully and has done so much for the development of Canada at such an enormous expense to the country. But I will not go any further into that. These trade questions have been debated so often that there is little left to be said. Suffice it to say, I would be more likely to believe that hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere if, during the fifteen years they were in power in this country, they had shown the slighest desire to reduce the tariff or grant free trade. But as their record is very strongly against that, their professions at this late date must fall, I think, upon deaf ears.

With respect to the Military Service Act, or conscription as it is generally called, there is this to be said: The leader of this Government and the party behind him did not mince matters when they went to the country last year. Conscription was the issue, and Canada never did itself more credit than on the seventeenth day of December last, when young men went to the polls and, like heroes, voted in favour of conscription, which meant voting themselves into the trenches; and when fathers and mothers went to the polls and voted their sons into the trenches. I think one of the noblest deeds Canada has to her credit is that the greater part of her population, knowing what the election of the Union Government meant, voted in favour of conscription and the Union Government.

I know a gentleman on the other side of the House whose son was a brilliant dashing young soldier before the war. When the war broke out he joined the home guard. When conscription was mooted his friends of the Liberal Government at Halifax made him stipendiary magistrate of New Glasgow, and he doffed the khaki. He is to-day in New Glasgow acting as stipendiary magistrate. His worthy sire has a seat on the other side of the House and was a great advocate of voluntary conscription, saying that there were lots of young men who were willing to volunteer for the front.

An hon. MEMBER: Give us his name.

Mr. BUTTS: I do not know that I should give the name. I will give his constituency. I refer to the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough. We had another candidate who ran in Eastern Nova Scotia. He is not in the House. He has two sons. One of them was eligible, while the other little fellow was about five years old and about the length of an axe handle. The son who was eligible for the front did not volunteer, but the little fellow strutted around home in khaki. When, during the election, his father was twitted about the matter, the little fellow was stripped of his khaki, I suppose, through mere shame, and God knows whether or not the world lost a Napoleon or a Hannibal. If it were necessary I could enumerate quite a number of such cases. It nearly always happens that when some of these gentlemen are in khaki they manage to get some position on the staff in Halifax, or to associate themselves with the home guard, to assure themselves that there are about 3,200 miles of salt water between them and danger. When I look around to see some of the conditions down in our province, and in some of the other provinces, I think I am very nearly justified in doubting the sincerity of those gentlemen when they protest against the Military Service Act and claim that the voluntary system of enlistment would have supplied all the demands.

I merely wish to refer in closing to some remarks made by the last speaker (Mr. Gladu) about the War-time Elections Act about the disfranchisement of Germans, Austrians and other foreigners in the West and different parts of Canada, and about women's votes. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are altogether angels. I suppose they resorted to a great many of the ordinary election devices. We appealed, no doubt, to the sentiments of the mothers who had sons over there to vote that reinforcements should be sent to them. Perhaps less worthy appeals were made. But surely hon. gentlemen opposite will not say that we had a monopoly of that? Is

it not true that they appealed to the mothers who had sons overseas telling them that if they got in power there would be long furloughs for their sons? Is it not true that they held up to the mothers of sons over there who still had brothers at home all the dangers of their other sons being put in the trenches by force? Is it not true that they appealed to them on the ground that if the Laurier party should be returned to power there would be no conscription and that every one who had been put into khaki under the conscription Act would be stripped of his khaki and given a chance, if he wished, to enlist voluntarily? Is it not true that they appealed to every delicate and tender sentiment of motherhood and parentage generally? Is it not true that those appeals were most successful particularly in those constituencies from which the greater number of hon. gentlemen opposite come? It must be absolutely true, I think that these appeals were made. Look at the number of acclamations; look at the small number of votes that the Government candidates received in these constituencies. That must be admitted inevitably by the whole of us in view of the fact that the province of which I am speaking went solidly against conscription and solidly against the Government. In quite a number of constituencies in that province there was not found one woman to whom those appeals were made who raised her voice in favour of the Government candidate, neither mother, nor sister of a soldier or a probable soldier.

If the Military Service Act had not been passed the mothers and sisters of soldiers would not have had votes. If the Military Service Act had not been passed the people of foreign blood and foreign leanings would have had votes. I suppose it is to be assumed that human nature is very much the same wherever you find it and that we must at least credit these people with having some love of the countries that they have left notwithstanding the fact that they have become naturalized British subjects. Had they not been disfranchised, had the women not been given the vote, had the soldiers across the seas not been given the vote—and that was looked upon with disfavour by hon. gentlemen opposite—had these things not been brought about by the Military Service Act, there were foreigners enough in this country to have elected any Government they wished and the native born Canadians and those of British birth could not under any circumstances have had a sufficiently strong voting power to overcome them. Of course, some fellows had to have their corns pinched, but I do not think there was anything wrong in granting a vote to a mother who had sacrificed a son for Canada and for the Empire. I do not think there was anything wrong in protecting Canada and British interests against what must be a very strong sentiment in favour of the enemies of the allied powers. I have come to the conclusion that it was not justice that these gentleman wanted but I am inclined to the belief that it was justice they got.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this debate, because I think all the questions involved have been already discussed at considerable length, but there are some matters in connection with this Budget which I have not yet heard any person mention, and which are of vital importance in connection with the affairs of the country. For that reason I trust that the House will bear with me while I refer briefly to those questions, and pass them on to the Government in the hope that they will receive consideration.

The Budget which we are discussing, as we all know, is the annual financial statement. I have heard quite a number of Budgets discussed in Parliament, and the procedure is that when the Minister of Finance comes down to the House on that occasion he presents a statement of his stewardship during the past year. He states what the expenditures and revenues have been, and how much the revenue exceeded the expenditure, or, if there has been undue expenditure, what the balance is on the other side. The Finance Minister also takes occasion to estimate the amount of money that will be required for the various public services during the coming year, and then summarizes the various sources from which he hopes, by the imposition of taxation, to meet those expenditures. If additional expenditures are required, he indicates the direction from which he hopes to receive the necessary revenue to meet those expenditures.

Now, the Acting Finance Minister made a speech which, to my mind, was a model of clearness. Personally, I regret very much indeed that the Finance Minister himself was unable to be present. Knowing the tremendous amount of work and labour which has devolved upon that hon. gentleman since the beginning of the war, it was not to be expected that a man of his

physique could stand such a strain continuously. There is no doubt that so far in the financial history of the war, the Minister of Finance has met the situation. When confronted with almost unsurmountable obstacles he has overcome them, obtained the necessary funds, and in that respect has displayed great capacity. In the hon. gentleman who recently delivered the Budget speech, we have a worthy successor of Sir Thomas White. The Budget was excellent in its clearness of detail and lucidity of exposition, dealing with the expenditures of the past and the possible expenditures during the coming year. The Acting Finance Minister also very clearly outlined the new methods of taxation. But there was one omission from his speech, which he must have overlooked, although it has always appeared in previous Budgets, and that was the estimated amount of revenue expected to be derived from the new taxes. Now, the present Administration is a Union Government, we are not supposed to be attached particularly to one side of politics or the other, and, naturally, we would expect to be enlightened as to whether the Budget was a Union Government Budget or not. I regret to say that in my judgment the Budget which was submitted to the House a few days ago is not a Union Budget.

In the first place, if the Budget were a Union Government Budget the taxation would be collected, to some extent, equally from our two principal sources of revenue. At the present time some of our revenue is derived from direct taxes, such as the income tax and the super tax and that constitutes what is known as a free trade or international method of taxation. We also receive a large amount of revenue from customs and excise duties, which form what is currently known as the protection, the national or indirect system of taxation. Now, if the present Administration were in reality a Union Government the new taxation would, as I have already said, be collected to some extent equally from the two sources of revenue to which I have referred; but that course has not been followed. I have looked very carefully over the statement of the Acting Minister of Finance, and I find that the new taxation applies almost entirely to incomes. It is true that a tax has been imposed on tea, coffee and tobacco, which will bring in some additional revenue. None of these articles, however, are produced to any extent in Canada, and the placing of any taxes whatever upon goods produced in this country has been carefully avoided. To my mind that is not a proper system of raising additional revenue from the country. I may have my own views as to that, but I say that when you are applying added taxes to income only, you are adopting the Free Trade method of taxation. Why should we have such a Free Trade Budget, and why, in the application of taxes, should we have recourse to only one onerous form of taxation? We are standing on the threshold of the fourth year of the war, which may be prolonged for another two years, we may have to raise additional money yet, and we have consistently, in the Budget, avoided a source of enormous revenue to this country, we have avoided the imposition of taxation that would bear upon the people with scarcely any pressure at all, namely, an addition to the customs tax.

5 p.m.

In the first place, I would say this to the Acting Minister of Finance: In looking over the blue books I find that the percentage of taxation upon imports this year is something like seventeen per cent, whilst in 1916 the percentage was over twenty per cent. In other words, the taxation on imports had been reduced three per cent during the war, whereas if it had been increased by that amount this year it would have yielded something like $25,000,000 to the country. Furthermore, had we adopted an increase of ten per cent it would have yielded the enormous sum of $80,000,000 of additional revenue. For that reason I say that we are eliminating and neglecting a most important source of revenue. I may be told that a taxation of twenty-seven per cent on imports is too much. I do not agree with that for the simple reason that the average in the United States is nearer fifty per cent. They are not neglecting any source of revenue over there, they are exploiting every source of revenue. Therefore, after examining the Budget, with all due regard to the Acting Finance Minister, and the manner in which his taxation proposals were framed, I must come to the conclusion that this is a Free Trade Budget, and deliberately framed as such, and that as far as the manufacturing and other industries of this country are concerned, we might as well roll up the industrial map on the wall. Why do I say that? I will give the House my reasons as briefly as I can, bearing in mind the fact that hon. gentlemen on both sides are anxious to get on with business. Why should we eliminate the source of revenue to which I have referred? Why

should we, instead, take away the profits of manufacturers and tax the people directly more and more every year? There is no particular merit in an income tax. The only claim to merit which an income tax finds among the people of England is that when they are taxed on their income they will know how much they are paying and devote more attention to the administration of public affairs. During the war, when we have to raise such enormous sums, would it not be logical that we should place taxation where the people would feel the burden the least? To my mind the idea of playing free trade, as against protection, during the war, is exploded as far as this country is concerned.

The idea of free trade and protection is busted so far as this war is concerned. We have had to eliminate a great many of these old ideas. I am appealing to men of common sense in this House, and those who have studied economics know very well that it is only a matter of a few years since the gold standard as a basis for currency was accepted as an axiom, and no country was supposed to issue paper money unless it had a gold dollar in its treasury to meet a paper dollar. When the war broke out all those theories of the schoolmen, whose ideas of finance which had been propounded for years by the professors of Oxford, Cambridge and other universities, were swept away within the first two weeks, and Great Britain found herself compelled to go on a fiat money basis. England had to take tea paper, print her currency on this tea paper, and hand it out as money. Fortunately, they struck the secret of success so far as financing the country was concerned. I remember when the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) used to come into this House and declare that we ought to issue paper money. We all looked upon him as a heretic, a greenbacker, a man who wanted fiat money. To-day, every country in the war, with the exception of the United States, is on a paper basis, and it is only a matter of a few months until the United States will be on a paper basis also. That is to say, the country promises to pay on paper, which paper takes the place of gold, and is not redeemable in gold during the war. We have had to revise our views, and a great change has come over the thinking community in England and every country. It is as if some new discovery had been made, such, for instance, as the discovery that the earth was round instead of flat. We all know that for centuries professors preached the doctrine that the earth was flat, until suddenly one man advanced the view that it was round, and the discovery of the telescope proved that it was round. Nobody holds the opinion any longer that the earth is flat except a very few cranks. In the same way our preconceived notions of finance on the eve of the war are all going to be changed.

I think I have clearly established that we are on the threshhold of these great changes and we have to face that situation. We have in our imports, a source of taxation from which, if we took one-quarter as much in duties as do the United States, would give use at least eighty or ninety million dollars additional revenue every year.

There is nothing new in taxes; the world has used all methods of taxation. The first taxation ever adopted, I understand, was a hut tax which is still used in Africa amongst the primitive savages. They pay a hut tax to the colonial governments. The lottery system is another method. That system has been dropped out of consideration by the English-speaking people, although I understand it is used in some foreign countries. Another method of taxation is that on business transactions. It was put forward by some of the press, we were to have this here, that there should be a stamp on every business transaction. That is the alcavala of Spain, and its effect was to ruin business and to destroy industry and trade in Spain, and to make that country poverty stricken. We must not adopt that system. My idea is that we must adopt every reasonable expedient, because we need large sums of money, and the first thing we should consider is to find a system that will bear as lightly as possible on the shoulders of the people during the war. There are people going around the country endeavouring in every possible way to contrive something to make the people here feel there is a war on. Some people want to take away our tea, others our bacon, others want to take 90 per cent of our incomes; and in every possible way they are devising means to make the people feel that they are at war. If I were the German Emperor and wanted the people of this country to be directed in a certain channel which would make them tired of this war and cease to support it, I would adopt a policy, not only in taxation but in other things, that would stir up resentment. I think it is a great mistake that the minister omitted to add a substantial percentage to the customs duties of the country.

There are two methods of taxation known to the world, direct and indirect. One of the old fashioned direct taxes is a head tax or a poll tax. That would get a very large sum of money, but would be unpopular. There is also the taxation on real property. And the very reason that England has a tax on incomes is because the landowners would never stand for a tax on their property. We know that a few years ago Lloyd George proposed to impose a tax on landed property, and they were all up in arms. It is not necessary for us to follow those methods; the methods for us to follow are those adopted by the United States. With reference to the income tax itself, it works out very unfairly. The man who pays an income tax on rentals, for instance, can pass that tax on to the tenants, but the man whose revenue is derived from his labours cannot pass the tax on, and therefore it bears heavily on him and his family. There is no particular merit in an income tax any more than in a hut tax; they are only methods of deriving revenue. For our country the income tax is the most dangerous system we can adopt. England has raised large sums of money in this way, but England is beginning to realize that there is a limit. The United States after the war of the Revolution and the War of 1812, adopted the system of taxation on imports, because that was a method which assisted the country in selling as much in a foreign market and buying little, keeping down the trade balance. By 1837 the cost of the Revolutionary War and of the War of 1812-14 were fully paid up. About the same time England was engaged in the Napoleonic Wars, and as near as I can find out, the cost of those wars is still being borne by the British people and they are paying interest on it still. Is that a policy for us to follow? When a tremendous amount of money is going to be charged to us, should we not adopt the policy of the United States, and struggle as best we can to get rid of this burden inside of ten or fifteen years? It is a great mistake not to have adopted the policy of adding an additional amount of taxes on imports. Take the case of trade: In addition to the expenditure on the war, which is one of the dark clouds on the horizon, there is also the war itself. I have no idea in my mind at all as to when the war is going to end, and whilst many members of this House and many of my friends are pessimistic over war conditions at the present time, knowing every foot of that country as I do and knowing that all that territory which the Germans took back a few days ago, I know that a great deal more of territory was held by them in 1914, I am still confident of the success of our arms.

They have not gained one foot of new territory. They are stopped and I am satisfied that it is only a question of time when they will be driven back. But we must face the necessity of constantly raising more men. I am glad the Government has adopted a policy for men which has some ginger in it. We must, however, get a little more ginger in our finances and not be afraid to put a tax on imports simply because one or two members on this side of the House happen to be theoretical free traders. I have listened to the avowed free traders on this side of the House with care and find they are reasonable men, men of great ability. I am sure that if any question is put fairly to them they will be satisfied to do what they consider to be Canada's duty. Why should we impose heavy direct taxation upon the people when we can get three times the money without their knowing anything about it or feeling the burden? The United States has constantly followed the protective financial policy laid down by Alexander Hamilton. By 1890 they had paid for the expenses of the Civil war, whereas Great Britain under free trade has not yet paid off the expenses of even the South African war, which are a burden every year to their people. The people of the United States are wise and practical; they do not run to fads; they take a common sense view of things; they do business without much regard to sentiment. Why do I say that we should add a tax on imports now? That may seem like heresy to a free trader, but there is no such thing as freedom of international trade at this time. A great change has come over all states. There is no free interchange of products. Nations are placing an embargo on many things that formerly came into their country. What is the use of having free trade with the United States if that country will not trade with us at all? Almost everything is embargoed that might go from Canada to the United States; we cannot sell an axe handle there, let alone a bushel of wheat, unless the Government of the United States grant us a special license. The result of that policy during the past year is that we have bought unlimited quantities of goods from the United States—something like $600,000,000 or $700,000,000 worth—and we cannot sell one dollar's worth of goods to them to pay our debts—nor can we borrow and fund our debt. In view of this fact, how

can any sane man say that we should stick to old ideas and old doctrines? There is a proposal on the Order Paper to give to Minister of Trade and Commerce the right to place an embargo on the importation of non-essential products into Canada from the United States. That is one way of avoiding the difficulty that confronts us, but another way would be to impose a heavy customs tax on all things that come from the United States. But we are in debt to the United States some five hundred million. They have refused to lend us the money to pay off our trade balance, but suppose they lent us the money, what right has any loyal Canadian woman to buy an American pair of shoes at $10 and make it necessary for the Minister of Finance to go to Washington and borrow $10 for thirty years at interest in order to pay for them? If a farmer's wife in the West buys from the United States a Chicago cook stove at $50 the Minister of Finance, if he can borrow in Washington —which he cannot just now—will have to borrow $50 in the United States to pay for that stove, and every man, woman and child in this country will have to pay 6 per cent interest on that $50 for thirty years. To do these things is absurd when we can buy these articles in this country with Canadian paper money instead of paying gold for them in the United States. If this condition continues and our trade balance keeps going up, we will owe the United States $1,000,000,000 on our trade balance before the war is over. When the Allies meet in final conference to adjust their balances the United States is going to exact that $1,000,000 in some form or other. We haven't the gold; how can we pay? They will not lend us the money; will we have to give territory for it? United States is a great country, and we all welcome her into the war. But, speaking on my responsibility as a member of this House, I submit that United States has failed to recognize Canada as being on the same plane as the other Allies, so far as war finances are concerned. Everybody knows that. We are not treated even as neutrals.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that the fault of the United States? Did not the United States offer to deal with us on the same basis that they were dealing with England? Did they not offer us orders for munitions if we wanted to accept them?

Mr. CURRIE: I know the United States gave Great Britain an order for munitions a few months ago through Secretary Baker to the extent of $1,300,000,000, in order to enable Great Britain to make munitions and get out of the debt she owed the United States.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And we could have had the same.

Mr. CURRIE: If that same policy could be adopted here we should very soon be free of our debt to the United States. However, the matter is beyond me. Some of these boards and commissions, over which we seem to have no control but which seem to be spending plenty of money for us all the time, are simply stop-logs in the current of our trade. No man who is a profiteer or who has been in the shell game should be put on a board or commission that has to do with our foreign trade. I do not like to name anybody. We all know who are on some of these boards. We know that they have factories in Canada manufacturing things for which they are liable to get orders from the United States, and that they have moved machinery from Canada to the United States in order to make munitions. They want to be in strategic positions.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did they not go to the United States because they were not allowed to bring goods from the United States into Canada?

Mr. CURRIE: Well, I do not know as to their going to the United States because they could not get orders for munitions here. I was told by a Montreal man who has an order for shells from the United States that to get that order he had to pay 7½ per cent commission to the Imperial Munitions Board. I do not think that any foreign institution in this country has the right to impose taxation upon the people of Canada. That should be done by Parliament alone. As far as the munitions business is concerned, the money raised by the Victory Loan in Canada during the last year was divided between munitions and wheat. Great Britain was unable to finance us. They said: If you want to make munitions, you must do your own financing. We must have wheat; we cannot give you the money to pay for it; you will have to raise the money yourself for the wheat—and we did so.

I think it is most hateful for members of Parliament to be provincial. I am a son of the great province of Ontario. We grow big men there; we try to let the people enjoy their full rights; we wish that justice be done to every one.

We are struggling hard to get out of the clutch of the so-called interests. We are an example to the whole world in public ownership institutions and in public-owned industries that are great and successful. Seventy-five per cent of the Victory Loan was raised in the province of Ontario. Seventy-five per cent of the munition orders went east of the Ottawa river. Seventy-five per cent of the grain and foodstuffs orders went west of Fort William. Yet Ontario has been constantly attacked by hon. members. You would think we were a lot of selfish people. You have never heard us complain about these orders in the press of Ontario, and every man in business in Ontario knows very well that we got the small end. We have tried to do our duty. We know that it is impossible for this country ever to achieve the greatness and the status that it should achieve if we are going to preach constantly sectionalism, class hatred, and stir up trouble between the provinces. We cannot have that. We must forget all those things, and now, of all times, is the period when we should forget them.

We are constantly charged, because, unfortunately, two or three so-called trusts have their headquarters in Ontario, that we are robbing the western farmers. I shall refer to some of these trusts, and it is just as well for us to have the matter spoken of openly in the House. Let us take the question of agricultural implements. There are in Ontario, and also in the Western Provinces, many concerns manufacturing agricultural implements. But there are agricultural implements and agricultural implements. The one item that stands out most of all is that which is controlled by a large trust. I refer to the binder used by the farmer. The question of reaping machines and binders is constantly being raised by the farmers. They say: Everybody is taking advantage of us, because we are taxed by protectionists on our binders. This is a matter of regret to every manufacturer, great and small, in Ontario, aye, and in Quebec, where they must have in the future greater manufactories, if they are going to retain their population, because they have not the agricultural land to support their population without the help of industries; they must depend on industries. Every legitimate manufacturer in Ontario regrets that there is such a thing as a binder industry in Ontario. It is of no use whatever to any other industry in Ontario than itself.

All the goods that go into the manufacture of a binder, for instance, the wood that goes into the tongue of it, or into the platform of it, the canvas, the tacks, the pig iron, are brought into this country free of duty, and those small manufacturing concerns in Canada who are manufacturing and who could manufacture those parts legitimately, do not get a cent out of the business. It is doubly protected. No other industry in Canada is protected in that way. Take the question of ploughs. Last year over $2,500,000 worth of ploughs were brought into this country. There is in the world no better plough made than the plough that is made in Canada. A plough is a very low priced article. There are in my province dozens of concerns manufacturing ploughs, but the race hatred cry has so grown in the West and the farmers are so stirred up against our ploughs and other small articles that we are legitimately trying to manufacture in order to support the population in our towns and villages, that they are boycotting our Ontario manufacturers, and they will not purchase our ploughs. What merit is it for a farmer in the West to buy an American plough at $25 or $30, and then send the Minister of Finance down to Washington to borrow money on that amount at 6 per cent for thirty years, simply because the farmer wants to buy an American plough? I have here a long list of articles. Last year we imported over $1,000,000 worth of cotton socks which could have been made in Montreal, where large quantities of socks are manufactured. Last year fully $400,000,000 worth of manufactured goods were brought into Canada which could have been manufactured by Canadian concerns.

The manufacturers of Canada have, during the last four years, been constantly subjected to unfair competition by the Americans. Let me point out an article that is free of duty, and that is made in this country, so that we need not become involved in any question of tariff in regard to it. I refer to barbed wire. The western farmers buy an average of 125 tons of barbed wire a day. The manufacture of that in Canada would give employment to about 5,000 people. Those people would be eating western wheat, whereas the people in the United States cannot eat western wheat, because the United States will not allow any western wheat to enter that country. There is an embargo on it. But, as I say, we import that barbed wire. Barbed wire has two prices in the United States. There is an "ordered" price of $3.80; there also is a "spot delivery" price, which is an

export price to the Allies and all other countries in the world of $4.75. If you live in the United States and you want a car of barbed wire, you go to the United States Steel Corporation and you ask them the price. They will say: "Well, we shall give it to you at $3.70 on order, or if you want 'spot' stuff, we cannot give it to you at that price." You say: "If I order it, when can I have it?" They will tell you: "You can have it after the war." But your wire was broken down and the cattle are running around your ranges, and you want the barbed wire right away, so you ask them: "Have you any "spot" wire? They say: "No, but John Jones across the street has some of our wire, and you can get some of it if you want an immediate order." If you go there, you will find that you will have to pay $4.70 to $4.80 for it. I know these are facts that I speak of. The documents are in Canada to prove them. If, however, a western Canadian jobber went down to Pittsburg and asked the United States Steel Corporation what barbed wire was worth, they would say: "The 'order' price is $3.40." He would ask them: "Can I get some?" They would say: "Where do you live?" He would reply: "I live in Saskatchewan." Then they would say: "All right, you can have it right away at $3.40." They thus flood this country not only with barbed wire, but they dump every other manufactured article which can be shoved into Canada on what is called an "order" price. That has been the unfair policy of the manufacturers of the United States. Some of the large trusts in the United States have tried this two price system on various other commodities. They have applied it on coke, of which they virtually have a monopoly. If you wanted to buy "order" coke, you could get it at $3 a ton, and have it delivered after the war. But if you wanted coke for immediate delivery you had to pay $12 a ton for it. The Government here was negligent in not taking cognizance of the two prices system in the United States, and stopping its application here, but they were more negligent than that, because if a good stiff customs duty were put on those articles it would have brought in to our treasury from seventy to eighty million dollars a year which would have enabled us to pay a hundred million dollars of the four hundred million dollars that we spent annually on the war. In 1916-17, we paid $100,000,000; in 1917-18, we shall pay not more than $50,000,000. If we were able to carry on our taxation in such a way as to pay on this war a hundred million dollars every year, inside of ten years after the termination of the war Canada would be free from all war debt. I am sure that every man who gives a thought to the finances of this country would say that is the proper method of carrying on taxation.

I wish to refer now to other things that are giving us a great deal of trouble. I refer to the proposal to grant the Minister of Trade and Commerce the right to embargo imports. We must do either one of two things. We must make up our minds to go behind the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) as one man and say: We give you full authority, for every year from now until the war is over, to put an embargo upon goods coming into this country from countries that will not trade with us, or else we must insist that the Government take the other method of imposing a stiff tax on goods coming from countries of that description. Otherwise Canada will be on the auction block after the war is over; we shall owe the United States so much money that we shall have to hand over to them British Columbia or Quebec or some other part of the country in payment. The manufacturers of Ontario, when they can meet the American manufacturers in a free market, are not afraid of their competition. In the manufacture of chains, for instance, Canadian manufacturers have discovered a method of making the chains automatically by electrically welding them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What kind of chains?

Mr. CURRIE: Logging chains, cow chains, and other chains of that description, of which a very large quantity is used in the United States and Canada. These Canadian manufacturers went to the United States, and inside of five years, by this new method, put the American chain factories out of the running. That shows what the Canadian manufacturers can do when given a fair chance. Our manufacturers are not behind our soldiers in enterprise, energy or courage, and you know how good our soldiers are. All we want is a fair and square deal. We do not want to be constantly subjected to one-sided unfair competition.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Is the hon. gentleman of the opinion that a protective tariff operating to the advantage of eastern manufacturers operates equally to the advantage of western farmers?

Mr. CURRIE: Certainly it does, because every extra mile the western farmer has

to send his wheat—I am speaking now of after-the-war conditions,—represents a toll on him. If the farmer sold his wheat to the industrial workers nearby, we would save this extra freight, and be that much more in pocket. But there is such a thing as "selling the hide for six pence and buying the tail back for a pound." The whole policy of the United States has been to build up home industries. Patriotic people in Canada are trying to do likewise. I am connected with a firm that has been manufacturing a line of goods that is shipped to the four corners of the earth. They had a large shipment to make to Ceylon and India, and needed jute sacks in which to ship the goods. Hon. gentlemen will hardly believe me when I say that the city of Winnipeg, in competition with every other city in Canada that was asked to bid, took the prize and got the order for the jute sacks; and the jute sacks were made in Winnipeg, shipped to Ontario, and then sent out to Ceylon and India. That is the condition that is going to obtain all over this country. Factories in the West are going to succeed as they are in the East. The province of Ontario has established a great trade with the province of Nova Scotia. There is more business done between those two provinces, I believe, than between any other two provinces in the country, and it is because the province of Nova Scotia with governmental assistance has built up great iron and steel works, and were it not for these works the manufacturers of Ontario would not have been able during the last two years to carry on business for one-half of their time. We had to have pig iron and steel, and we received greater advantages from these works in Nova Scotia. So he would be a very unnatural son of Ontario or of Nova Scotia who would try to set up any barriers or clan hatred between these two provinces.

We must look things in the face. The munitions business at the present time is dying away, and our factories will have to go at other work very soon. I am sorry to say that in many respects the Imperial Munitions Board did not observe Pitt's great maxim that they must make war pay. The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence knew that maxim, and did his best to carry it out. Men in this country who had made decent sums in the manufacture of munitions were thinking of enlarging their factories, but during the last two years the prices imposed by the Munitions Board have been so ridiculously low that these men have taken the orders at a great loss, and many of them have gone out of business and are now ruined. Many of our manufacturers, through lack of munitions orders, are taking their plants out of the country and working them in the United States. If the United States can give an order for one billion three hundred millions dollars worth of munitions to Great Britain, there is no reason why we should not get an order of reasonable size. What is the use of piffling with a forty or fifty million dollar order? That does not cut any figure. Last year we purchased close on to seven hundred million dollars' worth from the United States, and how can we pay for those goods unless we get orders for a similar amount for munitions or goods of one kind or another from the United States? Otherwise we shall have to close up our factories and our working men will go to the States. I am not a munitions manufacturer, so I am not personally interested in the game, but I am intensely interested in the success of my country. We have gone into this war, being a good loyal people, and we are now asking everybody to send their sons to the front under conscription. What do we get out of the war? What does Australia get out of it? She is going to get an Empire in the Pacific; the German empire in the Pacific will go to Australia.

What does South Africa get? She also gets an empire, two empires, in fact in Africa. What does Egypt get? She is doing very little, she gave five million pounds to the war. What is five million pounds in comparison with the amount we are spending on the war? Egypt will get Palestine and Arabia. Italy will get Asia Minor. Every country of the Allies is going to be indemnified except Canada. The indemnity which the United States is looking for is world trade, for they cannot receive any territorial indemnity; neither can we. The only indemnity we can get is a business indemnity. Then, as solid business men, why should we not forget our petty squabbles about what some school man wrote in a book years ago? I heard the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) speaking on free trade last night, and he reminded me of the doctors a thousand years ago disputing on the merits of Aristotelian medicine as against experimental science.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thought we were fighting for ideals and not for business.

Mr. CURRIE: We are fighting for an ideal, and that ideal is freedom, parliamentary freedom. When Strafford stood at the

Bar of the English House of Commons, charged with trying to suppress parliamentary liberties in England, he urged in his defence, "I have given a Parliament to Ireland." What answer did Pym give him? He said, "Parliaments without parliamentary liberties are but a fair and pleasant way to greater servitude." Stick that under your hats, gentlemen. That is a good motto for us in this House. We are fighting for freedom, but we must not forget to have a little eye on what we are going to do at home after the war. We all know that after the American war there was heard all over the country the tramp of the boys in the blue overcoats on all the roads of the United States; they were soldiers out of a job. The outhouses, the fence corners were filled with soldiers begging their bread. The United States immediately grasped the situation and did everything they possibly could by a high tariff to get factories established to give employment to these men. That is why I am calling attention to these matters now.

There will be three or four hundred thousand men coming home after the war, seventy-five per cent of whom are not farmers. Why, at one time at the front, there was a whole battalion of students, most of them in their third or fourth year—the Princess Pats, the brainiest men that ever stood in France.

The Princess Pat men were the highest type of men that ever set foot in France. Our battalions are composed of men of high educational attainments, men who can take their places in the factories, the mines or industrial institutions of the world. Why should we not help these men to secure profitable employment in industrial callings at home, as well as to put them on farms? The majority of these men from Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia are skilled in industrial trades and employments, and if you insist on putting them on farms you are going to impose a very great hardship upon them. Is it not better that we should keep this country on an even keel? We should not build up one industry at the expense of others. In order that these men and their families may have their bread and butter assured to them in the time to come after they leave the army and are disbanded, we should try and make the war pay for itself now, build up factories all over the country so that these men when they come back will have employment and take the places of the women factory workers, because the women in many cases, while filling the men's places for the present, will not continue to work in factories.

It is no use to talk about free trade, because there is no such thing as free trade. No man will stand up before me in this House and say that free trade is a possibility now in Canada for a moment. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) knows very well the facts that stare him in the face. We are face to face with new conditions. With all our patriotism, with all our love of country, with all our love for those men who are now serving at the front, we are surely not going to divest ourselves of all our interest the moment these men come back. Both our interest and our affection should teach us that it is our duty at the present moment to forget all this piffling about protection and free trade. We want to build up a country that will sell its products to the world and buy as little as possible for the time being. We can thus only get out of debt. Let political economy wait until we are past this great crisis. If we do that we will be in a better national position. If a 10 per cent customs tax were imposed on imports we would get at the very least $80,000,000. Nobody would be any the worse for that except those foolish women who buy American boots and those young fellows we see on the streets who are working in munition factories and who like to wear some American collar or tie. Why should we support them in trading abroad?

With reference to our industries, I am almost ashamed to confess that I am a manufacturer, because there is nothing good said of the manufacturers. As long as I have been in this Parliament I have heard nothing but sneers and expressions of scorn directed at the manufacturers. When the history of this war is written, as far as Canada is concerned, it will show that the greatest patriots in any of the allied countries have been the Canadian manufacturers. You may say that their patriotism earned money for them. It did not. When they started to manufacture munitions in England what happened? Lloyd George would go to a manufacturer and say: "You have a fine factory; how many hands do you employ?" "Three hundred hands." "Can you make shells?" "Yes." "Alright; go ahead and make them." "I have not the machinery, and I have not the capital to go on paying wages." "The Government of England will advance money to buy you the latest machinery; it will advance you money as the work progresses to buy your raw material and to pay wages. Then we will give you a price for your munitions which will enable you,

at the end of the year, to scrap every tool you have in the factory and give you a substantial profit." They amortised the plants in the price of the shells. The hon. the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) knows that that is true. Lloyd George, after another year, said: "Gentlemen, have you your plants free?" "Yes." "I will continue the price of munitions on condition that you give me a quarter or a third"—I forget which—"of your profits." Why should they not give him a third of their profits? He had given them a free plant and they were quite willing to give him a fair share of the profits. That is what took place in England. Now, what happened in Canada? When the Imperial Munitions Board was established they said to the manufacturer: "We want you to make shells." The manufacturer said: "I have not any plant." "You will have to get a plant."

Sir SAM HUGHES: We preceded England in that.

Mr. CURRIE: That is right, but it was dropped here when England took over the manufacture through the Imperial Munitions Board. The arrangement which was made by the late Minister of Militia and Defence to start the manufacturers of Canada making munitions, in justice to him, was borrowed by Mr. Lloyd George. There is no doubt about that, and we want to give the hon. gentleman full credit for that. The manufacturers of Canada and England do. But the Imperial Munitions Board said to the manufacturer: "Do you want to make shells?" The manufacturer said: "Yes." "You must get your own plant and put it in." "Alright." The directors of companies went to the banks and the bank directors stretched their imaginations a great deal and lent them the necessary money. But the directors of the companies had to go on the notes personally in almost every case in order that these plants might be put in. The prices for shells were very low, but still there was a margin of profit in it. No sooner had these manufacturers succeeded in showing a slight margin of profit for the first year than everybody in this country started yelling: "You are making too much profit out of this thing; the Government must take your profit." The Government have done so in the form of the supertax which has been imposed. I do not believe there is one out of a hundred corporation directors in this country who sleeps soundly at night. Why? They are a badly abused lot.

[Mr. Currie.]

If they go to the bank to borrow $100,000, they have to get down on their knees before they can get it, although in some cases the banks are very good. Some of the older banks are exceedingly good, but the company directors have to go on the notes of the company. What do they get out of that? If they get a ten dollar fee from their company for a meeting of directors, it is known all over the country. They have to go on the notes of these corporations, and if one fails to make any profit the directors have to make good the loss out of their own pockets. Do the shareholders have to pay that? No, they have paid up stock in their pockets, and like everybody else they have a kick at the directors. This country owes a great debt of gratitude to every director of a public company. If there are any people in Canada who have helped Canada to carry on the war, they are those men who are the directors of public companies and those carrying on manufacturing industries. Yet these men are constantly abused and are looked upon as outcasts, and as being unfit for ordinary society. I am ashamed to see this country forming small factions about this, that and the other thing.

I was the other day reading May, the well known authority on constitutional law, and he says the only safety for a country is partyism, that if you have not partyism you are going to have faction, and government will not be staple but will fall to pieces. Are you going to have in this country factions, differences and class hatreds, the farmer against the manufacturer, the manufacturer against the man who is working for him, and the labourer and the labour union against the manufacturer? Why should we begrudge a fair profit to the man who is at the head of a factory? There is no reason why we should. There is no reason why the directors of corporations and the captains of industry in this country should not be allowed to carry on their business as free, honest men, or why they should be constantly classed as rascals and renegades. It was faction and class hatred that ruined Russia. Where do you get your Victory Loan from?

You do not get it from those people who are going about the country crying down the manufacturers. The working class are sound and I must say for them, they have subscribed to the Victory Loan to the limit of their ability, just the same as any other class. The manufacturer also has subscribed, but in order to enlarge his factory, as is necessary in order to make pro-

vision for the future, he cannot willingly take all the loans you offer him. What is the policy which has been adopted in England? There Lloyd Genrge has done what he could to help the manufacturers, his idea being that war should pay and that their co-operation was necessary towards the winning of the war. It is from these manufacturers he is getting money for his loans. The same policy is pursued in Germany where the government have aided the manufacturers to develop their industries, believing that in so doing they were helping to win the war. The Germans do not buy abroad, and buying at home use paper money. As long as they do this they can go on indefinitely. In this country, however, no man can make a dollar but what everybody joins in an attack upon him. I think it is time that sort of conduct was stopped.

There is another phase of the Budget I wish to discuss, and that is the railway situation. Let me say that it is one of the most dangerous issues this country has to meet at the present moment. The war of the railroads in Canada is far greater than the war of Great Britain on Germany at the present moment. It is well known to members who sat with me on this side of the House in the last Parliament, that we urged the policy on the Government of following the example of the Government of Great Britain and relieving the railroads from the possibility of giving us any trouble during the war. What happened in Great Britain when the war broke out? There one-third of the railways were excursion lines and could not earn a dollar. Many of the large roads could carry on, but very few of the small ones could. The British Government very wisely called the heads of all these railways together and said to them: "Form a board. Every railway in Great Britain is going into this board, and the directors will manage all the systems as one concern. All the money that comes in will be pooled in one pool, and the Government will see that every shareholder gets a return equivalent to what he has been receiving on his investment for the past three years." That was a very successful idea. For three years the Government of Great Britain successfully carried on the railways in that way, Although I cannot say what the results of last year's operations were, they have increased the earnings of the employees from time to time by what they call war bonuses. That is, instead of an increase in wages the Government would give them a war bonus of ten per cent. In that way, as the cost of food went up the railwaymen's earnings kept pace with it, and the Government have done that after attending to all the wants of the debenture holders and the shareholders. Not only so, but the Government have carried free on those railways all their munitions and all the men that they needed at the front. We know that in 1914 all the British and all the Canadian soldiers got a free ticket on the railways to go and visit the localties where they came from, and it didn't cost the Government a farthing. We suggested the same thing should be done here, but the interests had too much control. For some reason, although many of us, including some able men, tried to do our best to get that policy carried out, we failed. The Government, however, succeeded in running us into a debt of thirty or forty millions a year that we have to pay, for these railways. No wonder the United States does not want to finance this country at the present moment, bearing in mind the improvident and wasteful policy we have pursued with railways. What has the United States Government done? The very moment they were involved in war they followed exactly the same course as Great Britain; they established a War Board to control their railways exactly as Great Britain has done, and they are putting men of business ability at the head of their great departments. I have no hesitation in saying that if we had placed ourselves at the beginning of the war in the same condition as Great Britain did and given the management of our railways to that great Canadian, Lord Shaughnessy, he would have established operating traditions on all our roads. The first tradition that would have been emphasised on the employees would have been honesty, from the water-boy right up to the president. The second tradition that Lord Shaughnessy would have developed in the course of three weeks after he had taken charge, would have been loyalty to the road. Travel on the Canadian Pacific railway and say anything to a brakesman or a water-boy derogatory to that road and the first thing you get is a sharp rebuff. That is loyalty. Every man feels that he is a part of that great machine, that he is doing a great public duty, and a great public service. He is not looking round to see if he can slink off and steal an hour from his employers, or get away into a corner and hide himself, but is doing his utmost to earn his pay. If we could have such a fine spirit established on every Canadian railroad there

would be inaugurated a reign of operating traditions that would be worth millions of dollars to the future trade of this country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Resuming). Mr. Speaker, when six o'clock was called I was entering into a discussion of the second great difficulty facing the people of this country. The first is the war; that is our greatest danger. The second dark cloud on the horizon is the railway question. It does seem to me that it is impossible for us to get rid of the railway question which is eating into our resources and our vitals every year. Every year they come to this House we have to vote from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 of the people's money to railways; it has gone out in an endless stream; for eight or ten years we have been throwing out these golden life-lines to rescue the railway capitalists from oblivion.

Now, we have railways and railways in this country. I took occasion to refer to the President of the Canadian Pacific railway as one to whom along with other able men from the other roads we could safely have entrusted the control and operation of our railway system during the war. We could have given them instructions to the following effect: For goodness sake do not let these railways come to the people or this House clamouring for more of the people's money until after the war is over. That is not what happened, and every year we are asked for more money, and we are shortly going to be asked again. Mr. Speaker, it took a little energy on the part of some of us here to get a move on as far as the Government was concerned to see that aid was sent to our men in the trenches; it seemed to me and to others that there was rather a hanging back, and we had to bring the matter before the House in a very urgent manner. But now the House is to be closed up in two or three days, possibly adjourned by Order in Council, in order that there may be an expedition over to England to rescue another railway over there. That does seem absurd to me in the face of the tragedy which is taking place in Europe. However, the facts stare us in the face, and the railway situation has to be solved.

Let me briefly go over the railway question. The Government of the day is not to blame originally for the situation; neither is the previous Government to blame. I must say, so far as what was done under the Liberal Government is concerned, that I believe the people to a large extent were to blame. First, there was a great expansion in the West, and a large number of men who were not legitimate farmers—I have every confidence in the legitimate farmer in the West, who is a hard-headed man—real estate boomers, and men wanting to live by their wits, started a great propaganda that the West must have more railways. They were never contented. When one was built they wanted another. Their latest proposition was the Hudson Bay railway. When this started the country was being rapidly provided with branch line railways, both by the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern. But that would not do; these propagandists must mave another transcontinental. I have seen maps showing no less than four or five transcontinental railways hanging in the Railway Committee of this House, and a dozen lines to Hudson bay and Greenland. A transcontinental railway was started as an adjunct of the Grand Trunk. This road as first proposed was to keep fifty or sixty miles away from the other railways, so that it would be a colonization road as well as a road for through traffic. The proposal passed the House, and arrangements were made to finance it. But when it came to construction, that road was so located that from its eastern terminal up as far as Edmonton a good cannon shot could not be fired from one line without danger of injuring the other, so closely were the existing railways duplicated. I took occasion in 1909, when the question was discussed in this House, to point out to the Minister of Railways and Canals, Hon. George P. Graham, that great duplication was proposed by that road, and that if the West was to be served properly the railway should be projected in another direction before it was too late. He laughed at me, and said: "We are not building railways for colonization and pioneering any more; that day has passed; we are building competitive railways." Well, we built that line as a competitive line, and the people of this country are paying for it through the nose. What has happened? As I said, the Grand Trunk has paralleled every other road in the West. Instead of keeping forty or fifty miles from other main lines, establishing new centres and building up a traffic of their own as the other roads had done, they wanted to dig in and divide the

traffic at every important point. And the farmers of the West to-day are just as far away from railway communication, so far as that road is concerned, as they were before it started.

Then the road was built through the Rockies. I have been over that road. The country was given the impression that it was a tremendous physical undertaking to put the road through the Yellowhead Pass. The road through the Rockies, with the exception of ten or fifteen miles near Hazleton, is as smooth as this floor right clean to Prince Rupert; it goes through a valley all the way. I remember the propaganda. All the press said that it was a terrible undertaking to run the line along the valley of the Skeena river. That valley is not half as impassable as the valley of the Ottawa river is in some places. I am told that the first fourteen miles of that road cost nearly a million dollars a mile. The contractors who built it from Edmonton to Winnipeg charged this country fifty-seven thousand dollars a mile over level prairie. Somebody got seven or eight million dollars out of that. Those who built the Canadian Pacific railway worked out their profits with fear and trembling years afterwards, in their effort to build up a utility that would be of some benefit to the community. But the men intimately connected with the promotion of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway wanted their money quickly, and they got it. So we have that road, paralleling the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific, and our own railway, the Intercolonial, built in such a way that in many places it is just impossible to use it as a two-way road. We cannot run trains one way by one route and back by another railway, because the lines are not sufficiently close together, and yet they are never sufficiently far apart to help the country; it is a case of neither fish, flesh, nor red herring. In the Railway Committee yesterday a man was charged with being a bad actor because he borrowed $11,000 from a bank to build four miles of railway. I felt constrained to say that I was sorry he had not been a promoter of some of our roads; we would have got the work done so much cheaper.

And then the Canadian Northern Railway people decided that they must have a through route. They had built up a railway in the mid-West which, to my mind, compared very favourably with some of the best roads in the United States. Their traffic system and their methods of operation very much resembled those of the Illinois Central, one of the most prosperous roads in the United States, the Delaware and Hudson, and other roads of that character. Wherever there was good traffic and a good line in those three Prairie Provinces, there you found the Canadian Northern railway. They came to the head of the lakes, delivered the traffic to boats, were doing an enormous business, and were getting wealthy. Then the cry arose throughout the West that the Canadian Northern should be extended to the Atlantic coast on the one hand and to the Pacific coast on the other. Almost everybody in the country had the transcontinental bug in his head. While this was going on, numerous applications were made in the Railway Committee for charters for the construction of other transcontinental railway lines. Any number of maps must be stowed away on the musty shelves of the Railway Committee room showing that not less than eight or ten different roads of that kind were projected. Hundreds of dollars were paid in to the Railway Committee by these promoters for charters and we took their money without batting an eye. Of all the charters that were granted in the West, outside of those of Mackenzie and Mann, the Canadian Pacific, and the Grand Trunk only about twelve miles of road were built by private enterprise—and the man who promoted the construction of these twelve miles is in the asylum. So the Canadian Northern commenced the construction of a transcontinental road, starting from Fort William east—and you could jump from the Canadian Pacific tracks to those of the Canadian Northern all the way to Nipigon. They thought that they had a wonderful find in the Nipigon falls, so they diverted the railway up to these falls, so they diverted the railway up to these falls through the gorge and then started east to catch up with the Canadian Pacific as quickly as they could and to keep on paralleling. This they did around Sudbury, and they continued on to Toronto, at no point more than a mile or a mile and one-half from the other line, but just so far away that you could not use the two tracks as a double track line. Then they came east from Toronto to this part of the country, and hon. gentlemen who have travelled over that road to Toronto know very well that for miles you could almost cover with a blanket the lines of the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern, in most places you could throw a stone from any one of the tracks to any other. Then they went east and built lines in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton and Que-

bec; wherever they could find a subsidy they were prepared to build a road and bond it—and now we have to pay the piper.

They went to British Columbia also on the principle that they must get an outlet on that coast. It was argued that elevators were to be built and that all the grain of the western provinces was to be sent from the Pacific coast around the Horn and the Cape of Good Hope to feed the Englishmen. Of course they never dreamed that when the grain crossed the equator the midge fly and the maggot would get into it; that every bushel of wheat which goes over the equator must be specially treated and disinfected in order that it may be transported without injury. That was all forgotten; there was millions on the Pacific coast, they thought, for any enterprising promoter who went there. So the road went from Edmonton through the Yellowhead Pass, never more than one hundred or two hundred yards from the National Transcontinental that we are sweating blood to pay for. The line went as far west as the other side of Prince George. They thought they could get a lot of fine scenery that way; they turned down and took some of the scenery from the Canadian Pacific. As a matter of fact, I suppose the Canadian Pacific would have been glad to give them the heavy grades along the Thompson and Fraser rivers. They paralleled the Canadian Pacific down the Fraser valley, the Canadian Pacific on one side of the creek and the Canadian Northern on the other, and they landed at Vancouver. If it were possible to operate any of these roads as a double-track line, a great deal of trouble would be saved, operating expenses would be reduced, a smaller working staff would be sufficient, and less equipment would be required. The grades could be readjusted on the up-and-down tracks. One staff of superintendents and operators and one private car to trot round the country in, instead of three or four, would be sufficient. We find ourselves in a difficulty so far as these roads are concerned; we have to provide money; and there will be great difficulty in synchronizing operation. I always like to find historical parallels for peculiar incidents in history, but I cannot find in any country in the world a case that at all parallels that of Mackenzie and Mann. A man by the name of Law blew certain bubbles in France, but he did not constantly bleed the people because they benefited by his operations in the establishment of banks. He left the Bank of England and the Bank of France. He blew the South Sea bubble in England; but these Mackenzie and Mann bubbles beat anything I ever saw or heard of in history. We are stuck for something like $25,000,000 a year for these gentlemen. When anything ever happens around the corridors of any legislative body in this country they have a lot of lawyers versed in the art of talking to members, and if you are a newly-elected member a very smooth gentleman offers you a cigar, gets into conversation with you and after a while wants to know your views on granting Mackenzie and Mann $50,000,000 of a bonus, or something of that kind. They operate amongst public men, the legislatures of the provinces and the Parliament of Canada. There is hardly a mile from the Behring sea to the trenches in France would fail to disclose wrecks strewn by these two men. Everything that they touch has blown up. At first their stocks went flying up like a kite, and when the public set in and woke up they had nothing but the stick left. Take the street railway in Winnipeg, the stock of which at one time was about 200, and is now down to about 50. When they owned the Toronto street railway the stock went up to 150 or 180; to-day it is down to 50. They are out. Wrecks all the way—saw mills, coal mines, trawlers, saw mill companies, whaling companies. I am informed that the coal lands on Vancouver island for all time will be obliged to earn an extra tax of something like $2.50 a ton because of the operations of Mackenzie & Mann. Now they are broken, they say, and they want more money. Nobody seems to know where they lost their money, what latitude or longitude, but they want more.

This country has entered into an agreement with them now to pay $10,000,000 for the rights of a road which is really in real financial difficulties. We have to take care of it by issuing short-term notes, and when we do get it, we shall hardly know what to do with this white elephant. No doubt, Mackenzie & Mann will come down to Ottawa after we pay them and want it back. I am credibly informed that those gentlemen are still in control of the Canadian Northern railway. I would have thought, when this country has used Mackenzie & Mann so well and has agreed to arbitrate their equity in the stock, a question which we really did not need to arbitrate at all, because we could have taken over the road under a mortgage; when we are so willing to hand them over $10,000,000, if they can only show us a reasonable

excuse for doing so—and some of their excuses are rather flimsy—that they would have the good grace to step out of the directorate and management of the company pending the conclusion of that investigation. I am told that Mackenzie & Mann are still in control of the Canadian Northern and direct its resources and enterprises. Furthermore, I understand that a very strong effort is being made to see that the control of the Consolidated Railway Companies of Canada is put into the hands of Sir William Mackenzie as general manager. This will need an Order in Council but the people of this country will rise in rebellion if anything of that kind occurs. We are tired of those gentlemen and their exploits. I have nothing personally against either of them. As a clannish Highland Scotchman, I would like to see them succeed. They have not, however, shown the slightest evidence of ability to manage public affairs, except to plunder the people. If a man had a good steam sawmill at any place along their line, they were not satisfied until they put another one in and beat him out of what he had. If a man had a coal yard out of which he was making money, they would put in another coal yard and destroy his business. It was nothing but a record of wrecks, as I said, from the Behring sea to the trenches. It is very hard for me to make these statements, but I have to speak the truth. It is difficult for a public man to tell the truth as he should do in a public place like this, but I am stating facts. We have to handle their derelicts. We have to pump the water out of those floating hulks of theirs. We have to get them into some shape again, and if we are going to do that, let us put in charge of them somebody who has business ability, and let us see that the road is properly managed and is not to continue a streak of rust as it is at present.

What is the condition of the National Transcontinental, which is another problem we have to face? For a number of years I handled the financial Bills of the Grand Trunk Railway in the House of Commons, and I shall say this, that under the management then of Mr. Hays, and those men who came here, especially Mr. Wainwright, an effort was made to put the old Grand Trunk on a first-class financial footing. Those men made that effort. They saw their troubles; they started in to pay up all their debts with debenture stock, which did not carry a mortgage against the road at all. Those debentures were sold in England, and as bonds matured the mortgages were taken off that road until, at one period, before they started financing for the new railway in the West, I think there was only something like $8,000,000 worth of bonds against the whole road. That was a very small amount, the road being at that time valued at between fifty and sixty million dollars. That was a splendid example of financing, unequalled by any other road on the American continent at that time; but they got into the flotation business, the transcontinental fever, and they agreed to finance the greater portion of those roads in the West which connect with the Grand Trunk Railway. The result is that the shareholders of the Grand Trunk are now so much involved that it is almost hopeless for those who hold the debentures ever to expect to receive a dividend. Did this country put the shareholders in that position? No. Their own directors, whom they appointed with their own votes, put them into that difficulty. That road, or a portion of it, must be taken over, and, as far as I am concerned, I think the only solution of the matter is to deal fairly with those shareholders and take over the whole road. The East will then, if it is properly managed, take care of the West; it will help the West. The tremendous arteries the Grand Trunk has running into every town and village of the East, coupled with the western connections and the similar web of the Canadian Northern in the West—those two gigantic webs joined together will, to my mind, pay and can be made to pay.

Last year, however, we found ourselves in the face of a peculiar difficulty. Those roads were constantly running into debt, and the Canadian Pacific was constantly making money. Instead of adopting the plan in existence in the United States of pooling the roads, we must adopt some expedient, and the expedient adopted was to raise the rates on those roads by 15 per cent. As a shipper, I do not see anything wrong in an additional freight rate of ten or fifteen per cent, because we must realize that the cost of operating those roads has tremendously increased. The price of coal has risen to almost three times its former cost; steel has advanced to an equal extent; rails which formerly could be secured for $28, now cost $70; locomotives that formerly cost $20,000, now cost $55,000. You see, therefore, the tremendous operating difficulties those railways had to bear. But

above all that, there was the human element. The men who had gone into the employment of those roads years ago, especially the men who were in the machine shops, were affected. Formerly, if they received twenty-five to thirty cents an hour for working in the roundhouses, repairing locomotives, running lathes, they considered they were well paid, and they were then a well paid class of mechanics. But, the manufacture of munitions was commenced in this country, and any man who could handle a lathe could earn from sixty to seventy cents an hour. Many of the railwaymen, as a matter of patriotism and principle, stuck to the roads, although they saw some of their comrades getting employment in the munition factories at three times their wages. No attempt was made to give these faithful employes a war-time bonus, because the roads were really losing money on their own operations, as they were unable to keep up their betterments; they could not afford to pay war bonuses to their workmen because they were going in the hole all the time on account of cars and locomotives being smashed. I do not think fifteen per cent of an increase in the freight rates was too much. A year ago I made a calculation that, if an advance of fifteen per cent was made, it would take care of all the difficulties with which we had to contend in connection with our roads; it would pay the additional wages that the men who were faithful to the roads should receive during the war, and it would enable us to carry on and avoid debt. The difficulty then was to deal with the Canadian Pacific. Had the Canadian Pacific been taken hold of; had they been offered the same earnings as they had been receiving in previous years, and their earnings put under their own management in a pool, we would not have had this difficulty of having to hand over, through the operation of this fifteen per cent increase, a large sum of money to the Canadian Pacific, and then levy, in my opinion, a very illegal tax in order to take it back. I cannot find, in my study of modern economics, a single case where a company or an individual has been taxed a large sum of money by Order in Council such as the arrangement made with the Canadian Pacific. The Canadian Pacific has been, during the war, a great national asset, and every dollar of profit that that road has made during the war, has been invested by it in war securities. In addition to that, thousands and millions of dollars that this road had on deposit in New York and elsewhere has been invested in war securities. I cannot see how we are going to go along. Something, I suppose, must be done with the Grand Trunk, but we must bear in mind that, as a Parliament and as a people of Canada, we are under no obligation to the directorate or shareholders of the Grand Trunk. Let us also bear in mind, what those of us who have dealt with England even during the war realize, and that is that, so far as the English are concerned, there is very little sentiment in business. I do not think, if we had any enterprise in England that blew up, that we could for one minute go to the English Government and ask them to recoup us for the money we had lost. They would laugh at us. So I do not see why we should indulge in any heroics over the British shareholders of the Grand Trunk if we take that road over. Furthermore, if we take over the Canadian Northern railway, I cannot see how we would be justified in paying Mackenzie and Mann millions of dollars in cash, and I think that as long as the war lasts, and for at least five years thereafter, Mackenzie and Mann or the Grand Trunk will be doing well if they get a fair rate of interest on what they are to be paid, without sending us into the market to borrow ten or twenty million dollars more for railways. It is hard for us to see our way clear in the matter of the railways of this country, but the United States and Great Britain have blazed the trail, and I think we should carefully consider what they have done before taking any action here.

The next thing I desire to say a word about is our foreign trade. If we are going to take our place with other nations we must not live to ourselves alone. We must establish a great foreign trade, and I think we shall have a great foreign trade outside of our natural products. It is only a few years since this country was sending millions of cords of pulpwood into the United States. Canadians were then simply hewers of wood and drawers of water. All they got was an axeman's wages of twenty-five dollars a month to produce the raw material for the mills on the other side. But the province of Ontario saw the light and put an embargo on the shipment of logs from the lands of the province, compelling the manufacture of that raw material in Canada. The neighbouring province of Quebec followed suit, with the result that to-day we have in that way established one of the greatest industries of this coun-

try, and one that is bound to bring millions of dollars annually into this country. I would be the last man to say: "Let us bleed these great concerns out of their last dollar." They must continue to build and to increase their plants if they are to keep up with business. Nobody who has studied the industrial history of the United States and considered the reports that have been made on that industry by British commissions, and especially the book on the life of Carnegie, by his own secretary, can escape the conclusion, which is proved by statistics, that during the period of expansion in the United States, the average profits of industry were thirty-five or thirty-six per cent. The proprietors received as a return six or seven per cent, and the balance went into the building of great factories. How otherwise could such enormous plants as the Carnegie Steel Company have been built in the States? There are in this country a great many concerns which have had a small beginning, and out of their earnings have reared enormous concerns employing from ten to fifteen thousand people. We must remember that if Canada is going to be a great country in the future we must allow for a large margin of profit or for something of that kind. We cannot go and borrow any money from England, or a five cent piece from the United States, with which to build factories. So I think the State, in adjusting its taxation, should be liberal in dealing with these industries who re-invest their profits in plant. If they put their added profits into new construction and new machinery and employ more people, they are doing as much benefit to the country, and possibly more, than if they handed that money over for the purposes of the war. They are building for the future.

What is going to occur after the war, when our outside trade will be threatened by the freedom of the seas? There is no freedom of the seas just now. The ships we have built for our inland waters and to carry our products across the ocean to foreign countries, are now carrying munitions and war supplies for our Allies. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) is endeavouring to get as many ships built as possible in Canada. There is but one thing in connection with that which I think we should reconsider. We are advancing $30,000,000 or $40,000,000—I do not know the exact amount—to the Imperial Munitions Board to built package freighters for the ocean, and those package freighters are being handed over to the British Government. I would insist that if we advance that money, and the ships are handed over to the Allies for the purposes of the war, they should be returned to this country after the war to look after our trade. I think that is only reasonable. We know very well what England is going to do with the ships she has built for war purposes. After the war they will be turned over to the large British shipping corporations to compensate them for ships which have been lost during the war. And I repeat, we should insist on the ships we loan to our Allies for the purposes of the war being returned to this country and coming under the Canadian flag when the war is over. Unless we do that, we shall have no guarantee that we will be able to carry on business with any foreign country except Great Britain. Is it necessary for us to do business with any other country but Great Britain? As one who has some idea of the amount of foreign trade that is being done at the present moment by Canada, I say unhesitatingly that if we had twenty-four ships at our disposal now, it would go a long way towards recouping ourselves for the war. It would enable us to take at least one-third of the pre-war German trade in India, Ceylon, Java, and other points on the Pacific ocean, Peru, Chili, the West Indies, and especially in South Africa where we have a preference. We have no ships now worth speaking of, trading with these ports. They have been taken away and I think we should make some arrangement whereby a certain number of our ships should be released as soon as possible to carry on our business with these countries. Our business in many cases is already established. Half a dozen ships do not amount to much to Great Britain, but they would assist us materially in carrying our manufactured products to these countries now; and that is something which is very much needed. We used to have a line of steamers running to the Bermudas and the Bahamas and they did a large trade. The people in those islands are now without our ships and are suffering very much. However, I leave it to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because I know his business instincts will see that so far as our business with those countries is concerned, justice will be done. I am speaking in this manner not by way of criticism, but to assist the minister by pointing to those Imperial merchants who are just as anxious to hog as much of Canada's trade as of anybody else's, and so that he can

say to them when they start hogging our trade and our ships, "There are men to-day in the Parliament of Canada who do not appreciate your walking off with our business and taking ships that are not necessary." I have been informed that some of our ships which have been taken over by the British authorities for the purpose of transporting munitions and food lay for weeks in the harbours of the United States without cargoes. One ship, I understand, lay in New York harbour for six weeks and then had to be taken back again by this Government to its owners, and from the noise that went up there you would have thought there was only one ship left in the Anglo-Saxon fleet, and that we were taking that one over. We must do things in a business-like way. Canada is not a crown colony. We are prepared to pay our way and more than pay our way. We are prepared to finance this war and grow the grain the Allies need in this war and wait for our pay. Where can you get anybody else to do that? That being so, I insist that justice must be done in the allotment of ships, to enable us to carry on our former business, unless it is absolutely impossible.

The ministers of this Government must have a very difficult time. There is always suspicion on account of their political leanings in the past. They are constantly confronted with new problems, and every interest will be trying to pull them in various directions. Members of Parliament on both sides of the House are critical, perhaps a little too much so, but so far as I am concerned, I want it understood that my criticism is made in no carping spirit. In a free Parliament, and a great Parliament such as we have here, it is the duty of every member to speak out and give his views instead of sitting behind and grumbling. The proper thing is to come to the front and say what you want to say. I have endeavoured to keep out of politics and follow the straight path as a Conservative Unionist. But, I am sorry to say that some of the press are trying to make it exceedingly difficult for any member of the great party to which I belong, the Liberal Conservative party, to be a minister of the Union Government in this country. I am referring to the Unionist press. The Conservative party supplies at least sixty-five per cent of the support of this Government. I was ashamed the other day to see in the Globe newspaper, which professes great friendship for the Unionist party, a mean and contemptible attack on my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) who happens unfortunately, like myself, to be a Tory. I do not think it is fair. I am ready to take all the blows I get, but when a man is endeavouring to do his duty in a very difficult situation I think that some credit should be given to him and the paper which would be the last to criticise him would be a paper of the opposite party in the Union Government. We want fair play in these things.

The food situation in Canada is critical and the food department of the Government is receiving a tremendous lot of criticism. It is very difficult to decide what to do under the circumstances. But, if the Government is willing to lend an ear to anything I say, and in this I am only voicing the sentiments of the country, I would favour fixing maximum prices for the principal food commodities so that the poor man will know how to adjust his breakfast table to the market. Prices have gone far too high. We fixed the price for wheat never expecting that oats and barley would, through some remarkable process, appreciate in value to such an extent as to reach a higher figure than wheat. Give the farmer whatever is the right price for his wheat and adjust the prices also of the other commodities according to that scale. In Great Britain they have had to come to fixed prices. In this country we are paying 37 cents a pound for oleomargarine while in the Old Country the advertised price is 27 cents a pound. The same applies to foods of other kinds such as meal, flour, etc. Why is it that you have to go to the United States to import corn in the face of an adverse trade balance in order to meet some requirement of the food controller that we shall not eat white bread? I do not see anything sensible in that. The food controller is collecting taxes under an Order in Council. He is selling a monopoly to a woman who serves a cup of tea in the morning to her boarders; he makes her take out a license. The regulations are so intricate that you cannot tell whether you are breaking the law if you sit down to a meal. Let the regulations be simplified as in the United States. There they have their meatless day and on that day they know they cannot eat meat. Monday is a meatless day and they refrain from eating meat on that day. Tuesday will be a wheatless day and they will not eat any bread that contains wheat on that day. I am unable to say whether we have a wheatless day or not. But, I do know that these regulations are very confusing, that I have

been receiving bunches of correspondence from farmers in my constituency asking such questions as this: "Is it true that I am contravening the law by eating pork or bread on Wednesday?" To my mind, all these confusing regulations are not in keeping with the spirit of the times. I do not offer any criticism of the Food Controller, excepting that. If Parliament is to give him the right to collect taxes, let it be brought into this House in the form of a Bill and let us put a law on the statute-book. I am quite willing to vote for it and I do not think a single member will raise an objection, but let us carry on our business in the proper way. Let us be straight with the people. I do not know but what I am going to find an order issued under an Order in Council some morning sending me down to Halifax or some place else. I do not say this in criticism. I am only repeating exactly what every man in the country, from one end of it to the other, is saying. Orders in Council? Why not give us an Order in Council to put 10 per cent on the customs imports and perhaps that would be a reasonable measure. We would get $70,000,000 in that way. That would be an order worth while. In order not to further detain the House on this particular question, I want to give notice that I intend to discuss the question of Orders in Council the first time we go into Committee of Supply. If nobody else does it I will.

Now, I have offered some criticism to the Government and I trust they will take it in good part. I trust they will take counsel together in these matters. It is well that the Government has somebody sitting behind it to say some of these things because many people think my way and if nobody offered criticism against free trade proposals the first thing we would know every factory in this country would be closed. If nobody offered any criticism in regard to railway rates and other matters concerning the railways the first thing we would know this Parliament House would be occupied by the railways and we would be all out of business. Somebody has to speak against these things and I think it is the duty of members on this side of the House to express their views just as much as it is that of members of the Opposition and perhaps their word will carry more weight.

I trust that members of this House will take into their consideration that we should do everything we can at this time to stop all this snarling, contemptible agitation and class hatred of various kinds. Do you not think it is time that we all got together? Quebec is doing its duty now in so far as the war is concerned. There was snarling between Quebec and Ontario, but we know, and everybody knows, that Quebec and Ontario are inevitably husband and wife and they cannot be permanently separated. There is always, however, a nasty hard man who is sticking his nose into our affairs, like Bourassa or Lavergne, and trying to cause trouble at the fireside. Let us get rid of all these trouble-makers, and let us unite behind this Government to win the war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They have lost the wedding ring.

Mr. CURRIE: They have not lost the wedding ring. The man who says so says what is untrue, because the ring is not lost. These two peoples must live alongside of each other, and if they are going to live alongside of each other they must have mutual respect for each other. I can never lose my respect for the French Canadians. I deplored the situation in Quebec with regard to the war, because I knew what a false position some politicians were putting the men from Quebec in, virtually branding them as cowards. When you have a man of French Canadian blood voluntarily interposing his body between you and the enemy, you can never have a hatred of the people of his race. I very much regret the feelings that have been engendered, but I hope that is all over. I hope we will all look forward to the time after this war is over when every man who has served his country in the war will be happily employed in his customary avocation and that we shall see him during his leisure in the evening of his life, sitting in peace beneath his own vine at home enjoying that rest which he has so well earned, because he has fought for the liberties of the world, and he, more than any one who has not taken part in the struggle, recognizes what the liberty of the world means. We want Canada to be a great country—to be not only a great country from the military standpoint, but great, also, agriculturally and industrially, because we have the motive power necessary to bring that about. We can put power on the belt of our industrial machines at a rate equivalent to coal at $1 a ton, and there is no country in the world where coal will ever again be as low in price as $1 a ton. We are going to be a great farming country, why cannot we be equally as great industrially? We are a military nation, why cannot we be also great in a truly national sense? Why can

9 p.m.

we not stop this constant stirring up of class hatred, this continuous snarling of one race against the other, and of one business against another, and become a truly united people worthy, in every sense of the term, of those brave men whose blood is to-day being shed so plentifully for our sake, and for the sake of all that we hold most dear in life?

M. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Jacques-Cartier) (translation): Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to preface the few remarks I am about to make by the last words fallen from the lips of my learned friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Currie) the hon. gentleman said: "Quebec and Ontario are inevitably husband and wife and they cannot be permanently separated," I am quite willing Sir, to contract marriage with the province of Ontario, but under one condition, namely, that Ontario shall deal justly with me. Husband and wife, forsooth! After marrying an Englishman, I would not be allowed to speak French; that is to say, being his wife, I would be denied the right of speaking my mother-tongue. Or else, I might not be able to speak English, and he might not understand French. How well we would understand one another, at the fireside! How nicely we would live together! He would say: "How dearly I love you, my wife, but take good care you do not speak French.

How sad such a match would be.

It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to make such remarks and say: "Let us live in peace, let us love one another, let us protect one another"; and then, when the question of the French language comes up, to say: "Cut it out, amputate the French tongue, do not speak French in the Ontario Schools, it is a crime." And the hon. gentleman talks about harmony, peace, toleration, "bonne entente". Let him first of all, begin by telling his fellow-countrymen. Let us mete out justice to the province of Quebec; let us grant the French Canadians full freedom to speak their mother tongue and practice their religion in the province of Ontario." And then we will talk about making love, an dthe courtship may perhaps result in wedlock.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to represent the mighty county of Jacques Cartier, the most beautiful, the most important, the most wealthy and the most populous in the Dominion.

Since the last election I have moved to Jacques-Cartier as a member of Parliament. I was sorry to leave Montcalm, for the old Administration had given full justice to the voters I had the honour of representing. I had got from them a great number of public works, a post office, several bridges, good roads, a railway, all sorts of things had been given me by the old Administration which was well-off financially, and as I said I was sorry to leave Montcalm; when that constituency was joined to l'Assomption county, there were two Liberal members, one representing Montcalm—myself—the other representing l'Assomption, my honourable colleague, Mr. Séguin. So I was asked to run in Jacques Cartier the old fortress of the Conservative Party, the old constituency of the ex-Minister of Public Works, the late Honourable F. D Monk. That gentleman represented Jacques Cartier from 1896 to his death, with honour to himself and a little benefit to his constituents. He was a good man, an honost man, a distinguished man, a lawyer of sterling worth.

Since 1878, the year of the famous contests between the late ex-Minister of Justice, Hon. Rodolphe Laflamme and the former M.P., the former Judge of the Supreme Court the late Hon. Désiré Girouard, from 1877 up to the death of Mr. Monk the election speeches in Jacques Cartier were always along this line: "You need a bridge from St. Anne to Ile Perrot and from Ile Perrot to Vaudreuil"—they spoke of two bridges. At every election this same appeal was trotted out and the voters were promised that if the candidate was elected he ;would move heaven and earth to have both these bridges erected.

Mr Speaker, when I see the millions and millions that are being asked of this House for things which are not indispensable and not a cent in the Estimates for the construction of these bridges, what must I think?

Mr. Monk went through many contests, from 1896 to his death, always victorious, always elected with a big majority, and always promising his electors to have these two bridges built.

When he became Minister of Public Works, the people began to feel easier, they began to expect that the bridges would be built, since their representative occupied the most important portfolio in the Government. All in vain; nothing was done. Millions upon millions were voted for all sorts of undertakings, but nary a cent for the St. Anne bridge nor for the Ile Perrot bridge.

In a way, I followed the example of my predecessors. I almost promised that these bridges would be built; but if I had known that the Administration we have at present would not include an item in the Estimates for the erection of these bridges, I am not

sure that I would have been willing to run in that county.

If I must face again the voters of Jacques Cartier without these bridges having been constructed, what shall their opinion be of your humble servant? They will certainly point out: "Sir, you are no improvement on our former representatives, who made us the same promises as you did, but who in the like manner failed to make good. You promised us to make every effort and sacrifice, as in the case of the electors of Montcalm, and we blindly believed in your word."

As soon as this House prorogues, Mr. Speaker, I will begin an electoral tour, and when I will tell my constituents, as I will be forced to, that I failed in having a sufficient amount placed in the Estimates for the erection of these two bridges, what shall they think of me? Being a lawyer, I will endeavour to make the best plea possible, but I can assure you, Sir, that they expect a full account from me, because, as I have already stated, these two bridges must be constructed. How can we conceive that, since the Confederation to this date, when millions and hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended for public works of all kinds, Montreal, the Queen of this Dominion, still remains isolated? How can we imagine that even to-day it is impossible to leave the Island of Montreal by any other means of communication than by row-boat? People are fully served if they can afford to walk, but transportation of this kind is not of a ready use with a heavy load. A light parcel, a suit-case, or other small articles can easily be carried in a row-boat, but transportation becomes impracticable in the case of an automobile; it is better not to take any chance, for it would mean a straight diving to the bottom. The county of Jacques Cartier, as well as Ste. Anne de Bellevue, for years a town, with a great population, having within its limits most important buildings, such as the Macdonald College, located in the neighbourhood, and for which were freely expended millions over millions of dollars, and which is every year visited by thousands of people from all parts of the country, are nevertheless bereft of means of communication. In order to reach that town, one must cross from Ste. Anne de Bellevue to Vaudreuil, by way of Perrot Island in a row-boat. You may point out that railways are available. Granted. However, the big bug, the powerful, the rich would certainly not be satisfied with it, on account of smoke. Further, we do not enjoy so great a freedom in railway cars, being unable to go back at will. We cannot travel along in private with beautiful women of our choice. and whose company we crave. In a word, we are somewhat interfered with, whereas in motor-car we leave and return at as early or late an hour as it suits our own convenience, nobody being on the spot to peep or gaze. Well, Mr. Speaker, I state and hold that these two bridges must necessarily be built from a triple, commercial, intellectual and moral point of view.

It is with great pleasure and pride that a large hospital is now being erected by the Government at Sainte-Anne de Bellevue, and I must especially congratulate the Government who was so well inspired as to construct such an important hospital near the limits of the County which I have the honour to represent in this House, and this would seem to me an additional reason why honourable ministers here present should make all their endeavours to decide and hasten the erection of these bridges. The building of Charlemagne bridge, which was less necessary, whatever may be said in that connection, was carried out. but it was under the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The Brandon bridge was also erected to replace the old one, built years before, and which was moved twice a year, in the fall, lest it should be crushed by ice, and in the spring at the time of the freshet. Now, if Sir Wilfrid so well succeeded in constructing all these bridges in my former constituency of Montcalm, why should not the present Government be in a position to build the bridges I ask to-day for the county of Jacques-Cartier? Truly, the bridges to which I referred a moment ago were not as costly, but they were needed. Therefore, at the last election, my opponents were at bay in my electoral district, and they pointed out: "David is unbeatable". Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of being returned by the voters of Jacques Cartier, as their representative, by a majority of more than 3,200 votes, although a great number of women have cast their votes for my opponent, on account of my getting older. However, I will not quarrel with them for they meant well, and I will endeavour to conquer them at the next election.

The Government friends, who were canvassing in behalf of the Union Government, stated everywhere that the Military Service Act was calculated to protect the farmers' sons, who should never be drafted, and that it was beyond reason to believe that the Union Government, if elected, would enlist the farmers' sons and send them over to

war. Otherwise, Sir Robert Borden had declared to all comers that the Military Service Act was to scare the province of Quebec, and that they would not be sent overseas. But, Sir, now that the women of Jacques Cartier are witnessing the departure of their sons to war, these clever voters who had supported the Union Government have changed their mind, as they have changed their course and policy. I pity these voters who were so deceived by the Prime Minister and the clergy, from the pulpit, in our churches. Countrymen are good people, but easy believers. Priests have urged them to sign the National Service cards under the belief that conscription would never be enforced. Do not fear, they were told, we are in connection with people quite to the fact, and we are assured that conscription shall never pass.

Masses are now being chanted, and the holy sacrament is carried in the churches; processions take place after Mass, after Vespers, as in the evening, and the holy sacrament is exposed in order that the children of this country be not sent over to war. What a change! I join them, I walk with them, and I am inclined to tell these people: "You should have been better informed before inducing any one to sign the National Service cards."

But I revert to my two points:

When I see ministers, who represent the beautiful, large and important City of Montreal, perfectly aware of the correctness of my statement, I say that it is a scandal, a wrong to treat in such a way the large population living in the vicinity of Montreal, in the finest part of the Dominion. Millionaires residing at Quenneville, Baie d'Urfé, and Dixie, and all along the road, expect me to leave no stone unturned and continue to be their representative in this House until I have succeeded in having these bridges built by the Government. The voters of Soulanges, so ably represented by my hon. friend, Mr. Gustave Boyer, the electors of Vaudreuil—the two constituencies have been amalgamated—the voters of Coteau Landing, as well as those of Montreal, are all favouring that construction. I would now ask the hon. member for Ste. Anne (Hon. Mr. Doherty), whose absence I regret, and the hon. Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) to make all their endeavours in view of justice being done.

As for me, I do not need these bridges, but the Dominion tax-payers who have always contributed towards the building of bridges, towards the construction of railways all over the country, and of wharves, elevators, as well as of our roads, churches, jails, penitentiaries, and of our post-offices, shall never give up asking for justice until they have received their equal part of public works, and nothing but the erection of these two buildings would satisfy them. Justice must be done, and people will finally say that in this small section of the Dominion our position has been considered by the Ministers and given some kind of satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, I will never stop pestering the Government so long as these two bridges have not been put up.

There is another bridge in my district which is not as important as the first two but which is very badly needed; I mean the bridge desired by the good voters of Bizard Isle who want to cross a part of the Ottawa and reach Jésus Isle. This need is imperative.

You see a rural population, a population made up of the best farmers in the country, the tobacco planters of Bizard Island. They have been there for years. With sweat and anguish they succeeded in getting a bridge from Bizard Isle to Saint Geneviève. Now they are protected. They are bellowing at me to speak to the Government, now when they see Ottawa spending hundreds of millions saying: "Mr. Lafortune, couldn't you at least get something towards our bridge from Ile Bizard to Ile Jésus?" I say: Gentlemen of Bizard Isle, were I alone in the matter your bridge would have been completed long ago. You see we are up against opponents. True, amongst these opponents are some former friends who will be favourable towards us; these are former Liberals who have left us on good grounds, they affirm. Let us take it for granted, although I wouldn't swear to it: however, we will not talk of the motives the honourable gentlemen had for leaving their old leader and following a new one. As for myself I can assure you that my price would be high to do a thing like that.

But what of all this, I have not lost faith. So I say: The bridge from Bizard Isle to Jésus Isle is absolutely necessary. I went to the place. The bridge will cost about $65,000. Perhaps you will say: Why do not you have this done by the provincial government? The provincial governments are ready to help us, just as they are ready to help us build the Saint Anne-Vaudreuil bridge. We are wondering whether this bridge is provincial or federal, or both. At Vaudreuil and at St. Anne the engineer of the Quebec Government stated that it

was a federal bridge, while at Vaudreuil it would be more of a provincial bridge.

The governments could take hold together and try to build both bridges because they are in the public interest, in the general interest; and in a case like this I believe we should be protected by both Governments.

The same is true of Bizard Island; navigation is practicable there also. Between Bizard island and Jésus island the river runs quite deep and I think that with a little dredging it could be made very navigable. I am happy that the Honourable Minister of Marine is in his seat; he is familiar with the place in question. For instance, opposite Saint Geneviève there is what from time immemorial has been known as the "White Horse" a sort of little water-fall near Bigras Island. If the Government took the trouble to make this "White Horse" disappear the river would be open all the way from Hawkesbury and barges could easily transport all the fuel necessary for the town of Saint Laurent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I figure that it would only cost $5,000 to take away this obstacle. In days gone by a cabinet minister once took the trouble to go to this place and see for himself how things stood; he came back astonished, telling his friends he could not understand why this obstacle had not been taken away sooner, all the more so since this improvement would be of very great service to this part of the population. I hope the honourable minister will consider the few remarks I have made on this subject; and in that case I feel sure that before long the "White Horse" will have disappeared.

In olden days wood and coal were carried along this route but to-day the water level has fallen and the route becoming dangerous, had to be abandoned. There is some thing else that needs to be done in Jacques Cartier and I ask the particular attention of the Honourable Minister of Justice, who is my neighbour, since he represents Saint Anne division.

I wish to draw the Hon. Minister's attention to the serious disturbance that the passing to and fro of boats in the Lachine canal causes to the people of Ville-Emard and St. Gabriel on one side of the canal and to those in St. Paul and Côte-Turcot on the other side. When boats go through this canal the bridges are raised and thoroughfare is interrupted until they are lowered again. Every morning you find a crowd of workers waiting to get across to their work and the same thing goes on every hour, day and night, for as you know, the Lachine canal is very busy; this is very inconvenient for the workers who are often forced to be late at their places of employment and the employer naturally pays them no wages for this lost time. For years and years the city of Montreal and the different governments have been asked to build a tunnel at this place; a number of petitions and delegations have solicited the construction of this tunnel; but without avail. I would ask the Hon. Minister of Marine to join with me in asking the Government to build this tunnel; it will be perhaps the only thing to carry his name through history since his name will be inscribed on the entrance to the tunnel—not in letters of gold—times are too hard, and they would cost too much—but in well-polished letters. Everybody is agreed on the necessity of this undertaking, everybody admits that it is essential, still, like sister Ann, we are watching; but all we see is the dust of the road and the sun reddening the hill. I feel sure that if the Hon. Minister of Justice will help us in this we shall soon see something besides the dust of the road, for he has a great deal of influence over his colleagues; he is a valuable man, like all Irishmen; besides he has shown his powers and there is no need of my praising him here; he is energetic and like all Irishmen, again, when he starts a thing, it must either go through or be broken in the process. So I beg of the Hon. Minister of Justice to give me a hand, to put himself at the head of the movement and, together with the Hon. Minister of Marine, to show the Prime Minister how necessary it is to give justice to that part of the population I am interceeding for at this moment.

What would you say, what would these hon. gentlemen say if they had to pass through the Lachine canal quite often and if they saw 30, 40, 50, 100 workers, men, women and children, waiting to get through.

I have visited the place several times since I am in the county and I intend to go there still oftener so as to become possessed of the fact that by all means, the Honourable ministers must go there and see with their own eyes just what is happening, for I am convinced that they will not turn a deaf ear to the prayer of these good working-folk and will help me to get this tunnel built. Tunnels have been built in Montreal, in Beaudry St., and in Visitation St. The Hon. Minister of Marine who, with honour to himself and advantage to us, was a member of the Harbour Commission, undertook

a great many costly works, through the Harbour Commission, to better the lot of the citizens of Montreal.

Now, I tell you, hon. minister, that you have done nothing; there can be no comparison between the necessity for building this tunnel and the very important works you did for Montreal. I feel sure that you will grant my request and will see that we get this tunnel and the day it is decided that we will get it I can assure you that it will be a holiday in your honour.

In Lachine, in the beautiful city of Lachine, a plot of land was bought to build a wharf. This land was bought a long time ago; but the wharf has not been built. In the meantime the people are using the wharf belonging to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and this wharf is in a bad state. If the Government is not ready to build the proposed wharf I would ask the hon. minister to see to it that the Grand Trunk wharf is repaired while waiting for the Government's projected wharf to be built. The wharf used is in bad shape and it would not cost much to repair it so as to make things a little easier for those whose business forces them to use it.

You were busy, Hon. Minister of Justice, so I am going to repeat what I was saying a moment ago.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I would not want to miss that.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I am going to repeat in two words what I said a moment ago. It is this: in your division of St. Anne you were elected by a large majority; although you were opposed by a man of sterling worth, of wonderful talent, despite all his efforts you triumphed over him. You are all the more indebted to your constituents. Rather you had two opponents and you defeated them both royally.

The people of Ville-Emard, of Monk boulevard, quite numerous, and now that the railway and the street cars are coming, now that we are going to have a new line along Côte St. Paul, St. Gabriel, Turcot, Ville-Emard, it is absolutely necessary, hon. minister, now that the tramways are going to run there—the commission has decided to lay new lines in that region—it seems to me, hon. minister that you should put yourself at the head of the movement to give this tunnel to these poor working people so that they will not lose any more time through waiting for the boats to go through and the bridges to be let down. I have seen 40, 50, 60 and more women and children, poor people, waiting for the bridge to close so they could continue on their way to work. It is a sorry sight. I feel sure that your sense of justice will not allow this thing to go on any longer and that you will put yourself, together with your colleague, the Hon. Minister of Marine, at the head of our movement and see to it that this tunnel is laid and that these people get fair treatment. I feel confident that you are going to do what I suggest.

There is a wharf at Pointe Clair, where I stopped recently.

An hon. MEMBER: The county was badly represented then?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: The county was well represented, but there was not a great deal of work done there. The late hon. Mr. Monk represented the district from 1896 until his death. He was in Opposition. I do not know if these works were refused him, but I see that the work has not been done.

Now there is no party to your Government. We can neither say that it is a Conservative Government nor a Liberal Government; it is a Union Government. So it is with confidence that I have recourse to our new Administration, feeling more or less certain that you will give some consideration to the voters I represent and grant them justice.

When I used to speak on behalf of the voters of Montcalm and go to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier to request certain public works I was the mouth-piece of 4,000 voters and he gave me my share; but when I speak in the name of the voters of Jacques Cartier—there are 23,000 of them—I assure you that those people have the right to speak right out loud. There are several Acadians among them, and several Irish too. I assure you that you must listen to them because Irishmen sometimes raise a holler. I have also in my county a young lady who wishes to enter the postal service. I told her: "Poor little girl, you are pretty, but to-day there is no more patronage; you must pass your examinations; try to get a certificate from the Civil Service Commission." I hope that when I introduce her to the hon. ministers, with a little influence, I shall succeed in getting her a place.

Mr. Speaker, the present Government is doing some dredging at Ste. Anne de Bellevue. The people in these parts are very grateful to the Government but they find that the work is not getting ahead fast enough and they are afraid that what has been dredged will be filled up again before the thing is completed.

That reminds me of the way things were done when we built the Soulanges canal which was started towards 1896; some excavation was done in the fall, but the following spring the place filled up again and we never got ahead. When the hon. leader of the Opposition came into power he went about matters with the care, the activity and the energy which universally characterize him; the canal was completed and is to-day the finest ornament in my county. When I pass through the Soulanges canal I would like to see the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier written on all the stones which line the canal, it is so beautiful, it would be so worthy of the name of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and in all frankness I must say that it is the finest I have ever seen. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this dredging must be brought to a head, if my good friends are to be pleased.

Now I take up a question which is very dear to me, Mr. Speaker. I am really very sorry to find that the estimates brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance (hon. Mr. Maclean) do not contain sufficient sum to encourage the holding of a great fair in Montreal; still, I have been begging the Government to do this for a long time. The hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Marine must admit that Montreal suffers from the fact that she does not have a fair every year. Twenty-five years ago I was present at the last annual exhibition held in Montreal at the Mile End grounds. In spite of my beseeching nothing has been done and it is truly pitiable to hear the hon. members on the other side of the House speak of agriculture, of progress, of farm-improvement. On behalf of all those things have not I the right to say to the Government: Place in your Estimates a sufficient sum to enable Montreal to take up once more the annual fairs which she held in the past and which the city was obliged to abandon for lack of funds. Still, Mr. Speaker, we find in the budget that sums are voted for Toronto, Guelph, Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe; even in the parish of St. Scholastique I have witnessed from 25,000 to 30,000 people gathered there from the surrounding country to visit the annual fair held there and I was ashamed that the city of Montreal, the Queen of the Dominion, despite the claims of our friends from Ontario who say that Toronto is the Queen of our fair Dominion, since Montreal has one hundred thousand more population than Toronto, I was ashamed that the city of Montreal should have no annual fair. The city of Toronto, although of less importance receives every year from the Federal treasury a large sum which enables it to hold its exhibition every year. I am in favour of encouraging these fairs in all the large cities like Toronto, Winnipeg, in a word, in all the provinces, for I believe that these exhibitions are bound to play an important part in the future of the country; I would like to see more done in that regard than has been the custom in the past; but why not give the province of Quebec her share; why not let Montreal hold a fair to the enormous advantage of its agriculture, its trade and its numerous industries? For that purpose Mr. Speaker the Government should vote at least $50,000 every year, and Montreal should moreover be helped by the provincial parliament.

The farmers are told that they should increase their production. I submit that the holding of fairs would be a great stimulant to the farmer, enabling him to have more known about his products, which would result in his receiving better prices. For my own part I must say that I have 10,000 pounds of tobacco from last year's crop; the crop was good, although half the product is below standard on account of the imperfect drying of the tobacco. If we had held a fair at Montreal I could have exhibited my products and I would have likely got a better price for them, although both the crop and the prices were very satisfactory last year. An exhibition brings better appreciation of the work of man, of intellectual and manual effort, and everybody learns while they are enjoying themselves. Once more I hope that the Government will not turn a deaf ear to my request.

Another thing that I would ask from the Government also is a national holiday for the agricultural class. All the other classes of the population have a national day of rejoicing; the agricultural class alone has none. This class comprises more than 65 per cent of the population of the country and to my mind it is only just that the Government should proclaim a day, as both a civic and a legal holiday, set apart every year for the especial benefit of the agricultural class of our population.

I come to another point. If it be true that the province of Quebec should have its share in the public monies voted for the holding of annual fairs it is further true that it should receive its share in the matter of good roads. Many of our roads are in need of improvement and this improvement is imperative if agricultural industry is to flourish in our province. Here I make a special appeal to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) who

spent his youth on a farm and I would ask him to place in his Estimates a sufficient amount for the construction of good roadways in our province. I shall perhaps be told by those on the Government benches that session before last they wanted to vote $10,000,000 for this purpose and that the said sum was to be distributed among the different provinces. I was in favour of the principle of this bill but I voted against the measure as did every member of the Opposition because the Prime Minister and his colleagues reserved the right to spend that money when and how they pleased, and as they saw fit. All that we asked at the time was that this money be distributed proportionately to population and that the provinces themselves have the handling of the funds.

The Senate supported the amendment that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had prepared. The bill came back to this House but they did not want to accept the amendment; the bill granting $10,000,000 for the construction of good roads was put aside. I say that in safeguarding the autonomy of our provinces it was absolutely necessary not to consent to this money being spent by the Ministers to suit themselves. We were perfectly right in insisting that these millions be spent by the provinces and thus protect automony.

It is absolutely necessary for the Government to make sacrifices in this direction for the sake of good roads. It is absolutely essential in a country like ours to see to it that our roads are kept in good condition.

Moreover, why not include in the budget an important amount to help the farming class, to reclaim wild land, land which lies too low, land that is covered with water, land that yields nothing; that can not be cultivated on account of its natural position. This sort of land requires special treatment.

Let us protect the farmer, protect him in a practical, logical way. Go through the province of Quebec, go through the province of Ontario, go into any province in the country and you will find acres upon acres of land which give no yield because they are not drained. The Government never had a better chance to show some real administrative wisdom; vote an important sum every year and say to the farmer: you have so many acres that yield nothing because they need to be attended to. We are going to advance you the necessary money for putting this land in good shape; we will take a lien on your property; and when the work is done you must get a certificate from the Departmental inspector to the effect that the work on your land has been done in accordance with the rules of the Department. I hope this matter will receive your serious consideration; that is at the root of all success.

A distressing thing these days is to see the farmers unable to procure the necessary fodder for their stock. It seems to me that the Government should do something to help the farmers to get the bran and shorts they need. As things are a great many farmers are forced to dispose of their cattle. Labour is becoming so hard to get and animal fodder is so high in price that a large number of farmers are beginning to sell their stock. A practical way for the Government to come to the help of the farmer in this matter would be to oblige the milling establishments to keep a little of our wheat, bran, shorts and middlings in this country instead of sending them all to foreign parts. I can assure you that there is nothing funny about it when we have to pay $70, $54 and $42 a ton for different kinds of feed grains. This thing is phenomenal. It must be remedied.

When I had the honour of discussing the reciprocity treaty that the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier wanted to bring about with the United States I was happy to foresee the possibility of buying corn cheap. If we had a treaty with the Americans today so that we could get from Illinois all the seed grain and all the corn we wanted, especially the corn which we do not grow in this country; we could buy it cheap and feed it to our stock: we could feed the pigs, the horses, the cows, the poultry and the sheep; with corn you can feed any animal. Sometimes it is too heavy for them, then you must mix it with a little oats; you cannot always use corn alone, but with a little care and proper mixing you can get along without wheat or barley and still feed your farm stock profitably.

We have suffered a frightful shortage and to-day we begin to see that we should have concluded that treaty with the United States, not a general treaty because I would have voted against a general treaty. For instance if there had been talk of concluding a treaty which would have put tobacco on the free list, tobacco that we grow—I who represented a county, the county of Montcalm—where all the people know is how to grow tobacco, would certainly have voted against any such general treaty which admitted American tobacco free of duty; what we needed was a special treaty for the exchange of goods, which we do not produce or which we do not produce in sufficient quantity, with the United States who have a surplus of these same goods.

This afternoon I heard an hon. gentleman on the Government side speak of corruption. I know neither his name nor the district he represents, but this gentleman was imprudent in speaking of corruption. He was speaking of corruption under the old Liberal regime. That was a poor compliment to certain hon. gentleman who are sitting beside him today. He should know that you must never mention the noose in the house of a man who has been hung. I know something about it; I have sent several of these poor wretches into Eternity, as a matter of duty, and one must never speak of the noose in the house of a man who has been hanged.

I do not know if the hon. gentleman knows the history of his country. I could have told him about corruption, about the monstrous scandals which made their appearance under Conservative administrations. He is not in his chair, so I will leave him alone; but he musn't repeat that.

Mr. Speaker, over and over again I have read the new tariff on Canadian tobacco and American tobacco; if the tobacco industry has flourished in this country we owe it to the policy inaugurated by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In former times when we had a duty of only 5 cents to help Canadian tobacco to compete against the American product the industry was practically worthless. However, those who inaugurated tobacco planting in Montcalm continued to grow a little as a matter of habit; later the Liberal Government put on a duty of 10 cents. We began to feel fine. Later the duty was raised to 28 cents. The golden period had come; tobacco growing, in the county of Montcalm, as in Essex and Rouville, became a success. A duty of 28 cents a pound had never been asked against American tobacco; but a powerful delegation came before the old Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier as they came before the new Government and they asked for 7 cents more; they proved, beyond all doubt, it seems to me, that the interest of the tobacco industry in Canada demanded an increase of seven cents in the duty on imported tobacco. We were well received on both occasions; this delegation was well received by the old Liberal Government. We had hopes and at one moment I felt that we would succeed. But the general elections came around; the matter had been laid aside; and the Government went down to defeat. We came back before the new regime; we pleaded our cause before the hon. Minister of the Interior and the hon. Minister of Finances (Mr. White). I think we succeeded in convincing them that it was necessary to raise the duty to 35 cents; however, matters went no further. Every time the farmer asks for a little help he is met by opposite interests; the manufacturers. Every time that the tobacco grower succeeds in having the duty on tobacco increased he is met by the cigar manufacturers who refuse to increase their prices, and very often we are their victims.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister who represents the Minister of Finance has put a further tax of from 28 to 40 cents, and even from 40 to 60 cents on American tobacco while putting a tax of 5 cents on Canadian tobacco. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the voters I represent I thank the hon. minister for having put a tax of from 28 to 60 cents on American tobacco in favour of Canadian tobacco.

Thanks to this tax the Canadian planters will be able to compete successfully with the American planters; we are all glad to pay the 5 cents tax.

The honourable member who preceded me said that on the 17th of last December the Canadian people went to the polls with their heads held high, proud to vote for the Union Government. If they did this it was because the leader of the new Administration had promised them that they would not be conscripted. So it is that to-day we witness delegations on delegations coming to Ottawa to protest against their sons being sent to the battlefields; and I know that when you go before your constituents you will be in a fine muddle; and if the election were to be held over again to-day I can assure you that the people of Canada would not go to the polls so gaily. You told those brave mothers that their sons would not be conscripted; they believed you and sent their sons to vote for Union Government. To-day this opinion has changed. We are told with a flourish of trumpets that a great delegation will come to Ottawa on the 14th to protest against the recent Order in Council concerning farmers' sons; we also learn through the newspapers that the hon. Mr. Caron, Minister of Agriculture in Quebec, will head the delegation from that province. I hope that those honourable members whose counties will be represented in this delegation will make it their duty to assist at this interview. We shall have the pleasure of seeing some of those wonderful people from Ontario who declared that Sir Wilfrid did not know what he was doing. I am in a hurry to see the face they will make when the Prime Minister tells them he can do nothing for them; you will see, Mr. Speaker, if they are in a pleasant mood

and if they will shout again: "Hurrah for conscription!"

Now I come back to the town of Ste. Anne that I was speaking of a while ago, to tell this House how badly the town is in need of a post office. It seems to me that this post office is certainly due St. Anne which has quite a population, constantly on the increase; then they have a number of important business establishments, besides Macdonald College, which employs a great many people, and the new naval hospital that the Government is now building there. I hope that the Postmaster General will think over my request, not forgetting St. Genevieve which is also sorely in need of a post office. My worthy constituents have asked me to submit their request to the hon. minister; it is my duty to do it; and I do it gladly. During the former Government's tenure of office post offices rose as if by enchantment; every city whose population was sufficiently numerous to warrant a post office being built there was sure to obtain one from us. I would like to see the present Administration follow the same policy. So, in a nutshell, I say that a post office at both St. Genevieve and Ste. Anne de Bellevue would be very useful.

A moment ago I heard one of the hon. members in the course of the very interesting remarks he made to the House say that he approved the taxes brought down by the hon. Minister in his budget speech; only he doesn't like the methods used to levy these taxes; he would like to see the people taxed in such a way that they would not notice it. Mr. Speaker, the members who sit in this House are the authorized representatives of the people and the people have the right to demand that their representatives here be sincere and straight forward. I want to say to the hon. member that when you start out to attain a certain good you should take the best means of getting there and not try to hide the truth. No, Mr. Speaker, let us be frank and above board with the people. Let us tell them just how things stand; you cannot, you should not do otherwise. The people who toil and who pay decidedly have the right to demand sincerity in those whom they pay. So I believe that we should speak out frankly to them and tell them the truth about matters. I have never done otherwise.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): Will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Certainly.

[Mr. Lafortune.]

Mr. MACKIE: If I understand the hon. member, I conclude from what he says that he is opposed to direct taxation.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I never said that, Mr. Speaker. I am merely blaming the hon. member who told this House that we should tax the people in such a way that they would not notice it.

About the time of the last election a very important question was discussed in this House: the question of establishing farming stations in the different centres of the Dominion. We already had large experimental farms in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and at Cap Rouge, Quebec and Ste. Anne de la Pocatière. I do not think we have enough of these establishments.

We have an experimental farm at Ottawa and its usefulness is recognized far and wide, but this is not enough for the farmers and I would like to see agricultural stations at different places in the provinces to give the farmers still more information. In the county of Montcalm the Government has established an experimental station for tobacco. At St. Jacques de l'Achigan they have succeeded in getting an agricultural station which is a tremendous help to the people of that locality. The Minister of Agriculture has just told me that the lease has expired. You wish to change the station; very well, so long as you set up some place else to better advantage and with greater efficiency. Last year we grew three million pounds of tobacco. As for myself every year I plant ten arpents with tobacco.

In the budget we meet no very great encouragement for dairies and creameries. I think that these latter should receive much more from the Government. Everything comes high and those who are engaged in the dairy industry should receive more protection. So I suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that he put larger sums in the budget for the encouragement of agriculture.

Agricultural societies should receive special atention; co-operative societies and cattle-raising associations should get more encouragement. When we have millions and millions to spend it seems to me that we should be able to do something for agriculture.

It is necessary also for the Government to appoint inspectors the better to protect our cattle against contagious diseases. For instance, at St. Laurent, near Montreal, through an epidemic the college at this place lost 150 head of pork while the nuns lost 200 head. I myself have lost some thoroughbred animals; they died because the village veterinary did not know how to treat them.

We want these inspectors, Mr. Speaker; we have a right to them and the Government should not refuse to give them to us. These inspectors would also ascertain what animals are unfit for breeding and have them killed with the unhealthy cattle.

I once spoke to the former Postmaster General, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, about a question of public interest and asked him why a law was not passed forbidding people to enclose money in letters which were not registered. For the last twelve years I have been a Crown prosecutor in Montreal and it always pains me to see young folks who come of good families enter the postal service and then be dragged into court for having stolen 50 cents, 75 cents or a dollar from letters which were not registered; in cases of this kind the law does not consider the amount stolen and the minimum sentence that a judge may pronounce is three years in the penitentiary. If such a law were passed temptation would disappear; registered letters are never rifled for the simple reason that they are traced from their point of departure to their destination. Since a law of this kind would bring a little money into the public Treasury it would cause a double advantage, for at the same time it would shield those young people from temptation. The former minister, Mr. Pelletier, promised to give the matter his serious consideration. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, a similar law exists in many countries. Very often these young folks are led astray by their youth; they take a small amount thinking that they will be able to refund it the next day; but if they are caught in the meantime, they are sentenced to three years in the penitentiary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about recruiting and I wonder why the hon. Minister of Justice does not send the inmates of our prisons to the front. It appears to me that when we are making every effort to send to the front our young men of education and character it is not asking too much of the Government to send, too, the inmates of our prisons and our penitentiaries. I do not claim that we should send all prisoners to war; such a policy would be dangerous in the case of murderers and cutthroats; but I see no objection to sending those guilty of minor offences. It would be a saving to the country, for each prisoner costs us from $175 to $215 a year and they give practically nothing to the State in return. If they were permitted to enlist they would be able to earn something for their families and they should certainly be of more service to the country over there than they can possibly be in our prison cells. Very recently I asked the hon. Minister of Justice to allow a young man of 27 to enlist; he is serving a prison term for a minor offence and I hope that when the hon. minister is in possession of all the facts he will grant my request. This young man, while making himself useful to the State, will greatly help his family, who are sorely in need of such help.

I regret to keep the attention of the House so long; but I speak so seldom that when I do take the floor I must speak for some length of time if I want my words to matter.

I want to make a brief reply to the hon. member who spoke of corruption this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, every promise we made, we kept. I remember very well in 1893, I was in front of the old House of Commons at that grand reunion when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was chosen as the leader of the Liberal party after the departure of Edward Blake. We had promised to do away with revisers, those gentlemen who went about in the country districts and put on the voting lists the names they chose. I do not say that they were not honest, but when we asked them if so and so, and this fellow and that fellow, were on the list we always found that they were not; and what was rather curious was the fact that those forgotten were always Liberals. Do you know how things were done? These gentlemen used to drive through the country districts in a fine carriage smoking Havana cigars; when they came into a parish they would ask the secretary of the municipality what names should be on the list; and as these secretaries were usually friendly towards the Conservatives, the Liberals suffered.

We did away with these revisers and we placed the voters' lists once more in the hands of the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities. All is now plain sailing and I hope there will never be any change.

A certain number of commercial treaties were repealed. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a shrewd diplomat; he set aside those treaties which were to our disadvantage and passed a number of new treaties which were very much in Canada's favour.

We had promised to reduce the cost of postage stamps and we kept our promise. Three-cent stamps were sold for two and the two-cent stamps dropped to one cent.

When the hon. Postmaster General of those days, Mr. Lemieux, took over the department, the preceding year had witnessed, there, a deficit of $750,000 and the following year the new minister came out with a million dollar surplus. But it must be said

that when the Liberals came into power they put new keys everywhere and new locks and bolts; in a word, everything was put under lock and key and both locks and keys were new and in good working-order; so the deficit was turned into a surplus. Every year the former Conservative Admintration showed a huge deficit; but the Liberal Government always had a huge surplus to show. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is difficult of persuasion; he looks twice at any problem before spending on it and he had with him a man of high worth, Mr. Fielding, his minister of the treasury. I can assure you that this gentleman never used sausages to leash a dog. I can assure you that before getting anything from the former Minister of Finance you had to have very good reasons and take plenty of time proving their worth. I can assure you that there was nothing prodigal about him; he was not liked because he was too strict; but all honour to him; he was honest, faithful, an administrator of the highest worth. It is very regrettable that he should have disappeared from our ranks; but he will come back to us; you may be sure of that.

We had promised the electorate that public contracts would not be given as in the past. The Government had decided to award contracts to the lowest bidder. Many times we Liberals were displeased to see contracts being given to opponents, but Sir Wilfrid Laurier was inexorable and Mr. Fielding would hear of nothing but the lowest bidder, no matter whether he were friend or opponent. That was the straight line and he never swerved from it: all contracts were awarded to the lowest bidder.

We had promised that our contracts would make sure of the workingmen being paid. Before that the workers' wages were lost, drawn on, not to say stolen. A contract was awarded to a bidder. He passed it to another party and this party to a third and so on; and while it went from one to the other the workers' wages were not protected. In the original contracts we inserted a clause to the effect that no matter whether the contract changed hands the worker was to be sure of his pay. That explains why the workingmen everywhere always greeted Sir Wilfrid Laurier with such warmth; he had insured the payment of their salaries large and small, alike. We had promised to do that; and we kept our word.

We had promised to pass a law against usury, this festering sore which was ruining everybody. We forbade usury under penalty of fine or imprisonment. This law put an end to a lot of dishonest dealing. These things took place under the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

The country became so prosperous that the banks were overflowing with money. The legal rate of interest was reduced from 6 per cent 5 per cent and it is still at 5 per cent.

There there was the school question, which had passionately interested the country from one end to the other; we had promised to settle that question and thank God, Sir Wilfrid Laurier settled it in a manner satisfactory both to the State and to the Catholics. And when I hear opponents declare that this question can still be a subject for discussion pro and con I tell them that it is not; that, thanks to the intervention of the Prime Minister of that time, the question has been settled.

We had promised to put a stop to emigration. Hundreds upon hundreds and even thousands of our Canadians were crossing the border, before 1896, because they could not make a decent living in this country. Hardly had Sir Wilfrid Laurier come into power than emigration ceased as if by magic. We afforded our protection to all our citizens, so that instead of losing them, many of our Canadians who had gone to the United States came back to this country.

There is a subject that I have already discussed and that I will take the license of discussing again: the Parliamentary indemnity and the salaries paid our ministers; these amounts are too small. You see men of great worth come here and sit in this House, at the cost of heavy sacrifices, and all for a measly $2,500. When we see the city of Montreal, for instance, come here and take away our best members, and give them salaries of $10,000 or even $12,000 a year . . . . well, I say that the ministers of the Cabinet are not doing themselves justice when they do not vote themselves reasonable salaries.

I feel sure that the members of both sides of the House would vote in favour of an increased indemnity, whether it be popular or not. When you are dealing with a matter of justice it is not time to curry popular favour; it is time to render justice.

No, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the indemnity of $2,500 is far from sufficient, if you consider that the member of Parliament is obliged to contribute, from night to morning and from morning till night to all sorts of patriotic and religious undertakings.

Mr. MACKIE: Does not the hon. member believe that members should be paid according to the length of their speeches?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: No, Mr. Speaker; members of Parliament are far too precious for that; you cannot measure things like that by the armful. I would like to see a reasonable indemnity paid to us members and to the hon. ministers of the Cabinet, for the present indemnity is not reasonable if you consider that the city solicitor of Montreal receives $15,000 a year, and the members of the Street Railway Commission $10,000 each. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, are those men worth any more than we? No. This is so true that when one of those good little Sisters comes and knocks at my door asking for help I can only answer: I am happy my good Sister, that you have come to my house, and that you have not forgotten me; if you had forgotten me I would have been very sorry indeed; but my good Sister, all I can give you is 50 cents, or a dollar; you understand, we are obliged to give for all sorts of purposes and we are always in the lead in everything; a church is never built, church-bells are never blessed, the corner stone of a monastery or a convent is never laid without the member of Parliament being there right in front. I will give you another example, Mr. Speaker. When a man loses a horse in a parish of your county, he comes to the member and tells him that he killed his horse at the last election helping to get the member of Parliament elected and that he ought to be shown some consideration for his devotion to the good cause. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if our indemnity were increased our good constituents would be delighted; they would be glad when they came to see us and they would say: Now that you are better paid as a member of Parliament we hope you will show a little more generosity. As for the ministers, if they were better paid, they would give better service to the country. What I am saying now, every one of you admits to himself; but you do not dare to say it; I am not afraid of the voters, Mr. Speaker; I never was afraid of the voters.

Under the old regime the farmers made more profit out of their products thanks to the Hon. Minister of Finances of those days, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, who equipped our railways with refrigerator cars and our ships with cold storage chambers, and that was why our Canadian products enjoyed such vogue on the other side of the water.

We had promised further that there would be no scandals; and there were none. No, Mr. Speaker; I beg your pardon, I was mistaken; there was the paint scandal. Do you know anything about this notorious paint scandal? A man, a member of this House had been imprudent enough to buy a can of paint and forgot to pay for it. He had told them to send him the bill; the bill was sent him; but neglected to settle it. There you have in a few words all there was to the notorious paint scandal. I was a member of the committee and I can assure this honourable House that it was merely imprudence on the part of the member to have gone and bought his paint in the Government store rather than to have bought it at the corner merchant's. For this imprudence, Mr. Speaker, he lost his mandate, the character of an honest man was blackened, and some even wanted to strip him of all honour. Our friends on the other side say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had promised to do something to the tariff whenever he came into power, but that once he was Prime Minister he never did anything about it. Then how do you explain the fact that what was an annual deficit in every branch of Government became an annual surplus under Sir Wilfrid Laurier if we always had the same tariff as before?

When Sir John A. Macdonald got hold of the reins of Government a great many of our friends were thrown out and there was a large number of dismissals merely because these employees were Liberals. We had promised to give them back their jobs; and we did it. We examined the main cases that were brought to our attention and we reinstated those who had been unjustly dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, in former days we granted subsidies to a good many railways. The Hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) was appointed Harbour Commissioner of Montreal; he did wonderful things there; the mightiest of elevators were erected, wharves were built, and all that we needed was accomplished with success; all that required money; but he found the necessary money and he did honour to the position he occupied. The St. Lawrence river was dredged to accommodate inland navigation. The channel was widened and deepened and a system of buoys was set up; and all this was done under the guidance of the Hon. Minister of Marine. If he meets with the same success in the administration of his department as crowned his efforts there he will be entitled to our congratulations.

Now let us speak of the Soulanges canal, the Great Trunk Pacific and the Quebec bridge.

I remember what our opponents used to say to the old Administration about the Quebec bridge; they said that the bridge had fallen down because the Cabinet had employed incompetent workmen; but they, who claimed to employ for this same bridge the most competent workmen, the greatest experts on the face of the globe, were overtaken by the same disaster. You did not see the Liberals take advantage of the opportunity to pass unfair remarks.

All honour to those who had a part in this gigantic undertaking. The bridge is completed.

The Victoria bridge was subsidized. This bridge had no accommodation for vehicles or pedestrians. It took many millions to alter the bridge so as to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians and help trade on the southern shore. That was done by the Liberal Government.

The Intercolonial Railway had its terminus at Lévis; the former Government changed this terminus to the Bonaventure Station at Montreal. The result of this change was astonishing, and the country will be thankful to Mr. Fielding for it.

We began certain preliminary work on the Georgian Bay Canal. We went to considerable expense in this connection, chiefly for excavation and for hydrographic surveys, etc. I regret that this canal was not continued; the reason given by the old Government was that there were more urgent needs to be met, like the Hudson Bay railroad, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the completion of Montreal harbour. But I hope that before long the country will be in a position to undergo the necessary sacrifices to execute this projet of the Georgian Bay Canal. It would certainly be in the interest of Canadian trade, doing away with a distance of some 400 miles and bringing about a big reduction in the transportation cost of our western grain.

When the Liberals wanted to change their fiscal policy a little, I think I still hear the hon. gentlemen who were then in opposition saying: "Don't touch it; let well enough alone", after saying for years that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was leading the country into bankruptcy; that his Administration was worthless. Coming from the Prime Minister and his friends that was quite a compliment to pay the former Administration. If it was a good administration, why did you oppose it? Why did you go through the country crying out against waste, against robbery, and doing your worst to destroy his policy? That is how sincere these gentlemen are.

[Mr. Lafortune.]

When the Liberals spoke of building ships in this country they were told that it was a ridiculous idea; and, to hear the Prime Minister of to-day talk then, it was absurd, it was utter nonsense, it was nothing short of childish, to speak of building ships in our country. Are these gentlemen willing to say the same thing to-day? What hypocrites. They who are now asking us for millions to build Canadian ships called us ridiculous when Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. Mr. Fielding wanted to do the same thing. That is how sincere they are.

This afternoon an hon. member said: Give the farmer his bushel of wheat. We are not asking you, sir, for our bushel of wheat; we are asking you to leave us the children who belong to us; do not take away the children off our soil; leave these young folk, the flower of our people, the future of our country, where they are. You come into our farming districts to take away the children of 19, 20, 21 and 22 years of age and you talk about increasing agricultural production. Don't you know what is going on in the countryside? We are told: Take men from the cities, take women, to work in the fields, Yes, we can take women for ploughing and for harrowing; we will take women for farm work— the notion is childish! Take men from the cities, we are told. Yes, they'll come and work on a farm for a day; but the next morning not one of them will be able to stand on his feet. These things require experience and concentration. It isn't any Tom, Dick and Harry who can make farming pay. You need practical men; men who have spent their lives on a farm. Those who ladle out this advice to the farmers are off their trolley.

Mr. Speaker, I am through. I know that you will not be sorry, and I am proud that you have given me your kind attention and have listened quietly, as usual, to my remarks. I believed I was keeping within bounds. You did me justice; so much the better; you were decidedly the man to preside over the deliberations of this Chamber and I tender my congratulations to the Prime Minister for having appointed you. He never did a better thing in his life. If only he did as well in other respects I would be very grateful to him. I thank the House for their kind attention and I resume my seat, happy if I have been of some use to those who elected me.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS.

Motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

CUSTOMS.

Tariff item 27—Coffee, roasted or ground, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, per pound—British Preferential Tariff 8 cents and 7½ per cent; Intermediate Tariff 10 cents and 10 per cent; General Tariff 10 cents and 10 per cent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This item calls for both a specific and an ad valorem duty. What is the reason for such a high duty?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are only increasing the specific duty, not the ad valorem.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the increase?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The old rate was 4 cents and 7½ per cent preferential; the general tariff was 5 cents and 10 per cent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the new rate not be prohibitive?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This item covers indirect importations, on which the tariff is higher than on direct importations for domestic consumption.

Item agreed to.

Tariff item 29a.—Tea n.o.p., per pound—British Preferential Tariff 10 cents and 10 per cent; Intermediate Tariff, 10 cents and 10 per cent; General Tariff, 10 cents and 10 per cent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the difference here?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There always was a tariff on tea under this item, and it had reference to indirect importations. The only difference is that we are adding the ten cents specific duty to the ad valorem duty which was in existence before. The purpose of the duty on indirect importations is to preserve that trade to Canadian business houses, otherwise it would go to the United States or to some other country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you make any distinction in the tea grown in the British possessions?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not proposed to give any preference to tea grown in British countries. This tariff is imposed particularly for the purpose of securing revenue, and we are applying here the same principle that we do to importations of liquors and tobaccos. However, there is a great deal to say in favour of granting a preference to British-grown tea——

Mr. LEMIEUX: In normal times.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: ——but at the present time I did not think it wise to make any distinction. Owing to the inability of shippers of teas from India and Ceylon to secure shipping, it would really make very little difference to them, or they would have very little advantage. At the next session of Parliament, however, I think the matter might very well be considered.

Item agreed to.

Tariff item 144.—Cut Tobacco per pound—British Preferential Tariff 95 cents; Intermediate Tariff 95 cents; General Tariff, 95 cents.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the increase on this item?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Thirty cents per pound.

Item agreed to.

Tariff item 145.—Manufactured Tobacco n.o.p. and Snuff per pound—British Preferential Tariff 90 cents; Intermediate Tariff, 90 cents; General Tariff, 90 cents.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The increase there is 30 cents.

Item agreed to.

Tariff item 657a—Cinematograph or moving picture films positives, one and one-eighth of an inch in width and over, per linear foot—British Preferential Tariff 3½ cents; Intermediate Tariff, 5 cents; General Tariff, 5 cents.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Since I gave notice of these resolutions it has been brought to my attention that the proposed tariffs upon the articles mentioned in this item are excessive. It would amount to an increase of more than one hundred per cent and would bear too heavily upon importers of films. The tariff rate before was 25 per cent plus 7½ per cent, equal to 2⅜ cents per lineal foot. I beg to propose an amendment which will provide that the British preferential tariff under item 657a shall be 2 cents, the intermediate tariff 3 cents and the general tariff 3 cents. I have given notice of an amendment to the special War Revenue Act to provide that a tax shall be paid upon moving picture films of one and one-eighth of an inch in width and over to the amount of 15 cents for each film—that is, in addition to the tariff as I propose that it shall be amended. At a later date I shall ask the committee to pass this resolution, notice of which has been given.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Films are shown successively in different cities at different times. A film may be shown in Ottawa, Montreal and other Canadian cities, returned to the United States, and then sent back to Canada. Does that film pay duty only once?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The films pay the duty each time they come into Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not sufficiently familiar with the intricacies of the tariff imposed by this item to realize the exact extent of the duty on moving picture films. There may be something in the argument of my hon. friend that we should not overtax this particular business. But these moving picture shows are always filled to the limit. The theatres on Bank, Sparks and Sussex streets are always crowded, and very frequently people may be seen waiting at the doors. If any reduction of the proposed additional taxation is intended, I suggest that it be made on tea.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: These films are usually one thousand feet in length and the tax of 3 cents per lineal foot amounts to $30 per reel. Since the introduction of the resolution it has been pointed out to me that at the beginning of the year contracts were made for the year with the manufacturers of films for the lease of films and there is now no way in which the persons entering into these contracts could protect themselves. The item as it now stands would be an injustice to such persons, but, as amended, with the additional tax on the exhibitors of films which I propose to submit to the committee, we shall receive as much revenue and the taxation will be more fairly distributed.

Mr. FIELDING: Some years ago, in one of the revisions of the tariff, an item was inserted prohibiting the importation of posters and handbills depicting scenes of crime and violence—I think my recollection of the phraseology is correct. We found that large numbers of printed handbills and posters were being brought in from the United States depicting scenes which could not fail to have an unpleasant effect. I think that item is still in the tariff, and we all agree that it is a wise provision, but I do not suppose that under the wording of the tariff as it stands, that provision would apply to moving picture films. Some of the films which are being brought in today certainly depict scenes of crime and violence and are not of a very elevating character, and I suggest that my hon. friend discuss the matters with the customs officials. Let us make sure that while we prohibit handbills depicting scenes of crime and violence, we do not allow moving pictures to be brought in which are just as bad or worse. It is true that we have censors in each province, but if we use the machinery of the customs to prevent the importation not only of handbills but of films depicting scenes of that character, it would be a step in the right direction.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move:

That the following words be added after item 657a:

"Provided, however, that the goods hereinbefore enumerated shall be exempt from the rates of duties of customs specified in section 3 of the Customs Tariff War Revenue Act, 1915."

The purpose of that amendment is to provide that the Customs Tariff War Revenue Act, which imposes 5½ per cent under the British preference and 7½ per cent under the general tariff, shall not apply to these several items.

Mr. MOWAT: It is evident that the picture show people have been making to the acting minister representations which have induced him to make this reduction, but I am glad to hear him say that the revenue is not to suffer by that. The point I wish to make is this, that I think he should impress upon the picture show people the fact that the kind of plays that are being shown are not at all popular with a large part of our population. I am not now discussing those pictures depicting crimes and things of that sort that are demoralizing, but the picture show people are utterly without discretion as to what films they bring into Canada. Whilst some of the pictures are very good and some of the parts are taken by the best actors and actresses, yet there are others which show altogether the seamy side of life and not our life. The consequence is that our people are getting to think that the proper way to live is as depicted on the screen. We constantly see pictures which depict, not the best kind of American people and their life, but the less desirable class. I would respectfully suggest that the Acting Minister of Finance if he is again approached for lowering of the proposed tax should tell the picture show people that, unless they are more discriminating, unless they think more of and find out more about the character of the films they bring into Canada, they will not receive further favours so far as many members of this House are concerned.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I desire to ask a question concerning the importation by the Government of Canada of films for various purposes. Does the minister know whether any such films have, in the last two years, been ordered by the Government of Canada from American concerns?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have no knowledge of there being any importation of films by the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the minister kindly make inquiry?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall make inquiry and inform my hon. friend when the Bill is under consideration.

Mr. KAY: How much does the minister expect to collect under this item as amended?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: About $300,000 altogether.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the minister is in a mood to confess what he will receive through the various amendments, will he say what he expects to collect from each of the items? Has he an estimate?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the first item, that is chicory, raw or green, an additional revenue of $900 is estimated. The importations are very limited, and we would not anticipate any great increase of revenue there. Under item 25, that is chicory, kiln-dried, roasted or ground, the estimated increase in revenue is $4,900. Under item 25a, extract of coffee, n.o.p., and substitutes thereof of all kinds, the estimated increase in revenue is $7,500. Under item 26, coffee and imitations or substitutes, the estimated increase in revenue is $15,000. Under item 27, coffee not imported direct from country of growth the estimated increase in revenue is $21,000. Under item 28, green coffee imported direct from country of growth and green coffee purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, the estimated increase in revenue is $650,000. Under item 28a, tea imported direct from country of growth or purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, the estimated increase in revenue is $3,200,000. The annual consumption of tea per head in Canada is estimated at 4.27 pounds. Under item 29, coffee, green, not otherwise provided for, the estimated increase in revenue is $30,000. Under item 29a, tea not otherwise provided for the estimated increase is $25,000; under item 143, cigars and cigarettes, $42,000; under item 144, cut tobacco, $175,000; under item 145, manufactured tobacco and snuff, $30,000; under item 147a, beverages in the manufacture of which malt, rice or corn is used and containing not more than 2½ per cent of proof spirit, $30,000. I have already given the estimated increase in revenue under item 657a relating to cinematograph or moving picture films.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is a total of how much?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: About $4,000,000 from customs duties upon these items.

Amendment agreed to.

EXCISE.

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to impose, levy and collect on tobacco and cigars manufactured in Canada the following duties of excise:—

(a) On all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine-cut, cavendish, plug or twist, cut or granulated, of every description,—on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed or in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument and without being pressed or sweetened,—and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, cuttings and sweepings of tobacco made from raw leaf tobacco or the product in any form, other than in this Act otherwise provided, of raw leaf tobacco, twenty cents per pound, actual weight;

(b) On common Canada twist, when made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, and on the farm or premises where grown, by the cultivator duly licensed therefor, or in a licensed tobacco manufactory, twenty cents per pound, actual weight;

(c) On all snuff made from raw leaf tobacco, or the product in any form of raw leaf tobacco or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, scented or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, twenty cents per pound, actual weight;

(d) Snuff flour, when sold or removed for use or consumption, shall pay the same duty as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and stamped in the same manner as herein prescribed for snuff completely manufactured, except that snuff flour not prepared for use, but which needs to be subjected to further processes, by sifting, pickling, scenting or otherwise, before it is in a condition fit for use or consumption, may be sold by one tobacco manufacturer directly to another tobacco manufacturer, and without payment of the duty, under such regulations as are provided in that behalf by the department;

(e) On cigars of all descriptions, made from raw leaf tobacco, or any substitute therefor, six dollars per thousand;

(f) On all cigars, when put up in packages containing less than ten cigars each, seven dollars per thousand;

(g) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, six dollars per thousand;

(h) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, eleven dollars per thousand;

(i) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, forty cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established;

(j) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, sixty cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established;

2. In all tobacco manufactories where less than fifty per cent Canadian raw leaf tobacco is used, and where ten per cent, or more, of other materials is used, such materials shall be subject to a duty of twenty-three cents per pound, actual weight.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: With the exception of foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed,

and foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, and with the exception also of the item referring to the materials used in the manufacture of tobacco where less than fifty per cent Canadian raw leaf tobacco is used, the increases amount to about one hundred per cent. The estimated increase in revenue is as follows: tobacco manufactured, increase $2,073,508; cigars, increase, $719,-256.75; cigarettes, increase, $3,921,830.75; foreign leaf tobacco, increase, $2,096,450.64; Canadian leaf tobacco, increase, $224,750. The total estimated increase in revenue upon these items is $9,035,796.14.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: With regard to the tax on cigars, there is a uniform tax of six dollars per thousand regardless of quality. It has been suggested to me that this is unjust, because the five-cent cigar is sold to the retailer on such a close margin that with the additional tax he will be unable to sell at five cents, and will have to charge six or seven cents. The tax, however, will not affect the price of the ten or fifteen-cent cigar and cigars of better quality, because the margin at which they are sold to the retailer is not so close. In the case of the cheaper cigar it is the labourer, the farmer, and the poor people of this country who will pay the tax, but the ten-cent cigar and cigars of better quality will still sell at the same price, and the wealthy man will not be touched by this tax. Another injustice is done to the poor man by the increase on the tax of tobacco entering into these cigars from twenty-eight cents to forty cents. The Government taxes the tobacco that comes from Cuba and Havana for 10 and 15 cents cigars at the same rate as the tobacco that goes into the five-cent cigar, which is not nearly of so good a quality. In the United States, the tobacco tax is based on quality and not quantity, and I say that our tax should be on a similar basis. I am informed that the five-cent cigar which before the first of May was sold to the retailer at thirty-six dollars per thousand, will sell under this new tax at forty-two to forty-three dollars per thousand. The ten-cent cigar before the first of May was selling at sixty-seven dollars per thousand, or at six and seventh-tenths of a cent each. So the margin there will allow the retailer to sell the ten-cent cigar at the same price even with this tax, or three for a quarter. The consumer will pay the tax on the five-cent cigar, and the manufacturer and retailer will pay the tax on the ten-cent cigar. I understood it was the intention of the Acting Minister of Finance to tax wealth, and I would therefore submit that he tax the cigars according to quality rather than quantity. I am informed that on the present basis the tax will lead to a loss in revenue because the manufacturers will stop making five cent cigars, as the people will not pay six or seven cents for them, and the Government will of course lose that much revenue. I hope the minister will take my suggestion into consideration, and see that justice is rendered to the common people. I know that as the tax is based at present it will fall heavily on the poor people, and they will feel they have not been treated fairly.

Mr. HENRY A. MACKIE: I desire to support the remarks of my hon. friend. I think he has stated the case fairly. The cigars selling at ten cents and higher prices can still be sold at the present price because of the margin that exists between the manufacturer's price and the retail price, but the margin in the case of the five cent cigar is so small that the consumer must pay the additional price. The lower-priced cigar will then be so unpopular that its manufacture will have to be discontinued, and consequently the manufacturer loses, the retailer loses, and indirectly the Government loses. I would ask the Government to take my hon. friend's suggestion into consideration.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not deny that there is some force in the remarks made by my hon. friend in which he suggests that the excise tax upon cigars be based upon the selling price and not upon the quality. The excise cigar tax in Canada has always been based upon quantity, and I do not feel justified in changing that principle at the present time. In the United States for a number of years the excise tax upon cigars has been based upon the selling price. If that principle were adopted in the case of a five cent cigar, we would be obliged to apply it to all other excise taxes on cigars. The increase in the taxation upon cigars does not exceed two-thirds of a cent for each cigar. In the case of the five cent cigar, it is generally sold to the retail trade by the manufacturer at $36 per thousand, leaving a profit, selling at five cents, of about forty per cent. This increase in taxation should not at the very most increase the price to the retailer by the manufacturer more than $6 per thousand, or from $36 to $42. Even selling at that price, the retailer would still have a profit of 20 per cent. Again, he could protect himself by adding one cent to the price of a five cent

cigar. It is quite true that in this country the payment of six cents for a cigar is somewhat awkward, but it is not impossible of accomplishment. If, during the present year the increased taxation upon the cheaper cigars, appears to do an injustice to the trade, at the next session of Parliament we shall give due consideration to the representations that have been made.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Who will be called upon to pay the five cent tax, the farmer or the manufacturer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That will be controlled by regulations. The price will be paid by the manufacturer and dealer in tobacco, and not by the grower—at least I think that is probable.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Paragraph (a) says that 20 cents a pound will have to be paid. If this tobacco is used by a manufacturer he will be called upon to pay 5 cents more, or 25 cents. As most of this tobacco is bought by consumers, they will have to pay this excise of 25 cents. Instead of being 20 cents it will be 25 cents a pound.

Resolution agreed to.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that no person shall grow tobacco in Canada in excess of the amount or for purposes other than those mentioned in section three hundred and twenty-five of the Inland Revenue Act without a license, that a fee of two dollars be paid for such license, and that a tax of five cents a pound be collected on all tobacco grown with the exception aforesaid.

Mr. KAY: What are the provisions of section 325 of the Inland Revenue Act, and how much tobacco can a man grow under those provisions?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:: Thirty pounds for each male member of the family.

Resolution agreed to.

WAR REVENUE ACT.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and to provide that the tax to be paid by purchasers of a berth in a sleeping car be increased to ten per cent of the price for each berth, but in no case shall the tax be less than twenty-five cents for each berth and that the tax for a seat in a pullman or parlour car be increased to ten cents for each seat; that the definition of the word "Consumer" be amended so as to include a person who buys the articles mentioned for any purpose; that medicinal preparations and compositions excepted at the end of section fourteen be limited to those sold under the name used for them in the publications mentioned in the said section or any preparation manufactured and sold exclusively for the medical profession and on the labels of which no claim is made that the preparation has medicinal or curative powers or any description as to the amount that constitutes a proper dose; that manufacturers and importers of matches and playing cards be required after the thirtieth day of April, 1918, to affix to each package of matches and playing cards an adhesive stamp of the value of one cent for each one hundred matches or fractional part thereof in a package and of the value of eight cents on each package containing not more than fifty-four playing cards, and that such stamps be placed upon all packages of matches and playing cards held by dealers for sale on the first day of July, 1918, and that such stamps need not be affixed to packages of matches or playing cards manufactured for export; that there be levied a war excise tax equal to ten per cent. upon automobiles, gramophones, graphophones, phonographs, talking machines, cylinders and records therefor, mechanical piano and organ players and records therefor, articles commonly or commercially known as jewellery, whether real or imitation, for adornment of the person, when manufactured or imported after the thirtieth day of April, 1918, on the duty paid value when imported and on the price when manufactured and sold, provided that such war excise tax shall not be payable when the articles are manufactured for export or in the case of jewellery where the total amount of jewellery manufactured by any one person does not exceed the value of one thousand dollars in any calendar year; that a war excise tax be collected upon all automobiles and jewellery imported into Canada for sale or manufactured in Canada on or before the thirtieth day of April 1918, and which on that day have not been sold to bona fide users, of ten per centum of the amount of the duty paid value when imported and of ten per centum of the price when they have been manufactured and sold in Canada, but that no war excise tax be collected upon the same when manufactured for export in accordance with regulations; and that no war excise tax be collected on jewellery imported or manufactured and unsold on the thirtieth day of April, 1918, where the total duty paid value or price of the entire stock of the same held by any one person does not exceed one thousand dollars; and that there be levied a war excise tax of ten cents per pound on all tea entered at Customs on or before the thirtieth day of April, 1918, and held by importers or dealers and which on that day had not been sold, where the stock of such importers or dealers exceeds one thousand pounds.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This resolution contains a great many items and refers to a great many matters—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you got an estimate of the amounts you intend to collect?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: —and when the Bills are printed there will be an opportunity for hon. gentlemen to make any inquiries they may deem necessary. In connection with the tax on sleeping car berths and parlour car chairs, the estimated revenue is $130,000, from matches $3,000,000, and from jewellery over $200,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the term "automobiles," as it appears in the resolution, serve the required purpose? Is the word so distinctly understood in its meaning, or will it apply, for example, to motor trucks?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is intended to apply only to passenger automobiles.

Mr. FIELDING: The resolution does not say so. I think the intention is all right, but the minister might consider whether in the Bill which he is going to introduce the term should be made more definite.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I might say that motor trucks do not appear in the Custom returns as "automobiles."

Mr. FIELDING: This matter is going to be dealt with by the excise law and not by the customs law. It may not be necessary to have a clearer definition, but I am only drawing the hon. gentleman's attention to the point. I notice, with regard to matches and playing cards, that adhesive stamps are to be attached. I suppose any postage stamps may be used, as in the case of cheques. But there is no definition of what is meant by an "adhesive stamp." In that connection I will be glad if my hon. friend could give me an idea of how the distinction is kept in the accounts between stamps that are, strictly speaking, postage stamps, and those that are used for internal revenue purposes. For example, if I draw a cheque I can put a two-cent postage stamp on it. Does that money go into the revenue of the post office or into the inland revenue? I have no doubt the matter has been considered, but I am not quite clear how you can do it. I think there must be a large amount of postage stamps used for inland revenue purposes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When the Bill is under consideration it is proposed to insert a provision that stamps other than adhesive stamps may be used. By the amendment it is proposed that a special stamp be used by the manufacturers of playing cards. It is impossible to estimate what is the proportion of postage stamps now used for excise purposes in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: Do you say that it is impossible?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is impossible. I have endeavoured to secure an estimate but found it impossible to do so. When the special War Revenue Tax Act was enacted in 1915, it was upon the strong representations of the members of the House that the Minister of Finance was induced to make the provision that a postage stamp might be used in place of the ordinary excise stamp.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a convenience, undoubtedly.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is unfortunate for statistical purposes, but it is a great convenience to the public to be able to use the ordinary postage stamp.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The resolution provides for a tax on matches. Does the hon. gentleman also propose to provide for a tax on cigar-lighters?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A tax on cigar lighters?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. For example, if I want to present a friend with a little souvenir. I go, say, into Birks and purchase a little silver box with my friend's name engraved, which by a mechanical process will light a cigar.

Mr. BUREAU: What you mean is a gasolene cigar lighter?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, in which alcohol or gasolene is used.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Because by means of these lighters a man can obviate using matches for weeks and months without having to replenish the receptacle.

Mr. SIFTON: That should come under the ten per cent tax on jewellery for personal adornment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In France, where match manufacture is a monopoly of the state, the Government has imposed a special tax on these cigar lighters.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I desire to move an amendment to the resolution. I move to insert after the word "dollars" on the fourth line from the bottom the words "or where the jewellery was imported or manufactured before the first day of October, 1917," and to insert after the words "importers or" in the second last line the word "retail." The purpose of this amendment is to provide that the payment of the excise tax on jewellery now in stock shall be applicable only to sales made since the first day of October last. As hon. gentlemen will know jewellers carry stocks over from year to year. That is, a great many articles ordinarily known as jewellery are not always saleable and have to remain in stock for a long time. The men in the

business represent to me that it will be highly inconvenient for them to carry jewellery that is taxable and perhaps other jewellery that is not. The word "jewellery" is intended to cover only articles for the adornment of the person. A watch chain would come within the definition of "jewellery," whereas a watch would not, and jewellers, of course, carry many other lines of goods besides jewellery. For administrative purposes we thought it was better to settle now the amount payable by those liable to the tax, on stock now on hand. That amount when once assessed and paid will be in full settlement of all taxes upon sales made from stock in hand on the first day of May. There may be a possible loss of revenue, but the administrative cost will be much less. Of course, all sales made since the first day of May will be liable to the tax.

Mr. CRONYN: Will the Bill, or the regulations made under it, provide in what way the excise duty is to be paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It will be paid as the goods are sold.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I would like to ask the minister if he has given any consideration to the question of allowing the preferential rate in favour of tea imports from the British possessions? I have written to him on the subject and received no answer. I was instructed by some persons who were interested to place the matter before him, but I do not know what is proposed to be done, because I did not receive any reply to my communication. I notice that a difference is made in the case of coffee.

A difference is made in coffee which is 5 cents per pound preferential and 7 cents general tariff. I do not see why tea grown in India and Ceylon which are British possessions, and which have been loyal to us in the present war, should not have some little advantage in the tea duties, and I ask the minister if he has given that matter consideration.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry that my hon. friend has not received an answer from me to the letter which he says he sent me. I may say to him that I have not yet received that letter.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I sent it four or five days ago.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In the case of coffee, we are bound to give a preference to coffee grown in the West Indies under the terms of the West Indies agreement so called. Coffee, cocoa and chocolate imported from certain of the West Indian Islands are entitled to a preference of 20 per cent on the general tariff. That is the reason why there is that distinction in tea and coffee so far as preferential rates are concerned. I explained some time ago that a preference is not always given on every commodity grown in the British Empire, and cited the instances of liquors and tobaccos. The imposition of a tax upon tea is purely for revenue, and it was deemed advisable to make the same imposition against British productions as against those of any other countries. However, there is a great deal to be said in favour of extending a preference to British importations. I explained earlier in the evening that such preference would not be of any particular advantage to the tea growers within the British Empire owing to their inability to get shipping to forward it. During the year and before the next session of Parliament, however, I promise my hon. friend that the Government will give consideration to the suggestion.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to move a further amendment to this resolution, and it is in accordance with the notice which I gave yesterday and which now appears upon the Order Paper, and has reference to the tax upon moving picture films. The amendment is as follows:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that a war excise tax be levied, collected and paid on all cinematograph or moving picture films, positives one and one-eighth of an inch in width and over of fifteen cents on each film for each day upon which such film is used.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that representations have been made by the smaller moving picture men that the proposed tax is going to put them out of business. It appears to me that, where films are used in very small buildings, where only two or three hundred can be housed at once, these should not be called upon to pay the same rate as houses accommodating two or three thousand. I am not a sponsor for picture shows and rarely attend them, but they are a benefit to many people who desire entertainment at very moderate rates, and the soldier, too, frequents these places very largely. I am not offering this by way of any factious criticism at all upon his very estimable way of raising the revenue, but from representations which have been made to me it appears that the smaller men will be practically put out of business if some differ-

ence is not made between the very small houses and the very large ones. This tax, I understand, increases the cost of the ordinary reel from $26 to $50, about 100 per cent of a tax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend was not in the House a few moments ago, when I moved an amendment to the tariff resolution respecting films, reducing the rate from 5 cents a lineal foot to 3 cents, representing a reduction from $50 to $30 upon film reels of one thousand feet. Having made that reduction, and not wishing to lose any revenue on account of the change, I desire to impose this further tax upon the theatre proprietor, that is, upon those displaying the film. The small theatres use five films per day, as a rule, and the tax would amount to 75 cents per day.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Knowing something about the moving picture business, I think there should be a further change made in the system of placing the tax. In times gone by, the film producers furnished reels of pictures which permitted the small houses to give three different shows each night. The film producers have now changed the size of the reels and made them nearly twice as large, and have increased the price. Consequently the increased size of the reel and greater length of time required to run it takes away one of the shows from the small picture houses, enabling them to put on only two shows in place of three. The film producers might still further increase the size of the reel and if that is done the small houses will have only one show each night. The reduction from 5 cents to 3 cents per foot will help the small picture shows. I think a picture house should be charged according to the seating capacity. A 500 seating capacity should be charged a certain fee and a show which has 1,000 seating capacity charged a higher rate, and so on. I do not think it is fair to make the tax on a small show equal to that on a large one. The larger houses usually get 30, 35 and 50 cents admission while the small shows get 10 cents in the evening and in the afternoon only 5 cents. This increase in the tax practically puts the small shows out of business. If the Acting Finance Minister would allow this item to stand over I expect a deputation here to wait upon him. I did not know that this question was coming up to-night or I would have been better prepared.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am afraid that the size of the theatres changes almost as rapidly as the length of the films. However, I may say to my hon. friend that before the Bill which will be founded upon this resolution passes, I shall be pleased to give every consideration to the representations which he has made to-night and which the delegation which is coming shall make.

Mr. KENNEDY: Does the minister think that the increased cost of films will add anything to the cost of the next Victory Loan?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hope it did not add anything to the last one.

Mr. KENNEDY: About $7,000 for films.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not aware that it did.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JACOBS: I have been asked to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we are now sitting on Ascension Day.

Resolution agreed to.

BUSINESS WAR PROFITS.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and to provide that paragraph (c) of section three be repealed; that any business having a capital of not less than twenty-five thousand dollars and under fifty thousand dollars shall pay a tax of twenty-five per centum of the amount of the profits exceeding ten per cent per annum upon the capital; that the amount paid or payable under the provisions of Part 1 of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and The Income War Tax Act, 1917, shall be deducted from the amount payable under the provisions of the above Act, and that in computing the profits of such no taxpayer shall include any tax paid under the said Acts in the expenses of his business; that the amount of capital in the excepted business mentioned in paragraph (a) of section five of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, be reduced from fifty thousand dollars to twenty-five thousand dollars; that dividends paid during the accounting period shall be considered as a reduction of the unimpaired reserve, rest or accumulated profits; that the provisions of section three of the last mentioned Act be continued in force to the thirty-first day of December, 1918.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The only important amendments contemplated are to provide, first, that the Act shall apply to the accounting period of 1918 and, secondly, that companies employing a capital of $25,000 and up to $50,000 shall be liable to a business profits tax. The rate applicable to companies employing that amount of capital is that which first prevailed under the Business Profits Tax Act. An exemption of 10 per cent upon the capital em-

ployed is allowed, and 25 per cent of the profits in excess is payable to the Government.

Mr. McMASTER: It has been pointed out to me by a business man that in the case of small companies with a capitalization of, say $25,000, operating under a limited liability charter, the profits realized are not so much from the investment of large capital as the reward of the energy and work of the individuals forming the partnership. My correspondent suggested that it was hardly fair to tax a company with so small a capitalization as heavily as the corporations with larger capital are taxed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The law as it now stands is applicable to partnerships as well as to corporations, though there is a difference in the rate.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Practically every resolution that we have dealt with to-night has been amended in some way to make less onerous the burden resting on those who pay taxes, and I urge on the Government to reconsider the scale now in force with respect to excess profits tax. Speaker after speaker has drawn the attention of the Government to this matter, and though the front benches have been vacant most of the time, the Acting Finance Minister has been here and I trust that he will give it careful consideration. We are placing our business houses at a very great disadvantage compared with those in the United States with whom they have to compete. In the case of two firms on the opposite sides of the Detroit river, one at Windsor and one at Detroit, with capitalization of $300,000 and making 25 per cent each in the course of a year, the firm in American territory is taxed only $12,150 while the firm in Canadian territory is taxed $24,750. Nothing is more mobile than capital; moreover, our Canadian business firms must prepare for what is in store for them when the war is over; there will be great deflation and great readjustment. Where shall our Canadian business men get money to enable them to weather that storm? They cannot borrow in England or in the United States. Our own people will have invested nearly all their available cash in Victory Loans. The banks will not lend them any money, you may be sure, to put into plant or anything immobile. The only thing our business firms can do in order to meet this period of readjustment is to save. When you take such a large percentage of savings from them that, after paying a dividend of 7, 8 or 9 per cent they are able to lay aside only very little towards the time of reconstruction, you are deliberately handicapping them for the competition of the future. If our business profits tax were made on a par with that of the United States, our revenue would only be $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 less, whereas the operation of the present scale is making ten times that amount of difference to the business institutions of our country. A gentleman from Toronto said the other day: American friends of ours were prepared to put $500,000 into the creating of a new industry in Canada, but when they found that the business profits tax was double that of the United States, they decided not to put their money into the enterprise. A Montreal gentleman said to me: We had intended to add three additional businesses to our plant in New Brunswick, but we find that we cannot save the money to do it; we cannot get the money in any other way, so that we are going on as before. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. We should impose heavy taxation where the liquid capital finally rests and the ownership lies. We should not tax earnings very heavily at their source; we should tax them at their destination. I will support any increase in income tax the Government care to make, even if they double it. When my revenue reaches me, I can do what I please with it. I can spend it on frivolities, if I like; put it into the bank, or invest it in some manufacturing enterprise. It is on revenue of this kind that taxation ought to rest. From the business firm which is preparing to weather the gale, which has not distributed its profits, which pays only a reasonable dividend and puts the balance into plant, in order that it may create more wealth, in order that it may, when the war is ended, employ more labour and strike out into the fields of the world, you are taking practically all that they have to fall back upon for their reconstruction. So again, in view of the fact that after the war we shall have to make great reconstruction of all our business enterprises throughout the country; in view of the fact that, after the war, we shall have to find employment for thousands and tens of thousands of additional men, I ask the Government not, at the present time, to stagnate Canadian industry; not, at the present time, to take away all incentive from Canadian industry; not, at the present time, to put Canadian industry under a tremendous

disadvantage as compared with the United States. After the war is over, we want to compete in the markets of the world; we want to put our Canadian industry on a par with American industry so as to be able to compete. We cannot do that if all the industries are overtaxed as we go along. Take the two firms of which I spoke, one on each side of the Detroit river. In three years the American company will have raised its capital from $300,000 to $400,000, while the Canadian firm, supposing it is able to pay a small dividend during that period, will be able to raise its capital only from $300,000 to $350,000. Which is best fitted to compete in the markets of the world—the firm that has been allowed to prepare itself for the reconstruction period, or the firm which has been stripped of practically all its earnings as it goes along? The Government should give this matter serious consideration. What is a matter of three or four million dollars of revenue compared with having it known in Europe, Canada and the United States that the taxation in Canada on business profits is the heaviest in the world, and that new capital, if it comes in, must face that contingency?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Many representations have been made to the Government along the lines pointed out by my hon. friend. For the present it is the policy of the Government to renew the business profits tax at the same rate as provided for during the last three accounting periods. It is proposed, however, to impose this tax only year by year. It is not a tax that might fairly be imposed upon business after the conclusion of the war. The amendment which provides for the re-enacting of clause 3, which is the taxing clause of the Bill, provides that it shall continue in force and be effective only until the 31st day of December, 1918. During that period, the Government will, of course, be glad to hear any representations from the business men of the country, and if it should appear that the tax is too onerous, the Government shall be pleased to give every consideration to such representations. In the meantime, it is the policy of the Government to renew this taxation.

INCOME.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and provided that "dependent child" shall mean a child under twenty-one years of age and dependent on its parent for support or over twenty-one and dependent on its parent for support on account of physical or mental incapacity; that paragraph (b) of section three be repealed and that an exemption of two hundred dollars be allowed for each dependent child under sixteen years of age; that paragraph (d) of section three be amended by striking out the words "or from the net earnings"; that subsections one and two of section four be repealed and that it be provided that there shall be assessed, levied and paid upon the income during the preceding year of every person residing or ordinarily resident in Canada or carrying on any business in Canada and upon the income received by any person from any source within Canada the following taxes:—

(a) two per centum upon all income exceeding one thousand dollars but not exceeding fifteen hundred dollars in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children, and exceeding two thousand dollars but not exceeding three thousand dollars in the case of all other persons; four per centum upon all incomes exceeding fifteen hundred dollars in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children, and exceeding three thousand dollars in the case of all other persons;

and in addition thereto,

(b) two per centum upon the amount by which the income exceeds six thousand dollars and does not exceed ten thousand dollars; and

(c) five per centum upon the amount which the income exceeds ten thousand dollars and does not exceed twenty thousand dollars; and

(d) eight per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds twenty thousand dollars and does not exceed thirty thousand dollars; and

(e) ten per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds thirty thousand dollars and does not exceed fifty thousand dollars; and

(f) fifteen per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds fifty thousand dollars and does not exceed seventy-five thousand dollars; and

(g) twenty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds seventy-five thousand dollars and does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars; and

(h) twenty-five per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds one hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed two hundred thousand dollars; and

(i) thirty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds two hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed four hundred thousand dollars; and

(j) thirty-five per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds four hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed six hundred thousand dollars; and

(k) forty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds six hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed eight hundred thousand dollars; and

(l) forty-five per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds eight hundred thousand dollars and does not exceed one million dollars; and

(m) fifty per centum of the amount by which the income exceeds one million dollars;

and in addition thereto the following surtax.

(n) five per centum of the tax payable upon income in excess of six thousand dollars but not exceeding ten thousand dollars;

(o) ten per centum of the tax payable upon income in excess of ten thousand dollars but not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars;

(p) fifteen per centum of the tax payable upon income exceeding one hundred thousand

dollars but not exceeding two hundred thousand dollars;

(q) thirty-five per centum of the tax payable upon income exceeding two hundred thousand dollars;

that corporations and joint stock companies, no matter how created or organized, shall pay six per centum upon income exceeding three thousand dollars, but shall not be liable to pay the supertax; that the minister may permit any corporation or joint stock company the fiscal year of which is not the calendar year, to make a return and to have the tax payable by it computed upon its income for the twelve months ending with its last fiscal year preceding the date of assessment; that section five be amended by exempting the incomes or such portion of the incomes of judges and retired judges as comes within the provisions of subsection three of section twenty-seven of the Judges Act and the incomes of incorporated companies whose business and assets are carried on and situate entirely outside Canada

Mr. PROULX: In reference to the latter part of the resolution, what portion of the income of judges comes within the provisions of subsection 3 of section 27 of the Judges' Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The incomes of judges appointed by the Federal Government.

Mr. PROULX: Why the exception?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Judges' Act provides that their salaries shall not be subject to any Federal tax.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is an amendment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it is not an amendment; it is simply to carry out the provisions of the Judges' Act. I should like to place upon Hansard a table showing the comparison between our income tax and that of the United States in the case of a married person. It might be of interest to hon. gentlemen.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the minister a table showing the comparison between what we pay and what the people of Great Britain pay? That might be very illuminating.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It might be very illuminating, but it is a very difficult statement to prepare, and it would not be as illuminating as a comparison with the income tax in the United States.

Mr. McMASTER: You might have the three columns.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If my hon. friend desires it, I shall endeavour to have a statement prepared for him. This is the table of which I have just spoken:

INCOME TAX.

	Canada.		United States.
Income.	Married persons. Present Tax.	Married persons. Proposed Tax.	Married persons. Tax.
$	$	$	$
3,000	Nil.	20	20
6,000	120	140	130
10,000	360	392	355
20,000	1,260	1,382	1,180
30,000	2,460	2,702	2,380
50,000	5,260	5,782	5,180
75,000	10,010	11,007	9,930
100,000	14,760	17,607	16,180
200,000	43,760	50,957	49,180
400,000	101,760	142,757	142,680
500,000	130,760	195,407	192,680
600,000	159,760	248,057	246,680
800,000	217,760	366,857	357,180
1,000,000	275,760	499,157	475,180
2,000,000	565,760	1,228,157	1,130,180

I have also a statement showing the normal tax, the super-tax and the surtax, also the total. Hon. gentlemen will remember that under the Income Tax Act, as proposed to be amended, we shall have a surtax, whereas in the Act of last year there was only the normal tax and the super-tax. The table is as follows:

Income Tax.

Married persons.

Income.	Normal Tax.	Super Tax.	Surtax.	Total.
$ 3,000	$ 20			
6,000	140			
10,000	300	$ 80	$ 12	$ 392
20,000	700	580	102	1,382
30,000	1,100	1,380	222	2,702
50,000	1,900	3,380	502	5,782
75,000	2,900	7,130	977	11,007
100,000	3,900	12,130	1,577	17,607
200,000	7,900	37,130	5,927	50,957
400,000	15,900	97,130	29,727	142,757
500,000	19,900	132,130	43,377	195,407
600,000	23,900	167,130	57,027	248,057
800,000	31,900	247,130	87,827	366,857
1,000,000	39,900	337,130	122,127	499,157
2,000,000	79,900	837,130	311,127	1,228,157

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see that paragraph (d) of section 3 is proposed to be amended by striking out the words "or from the net earnings." What is the meaning of that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Subsection (d) of section 3 as it now stands reads as follows:

For the purposes of the normal tax the income in a personal return shall be credited with the amount received as dividends upon the stock or from the net earnings of any company.

As the dividends upon the stock were credited, the words "or from the net earnings" had no significance whatever, and for administrative purposes only it is desired to strike these words out.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman has referred to the exemption from taxation of judges. From what classes of taxation are judges exempt? At all events, I suppose that the laws respecting the judges are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians. The judges, above all other things, are just men and I am sure they will not desire to be exempt from any tax, especially in these times, which their poorer neighbours are obliged to pay.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: They do not get salary enough to be taxed.

Mr. FIELDING: Lots of us do not get enough salary, but we have to pay the tax. I am curious to know from what classes of taxation the judges are exempt.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All salaries or annuities paid by the Government of Canada to any of the judges are exempt from any tax imposed by the Parliament of Canada. This is only to carry out that provision. Of course, it does not prevent judges from paying the tax if they so desire. Whether the judges should be exempt or not is a matter of policy. I am not suggesting any change.

Mr. FIELDING: How can there be a provision in the law to exempt judges from income tax when we did not have any income tax before last year? Are the judges exempt from customs and excise taxation? We have here a new system of taxation. We are creating an exemption which the judges apparently do not now enjoy. I think the point is worth looking into. The judges are most estimable men, but above everything else they are just, and I am sure they would not desire to be exempted from taxation which their less favoured brethren have to pay. I simply want to protect the judges.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The last clause says:

> Corporations and joint stock companies, no matter how created or organized, shall pay six per centum upon income exceeding three thousand dollars but shall not be liable to pay the supertax.

Under the Act of last year the income paid by incorporated companies was carried forward to the credit of the shareholders, who received it later in the form of dividends. Is it the intention to continue that provision? I am not able to ascertain from the wording of the clause whether the income which has been taxed six per cent is to be re-taxed, as though it had paid no tax, after it has been distributed to the shareholders.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Act as amended will only give credit for the normal tax of four per cent. There will be no change.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It says six per cent here.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the tax on any income in excess of three thousand dollars. Only the four per cent normal tax paid by corporations will be credited.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Although the corporations pay six?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year the Minister of Finance stated that the sessional indemnity was assessable. I have no objection to that, but the very word "indemnity" suggests, not a salary, but compensation for service which one is called upon to perform for the Crown. Some gentlemen have suggested that in the return to be made the indemnity should be reduced by the amount that has been expended by the member. A member who comes from afar spends a part of his indemnity in Ottawa and he should not be accountable for that in the return.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not desire to detain the House by asking for the information now, but if my hon. friend will make a note of it and bring it forward at another stage of the discussion I shall be quite content. I cannot see any reason why judges should be exempt. An hon. gentleman says that the judges salaries are not big enough. That is true of a great many people. It is a fact that the civil servants all over Canada are very poorly paid. If I may be allowed to say so, having regard to their duties and responsibilities, the most poorly paid officials in the Dominion of Canada are the Ministers of the Crown. They are the only people who have not received an increase in their salaries for the last thirty years. But still they have to pay income tax. I think they escape in the city of Ottawa——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: At all events it is quite understood that Ministers of the Crown have to pay this income tax like any other people. If they are to be taxed I cannot see why the judges should be exempt.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not wish to be understood as opposing the suggestion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, but, as he suggests, the point may be raised later on when the Bill is before the committee.

Mr. BUREAU: If judges are exempt it must be for one of two reasons. The minister said that all judges received their salaries from the Dominion Government. If the fact of receiving a salary from the Dominion Government is going to be given as a reason for exemption, I think the point raised by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) is a good one, that it ought to apply to all those who receive a salary from the Dominion Government. If, it is on account of his judicial capacity, other judges who are not appointed by this Government and are not paid by this Government should be exempt. The judge of the general sessions of the peace in Montreal gets his salary from the provincial Government while a judge of the Superior Court gets his salary from the Dominion Government. If, on account of his judicial position, the judge of the Superior Court is exempt, why should not the judge of the general sessions at Montreal, or in any other judicial district, be exempt? On the other hand, if a judge is going to be exempt because the money is paid by the Dominion Government I agree with my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens that all other people who receive their money from the Dominion Government should be exempt from this tax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have the provisions of the Judges Act before me. Section 27, subsection 3 provides:

> The salaries and retiring allowances or annuities shall be payable by monthly instalments and shall be free and clear of all taxes and deductions whatsoever imposed under any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. CRONYN: On the consideration of the Bill there will be an opportunity to discuss the point raised by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) as to the increase in the tax in the case of incorporated companies. I do not want to delay the Committee by discussing it, but I think that something might be said on the subject.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Has any further consideration been given to clause 3c of the Business Profits tax, as to a reciprocal arrangement with the United States without which the Business Profits tax that we should receive is paid to them? Has that been taken up?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not proposed to submit to the Committee any amendment providing for a reciprocal arrangement with the United States. The Business Profits tax in the United States is based upon a somewhat different principle from ours. They have ruled that income received by Canadian corporations from products sold in the United States is subject to their Business Profits Tax Act. For instance, our manufacturers of newsprint export to the United States 88 or 89 per cent of their total production. The United States treasury has ruled that the proceeds of sales of newsprint in the United States are subject to taxation under their Act. Sir Thomas White, who is now in Washington, a day or two ago had an interview with the United States Treasury Department upon the matter, and yesterday I had a communication from him assuring me that his representations were sympathetically received by the department and he thought an understanding would be reached with respect to the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In other words, there will be no change in the law regarding non-residents?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. You are referring to the Income Tax Act?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was speaking of the business profits tax. The matter of reciprocal arrangements between Canada and other countries, so as to avoid a double income tax, was discussed at the Imperial Conference last year, and I understand it was decided to allow it to stand over until after the conclusion of the war.

Mr. McMASTER: I believe that the rate of taxation on incomes over $10,000 is utterly inadequate and I am sure that the country will agree with that view. When this Government is asking the poorer folk to make the sacrifice both in men and money that they are being asked to make, the rate at which the larger incomes are being taxed is utterly inadequate. I know the reply will be given that the United States is taxing incomes on the same ratio. I hardly think that applies. What we want to do is to endeavour to equalize sacrifice as between the citizens of this country, and that is not done by the taxation that is imposed on the larger incomes.

Mr. LALOR: Is the Acting Minister of Finance aware that a Canadian company with branch factories in the United States doing business there is taxed in the United States upon the profits of these branches and again taxed in Canada upon the same profits it has made in the United States? I know something about this from personal experience. The company is taxed on the

profits of its factories in the United States and when these profits are returned to the parent company in Canada the company is again taxed by the Canadian Government. I think it is hardly fair to have to pay such a tax.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why cannot the minister devise a scheme to avoid this inequality? Because it is a clear injustice that a man should be compelled to pay a tax in the United States and in Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do you mean income tax?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, income tax.

Mr. LALOR: I am speaking of the Business Profits Tax.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am speaking of the income tax.

The CHAIRMAN: The Business Profits War Tax Resolution was adopted some time ago, and the discussion is now on the Income War Tax Act. It would be more regular, I think, for the hon. gentleman, when we have disposed of this matter, to move to reconsider the one to which he has reference.

Mr. LALOR: I merely draw the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance to this matter so that he may give it consideration.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I would ask the minister whether any action or decision has been arrived at with respect to farming and ranching companies? I want to know whether a farmer who has raised one hundred thousand bushels of grain and sold them for $2 a bushel comes under the Business Profits Tax, and whether a rancher who raises $250,000 on horses and sells them to the Remount Commission comes under the same tax? Has the Government considered whether these industries should be rightly brought under the Business Profits Tax, or left subject only to Income Tax?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can only say it is not proposed to make these industries liable to the Business Profits Tax.

Sir HERBERT AMES: What justification is there for that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For the reason that in the cases mentioned, I am told, it is unlikely that the amount of capital employed would be such as to make them liable to the tax, and for other reasons.

[Mr. Lalor.]

Sir HERBERT AMES: Are they not businesses just the same as any others that are made subject to the tax?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was the policy of the Government which introduced this Bill not to make the Acts applicable to them. It would affect only a small class in Canada—

Sir HERBERT AMES: Why should that be a favoured class?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: —and the administrative cost would be so high as to make it not a profitable source of revenue.

Mr. JACOBS. I would like to point out the disparity which exists between the income tax in Great Britain and that which is proposed to levy under this new Act. I had occasion to look the matter up yesterday, and I find that for the present year the tax is six shillings in the pound on income. That is to say a person with an income of $10,000 would be paying almost one-third of that into the treasury. Now there is a wide difference between paying $392 a year, and paying nearly $3,000 a year on the same income. We have only increased this tax from $380 last year to $392 this year, a difference of $12 per annum. Of course we have started at $2,000 instead of $3,000, but we are only paying $12 more than we paid last year on income. I am talking of an income of $10,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was $360 last year.

Mr. JACOBS: We paid $360 last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: But now we are paying on from $2,000 up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And $392 will be payable under the Act when amended as proposed.

Mr. JACOBS: That may be, but we start from $2,000 instead of $3,000, so we really only have raised the tax $12.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, $32.

Mr. JACOBS: Very well then, $32, but we have started from $2,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It does not matter where we have started from.

Mr. JACOBS: We will not quarrel on a matter of $20 a year. We are paying $32 more than we did last year, and our expenditure for war purposes has gone up something like $500,000,000. It does seem to me that a man who has an income of

$10,000 a year ought really to pay more than $392 a year when we have a war of this kind going on; it does not seem right to the community. In the general list we have taken chicory, green and ripe coffee, tea, snuff, and that kind of thing, and even matches; adhesive stamps have to be attached to packages, and all that kind of thing; and here right at our door we have large sums of money which can be obtained merely for the asking. All the Acting Finance Minister has to do is to declare by a stroke of the pen that So-and-so must pay a certain sum of money, and behold, he has it. My hon. friend has spoken of the fact that this tax is on a parity with the tax in the United States. We must not forget, however, that the United States is only in the first year of the war, whereas we are in our fourth year, and I venture to predict that when the United States is in its fourth year—I hope to God the war will not last so long, but if it should come about—the tax will be very much more than $392 on an income of $10,000 a year. In the matter of tea, large consumers will be paying a considerable sum of money. With that tea goes tobacco, and with tobacco goes all these little petty luxuries of the poor, and we will find that these people, although they have not an income of $2,000 a year, will be paying relatively a very much larger sum than other persons who have an income of $10,000 and upwards. It seems rather strange, rather extraordinary, that the Opposition should be begging the Government to increase the taxation, but we find that it is necessary to do so because the Government are not acting as we think they should in the interest of the country. While there is yet time, we on this side of the House urge the Government to see to it that the taxation is made commensurate with the needs of the country, because the people who have these incomes can very well afford to pay.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is quite easy to understand why an Opposition may be begging, to use my hon. friend's terms, the Government to increase taxation. I suppose that may be quite fair political game, but does not—

Mr. McMASTER: It is not a game. Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity for the Acting Finance Minister to say that and to impute motives.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not imputing motives.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, you are.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not imputing motives at all. My hon. friend says that our income tax in Canada is not as large as it is in England. That is a well-known fact, but there are many reasons why that should be so. In the first place, there is no taxation upon consumption in England, as there is in this country. My hon. friend knows, further, that the customs tax upon practically everything coming into this country is very high indeed. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) very naturally bows assent to that statement, and we are not at variance upon that point. Well, that must be taken into consideration. To suggest that the income tax of Canada should be the same as that of England would be rather preposterous.

Mr. JACOBS: I am not suggesting that. There is a wide margin between $390 and $3,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is quite a wide difference, and it would be a very difficult matter for us to agree upon the exact point to which we should go in seeking to approximate the income tax of Great Britain. Now, the income tax in Canada under the present amendment will exceed that of the United States upon all incomes. Of course, that is not a complete answer to the statement that our income tax now is too low, but some consideration must be paid to the rate of income taxation in the United States. We cannot escape from it. Our territories lie side by side, and if the income tax is much higher in this country than it is in the United States there can be only one outcome: people will leave Canada and go to the United States. And the same might be said of our Business Profits War Tax, if the difference was very great. I hope my hon. friend does not mean to say that a consideration of that kind must not weigh with the Government. Further, in British Columbia, there is an income tax of 7 per cent upon incomes that are quite low, and in fixing the federal Income Tax we had to take that into consideration also. In the province of Ontario there is a municipal income tax, but I am really not in a position to state whether it is onerous or not. But I do know that the income tax in British Columbia is quite onerous and we could not escape giving due consideration to that fact. I would like to say also that while the tax upon an income of $10,000 will now be $392, it does not follow that it shall always remain at that sum. It is a

good canon of taxation, well recognized by students and writers, that any new tax should grow gradually, and it should not be at its highest point when the machinery is being formed for its collection. My hon. friend may be quite right in saying that the tax upon an income of $10,000 is too small. It rather has that appearance to me, I admit. But the difficulty is, that if you apply a certain rate on the income of $10,000 you must carry that rate right through all the higher incomes, and if you did that the disparity with the United States Income Tax would be very much greater than it is at present. However, I am not arguing that our tax should remain fixed at the present rates forever. Circumstances and conditions in the future may make it absolutely necessary that we increase the present rates.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I want to draw the minister's attention to a fallacy he has been making use of with regard to the question of our people going over to the United States if we increase the income tax. If the income tax is increased and money is collected from our people it goes towards paying the debt. If we have a tremendous debt, much larger in proportion than that of the United States, won't our people go into the United States to the same extent by reason of the debt as by reason of the taxes?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think people in all communities fear taxes more than they fear debt.

Mr. BUREAU: I would like to remind the Acting Minister of Finance that by the new time, and by the sun, it is now Ascension Day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is quite mistaken so far as the House is concerned. It has been the practice for twenty-five years that if the House should meet on Monday and should sit continuously until Saturday it still remains Monday.

Mr. BUREAU: I appeal to the Prime Minister's sense of respect for all creeds, and he knows the position we are in. Of course, we can remain if necessary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will be through in a moment. I discussed this matter with the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and it is important to get these Bills introduced if possible. It will take us only a few minutes. All the information that is being asked for now could just as well be asked for when we are in committee on the Bill, so there is really no great advantage in delaying now.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I would like to ask the Acting Finance Minister whether any consideration has been given to certain representations made to him recently by the trust companies. I know that while we have the income tax under consideration other amendments that are desirable can be considered, and while this resolution is being considered seems the proper time to make suggestions. One of the suggestions made is that the date, February 28, is too early, and that March 31 would be preferable. Did that suggestion receive consideration?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not proposed to change the date.

Sir HERBERT AMES: The second suggestion was with respect to exacting what is called for in Clause 6 from fiduciary companies. They find that clause extremely onerous. Has that suggestion been considered?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is proposed to repeal Clause 6.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The acting minister has not answered my question.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the hon. gentleman renew his question on the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: All right.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions reported as amended and amendments agreed to.

REVENUE BILLS INTRODUCED.

The resolutions to amend the customs tariff, of 1907, were read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. A. K. Maclean thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 81, to amend the Customs Act, 1907.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

The resolutions respecting Duties of Excise were read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. A. K. Maclean thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 82, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

The resolution respecting the Special War Revenue was read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 83, to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

The resolution respecting the Business Profits War Tax was read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 84, to amend the Business Profits War Tax, 1916.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

The resolution respecting the Income War Tax was read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 85, to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women, was read the first and second times and agreed to.

ASCENSION DAY ADJOURNMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 8th instant, it stand adjourned until Friday the 10th instant.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 1.22 a.m., Thursday.

Friday, May 10, 1918.

Friday, May 10, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

BRAZEAU COLLIERIES—BILL WITHDRAWN.

Sir HERBERT AMES presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, recommending that the fees paid on Bill No. 33 respecting Brazeau Collieries, Limited, be refunded.

Sir HERBERT AMES moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has this Bill been withdrawn?

Sir HERBERT AMES: In the report just presented and read to the House it will be seen that the committee unanimously decided that the preamble was not proven; that the Bill was unnecessary, and that it should not be adopted. The committee reported accordingly. The applicants then asked that the fees be refunded.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE.

BILLS OF THE OTTAWA GAS COMPANY AND THE GOSPEL WORKERS CHURCH IN CANADA WITHDRAWN.

Mr. M. STEELE (South Perth) presented the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills; recommending that Bill No. 35, respecting the Ottawa Gas Company, be withdrawn, and the fee and charges paid thereon be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation; and also recommending that the fee and charges, less the cost of printing and translation, paid on Bill No. 59, to incorporate the Gospel Workers Church in Canada, be refunded.

On motion of Mr. Steele, the report was concurred in.

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE presented the report of the Special Committee on Bill No. 25, respecting bankruptcy; recommending that the Bill be forthwith printed as amended and herewith reported, with a further recommendation that over and above the usual parliamentary distribution, a certain number of copies of the Bill, as so reprinted, be supplied for distribution amongst the public libraries and the industrial, commercial, financial and legal bodies of the country.

On motion of Mr. Guthrie, the report was concurred in.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) moved that the recommendations contained in the first report of the Joint Committee on Printing, presented to the House on Tuesday, April 23, be concurred in. He said: There is nothing in this report outside of the customary recommendation to print or not to print certain public documents.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like my hon. friend to summarize in a few words the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. CURRIE: The report has been on the Table for a number of weeks. It recommends that a few documents be printed, and that a large number of documents be not printed. The report is on file for the hon. gentleman to see. It does not deal with any question of printing by the departments.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL AMENDMENT.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 86, to amend the Daylight Saving Act, 1918.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The amendment appears to be made necessary, as will be shown when I read clause 2, as it is at present:

> 2. During the prescribed period in each year in which this Act is in force, the time, for general purposes in Canada, in each province, shall be one hour in advance of the time which under the law of the province is the time prescribed for such province.

We propose to amend that by adding after the words " law of the province," these words:

> At the time of the coming into force of this Act.

The clause will then read:

> During the prescribed pediod in each year in which this Act is in force, the time, for general purposes in Canada, in each province, shall be one hour in advance of the time which under the law of the province at the time of the coming into force of this Act is the time prescribed for such province.

What happens if that amendment is not made, is, for instance, in the province of Nova Scotia, the Daylight Saving Act went into force on the standard time in Nova Scotia. If Nova Scotia, for provincial purposes wishes to advance its time one hour so as to provide against any confusion of times in the province and does so advance it, then the Daylight Saving Act time would have to be advanced one hour beyond that, and that would throw it out of gear with the time in all the other provinces, and if the same operation was carried on time after time, the two times would be chasing each other around the whole circumference of the globe and would never get even.

[Mr. Currie.]

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of William Leo Walpole.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Mary Claire Dawson Hislop.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Martin Hafner.—Mr. H. A. Mackie.

Bill No. 79, for the relief of Ida Sophia Wardell.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Bill No. 80, for the relief of Edward David Hill.—Mr. Richardson.

FISHERIES BRANCH, NAVAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT.

On the Orders of the day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With the leave of the House, I move that the Fiftieth Annual Report of the Fisheries Branch, Department of Naval Service, be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. I understand that without some such motion it is not competent for the Committee to take it up and consider it.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—THE MINISTER OF MILITIA.

STATEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO COLONEL LABATT OF THE PENSIONS BOARD.

On the Orders of the day:

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. In the Ottawa Citizen of the 9th instant, an article was published—and copied in many of the newspaper journals throughout the country—in which my name was referred to in connection with the appointment of Colonel R. H. Labatt to the Board of Pension Commissioners. Included in this article was a letter from Mr. H. H. Stevens, member of this House for Vancouver Centre, in which letter the hon. member states:

> It is pointed out that Colonel Labatt is reported to be a brother-in-law to the Minister of Militia, (General Mewburn), and to the Minister of Railways and Canals, (Hon. Dr. Reid).

The said article and letter referred to, suggest to the public mind that Colonel Labatt's relationship to me had something to do with his appointment and pension. I, therefore, wish to take this opportunity of informing the members of this House that Colonel Labatt is not my brother-in-

law and is not a relation of mine, but is connected with me by marriage.

Colonel Labatt's appointment to the Board of Pension Commissioners was made in 1916, long before I became a member of the present Government. or had any idea of being such a member. Further, I wish to state that I had no connection, directly or indirectly, with Colonel Labatt's appointment, although I remember that at the time he was offered the appointment he informed me of the fact and I advised him against taking it, because he had a good private business, and I believed the heavy responsibility and worry of such an office would be too much of a strain on his health.

While I have stated that Colonel Labatt is not a relation of mine, I do not wish to be misunderstood; I would feel honoured if this gentleman were a relation of mine. He enjoys the respect of all who know him and he is one of the most experienced and best known Canadian officers. His service in the Canadian militia dates back prior to 1885. He served through the Northwest Rebellion as a private. Ever since that time he has been a very active officer in the Canadian militia. He has given his best to the service of his country through this long period.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is exceeding his rights on a question of privilege.

Major-General MEWBURN: I was going to say that Colonel Labatt had been at the front. I desire to repudiate, in the strongest possible language, the inference that Colonel Labatt's appointment or his right to draw a pension, had anything to do with his association or connection with me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should like to add that the appointment of Colonel Labatt to the position which he now holds as a member of the Board of Pensions Commissioners was not due in any sense to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. J. D. Reid.) His name was not suggested to me by Dr. Reid, nor did Dr. Reid have anything to do with his appointment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: These appointments on the Board of Pension Commissioners have caused a great deal of comment. I suggest that the House be given an opportunity to discuss the matter on a later occasion. It cannot be discussed at this moment on a question of privilege.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I believe that the subject is under consideration by the Committee on Pensions and when the report of that committee is made, ample opportunity for discussion will be given. The matter can be taken up earlier than that if the House considers that there is any urgency.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it not a fact that Colonel Labatt has been asked to renounce this pension?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not had any communication with him in the matter so far, for the reason that the subject is under consideration by the Pensions Committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then we shall have an early opportunity of discussing the matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CURRIE.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I rise to a question of privilege. In the Canadian Press report of my address in this House on the Budget, which has been sent to all the newspapers of Canada, there appears the following:

> There had been a careful avoidance of placing a tax on Canadian-made goods, he said, and this was not good policy on the part of the Government

I said exactly the opposite, and as this House is spending a large sum of money to have these reports sent out to the public, I think somebody should be put in the press gallery who will be more careful in the future.

PURCHASE OF TRACTORS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask the Minister of Agriculture if a report has been received from Hon. Mr. Dunning, of the Canada Food Board, as to the purchase of tractors for farm work in Canada?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: No such report has come before me, but I will make inquiries of the Canada Food Board.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY: I understand that a number of young conscripts between the ages of twenty and twenty-two, and whose medical category is "C," have been put in the ranks at Lansdowne Park with-

out further medical examination. Have all men in this class been ordered to report?

Major-General MEWBURN: A man's category may not be known when his notice to report is sent out. When he reports he undergoes a medical examination immediately, and if found to be in category "C" he would be relieved at once.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I will give the minister the names of some of these young men.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: When a category "A" man is called, has he to undergo a further medical examination?

Major-General MEWBURN: In calling up the young men between twenty and twenty-two it has been found that a considerable number who were originally put in category "A" have fallen below that category when re-examined. Of course, it is not our desire to take the men of that class who fall below category "A," but there must be a re-examination to ascertain the condition the men are in at the time they report.

Mr. BUREAU: If a man had previously been placed in category "B" or "C," would not the production of his medical certificate be sufficient to relieve him from duty until his particular category is called?

Major-General MEWBURN: It is quite possible there may have to be a re-examination of all the men. Some who have been placed in category "B" or "C" in the first place, may be in category "A" when called to report.

LEGISLATION RESPECTING ALIENS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): A few days ago this House unanimously adopted a series of resolutions requesting the Government to bring down legislation with respect to the aliens in Canada. The Government accepted these resolucions, and I would ask when they intend to bring down the legislation, for the session is likely to be short.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not recall any such resolutions.

Mr. CURRIE: The resolution of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) was passed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not aware that it called for any legislation but rather that certain Orders in Council should be revised.

[Mr. DuTremblay.]

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

RENEWAL OR POSTPONEMENT OF PAYMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMPANY.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) for the second reading of the resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of assisting the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System, in renewing or postponing the payment of any indebtedness of any such company, etc.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I had understood the minister was to produce at this stage all the documents that were promised.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if the hon. member purposes making a speech, but I have grave doubts whether this motion is debatable. In the meantime, with the unanimous consent of the House, there can be no objection to his producing the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am inclined to think the motion is debatable but I do not want to debate it now. We simply want the information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall be very glad to avoid any debate on the resolution. I shall lay on the Table all the information available. I had not understood, however, that the right hon. gentleman wanted me to lay the information on the Table. I understood he wished me to give it orally to the House, and I shall be very glad to do that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We are hungering for information, and want a taste of the food we are to get.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My colleague is proposing to feed my right hon. friend now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will give him all the information he can comfortably read in a couple of days.

Motion agreed to, and resolution read the second time.

Mr. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 87, an Act supplementary to chapter 24 of the statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall this Bill be read a second time?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is only reasonable that we should have time to digest the information that was promised, before taking up the second reading.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am ready to give the information now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I should like to digest it before we take the second reading.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 5, to amend the Dominion Lands, be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What are the amendments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subsection 1 of section 10 of the Dominion Lands Act, chapter 20 of the statutes of 1918, is amended by striking out the words "or purchased homestead" in the fifth line thereof. There was another place in the Act where the purchased homestead provision was still included notwithstanding the fact that purchased homesteads had been abolished. Consequently, it was merely by a clerical oversight that the words "or purchased homestead" were left in. The Senate struck them out and properly so. The Senate also struck out a clause which provided that when a patent was issued, and before it was delivered from the office of the Department of the Interior, it might be cancelled by the minister without recourse to the Exchequer Court. The Senate took the view that it was not good practice to cancel a patent after issue even though it was still within the office of the minister. The matter is not of sufficient importance to refer back to the Senate and I am prepared to accept that amendment. There was another amendment which was of a clerical character and it is also accepted.

Motion agreed to, and amendment concurred in.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 65 to amend the Companies Act be concurred in.

He said: The amendment, I think, is an improvement to the Bill. The Bill simply provides that for the purpose of complying with the requirement of the Companies Act any agreement shall be deposited with the Secretary of State, but that in the case of an agreement from the province of Quebec, which is in notarial form, it shall be sufficient to file a copy of the original. The amendment that the Senate has made is to make that the provision shall operate as from the passing of the clause in the Companies Act in order that copies that have been deposited under the Act up to the present shall avail as well as those which may be produced in future.

Motion agreed to and amendment concurred in.

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 32, respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, be concurred in. He said:

The amendment that was made in the Senate is to subsection 3 of section 26. The word "railway" is struck out and the word "company" is put in its place. It refers to more than railways. It refers to express companies and carriers by water; so that, the proper word should have been "company," and not "railway," in order to make it include all.

Motion agreed to and amendment concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Doherty, Bill No. 69, to amend the Criminal Code, was read a second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

On section 1—Seduction of girls between sixteen and eighteen; paragraph 2, male persons under twenty-one not to be prosecuted.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would just like to point out that subclause 2, reading that no male person under the age of twenty-one years shall be prosecuted for any offence under the provisions of this section, is either designed to maintain a double standard of morality, or else it is a direct contradiction of paragraph 1. I submit that if the Parliament of Canada establishes the principle that a girl has come to the age of responsibility at eighteen years, it has no right to establish the principle that a man up to twenty-one has not come to the same age of responsibility.

I further submit that the clause is setting up a vicious principle, in that it is saying to young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one: We recognize that you have

free license to do as you like during this period. Now the Act would be very much stronger if subclause 2 were omitted entirely, but I submit we are not keeping abreast of the times if we set up anything that would be in the nature of a double standard of morality. Subclause 1, providing for raising the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years, is excellent so far as it goes, but subclause 2 certainly should be dropped, otherwise we are saying to our young men: We give you all the license that you wish, we invite you to do as you like between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one—the most vital years of a young man's life,—and we will undertake to correct the habits you have formed after you have passed the age of twenty-one.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will explain the reason for having in the Bill provisions to which he objects, and which he argues is creating a double standard of morality. Might I point out to him that the section which he commends—and which I am glad to see meets with his approval,—and the provision of the law up to the present which has been the same, save as regards the age fixed for the young girl, proceeds on the assumption that there is a double standard, but a double standard more severe as against the man than against the girl, because the man is made a criminal.

An hon. MEMBER: So he should be.

Mr. DOHERTY: This section makes the young man a criminal and extends the criminality as regards girls of higher age than the law previously provided, but it does seem that there is a severer provision as against the man than there is against the girl, and I think quite rightly and quite properly. The reason why the provision in question was inserted is this: You are making this offence, which it takes two people to perpetrate, a crime as regards one of them. By this section you are increasing the age at which the girl is held to be capable of consenting; you are raising the age of the girl in such a manner as to make it an offence henceforth on the part of the man to have relations with a girl with regard to whom, up till to-day, that was not an offence. The reason why that provision was introduced with regard to the boy up to the age of twenty-one, and the representation made in its favour, was that when you are dealing with a girl who may be just under the age of eighteen years, and a boy, say, of nineteen or twenty years of age, there was really no strong reason to assume that, as between young people of those ages respectively, the guilt or responsibility in the matter was entirely on the part of the young man. I do not want to go into the argument in detail. I think all our experience of human nature would lead us to concede, even if we do not think this provision ought to stand as it is, that there at all events is some force in the argument. The provision itself has been very strongly supported—I am speaking now of the main provision raising the age—by the Social Service Council of Canada while they very strongly recommend the enactment of the first section raising the age, they also expressed the view and recommended that there should be a clause which would give protection to boys up to the same age and in the same way as the section protects the girls. That involves a section fixing precisely the same age for both sexes, and I think, perhaps, there may be a general consensus of opinion in favour of accepting that. The reason for carrying the age up to twenty-one was that which I have given. It was represented to us by people who have had very considerable to do with the detection and punishment of offences of this kind, that when you raise the age of the girl to eighteen you diminish very materially the presumption, as I have said, that the entire responsibility for what happened was upon the young man. It was pointed out that in those very years is the time when young men are more open to the influence, or more apt to be carried away by the influence, of passion, and that experience would go to show that under those conditions the young girl—any girl of seventeen or eighteen years—may fairly be assumed to be as well qualified to control herself, and to prevent conditions arising where unfortunately these offences may be committed, as the young man up to the age of twenty-one. However, this is not a question upon which I am wedded at all to the fixing of a particular age; I am absolutely in the hands of the committee as to what age limit, if any, should be fixed with regard to the young man. This is a question, of course, as to which there can be no suggestion that there should be any consideration come into play but what, in the judgment of this House, would best conduce to the maintenance of morality.

It has been pointed out to me also in this connection, and as a ground for making a provision of this kind fixing this particular age, or possibly another age, with regard to the young man, that we are mak-

ing this a crime. Undoubtedly the consequence will be that the young man who offends in this regard will be made a criminal; he is going to be subjected to the treatment of a criminal and started in his early youth with the brand of criminality upon him. Unless the proposed amendment passes, that has not been the case up to the present time. We all fully appreciate, and there is no occasion to dilate upon it, the very grave consequences that, without regard to legislative enactment, fall upon the girl who sins in this way, and I have no desire to make the position of the young man better in that regard than her own. On the other hand, I do not think it is quite correct to point to this section as giving a license to the young man to do what he likes with regard to girls of the age referred to. If that appreciation of it be correct, then the law up to the present has given a license to men of all ages to do what they please in that respect.

But now we are creating a new offence. This Bill makes it an offence for all men over twenty-one years of age, and assumes absolutely their exclusive responsibility for the commission of this sin, which, as I have said, takes two people to commit. Whether it is wise or unwise, in making that extension and raising the age of the girl, also to make that offence apply with regard to men of all ages, is a question that, at all events, is serious, and calls for consideration. As I have said, however, I am not wedded to this particular age. I am quite in the judgment of the committee and of the House as to whether the age with regard to the young man is the age that should properly be fixed, or whether we should fix the same age as for the girl, or any intervening age, or whether there should be any provision at all fixing the age. I would only like to call the attention of the committee to what has been said in support of this proposition, and perhaps particularly to the fact that by making legislation which will be applicable to young men of all ages you are perhaps not bettering the position of the girl who has the misfortune to be a participant in this sin, but you are very materially aggravating the consequences to the young man. So far as those consequences will operate as a deterrent, of course I think we would all hold up both hands for them. But I think it is well to look at the other side of the picture and to consider whether in the general interest of the community it is well to enact a law that will start out in his career in life branded as a criminal every young man who may have yielded to temptation in this particular regard. If we could do something to mitigate the social consequences to the young woman probably it would be better, but I do not imagine that we can, nor am I affirming absolutely that it would be. But the question really pressing is: Will society as a whole gain if we blast as a criminal at the very outset of his career the young man who, under the circumstances provided for by the section, has yielded to temptation and fallen into this sin and committed this offence, whose gravity I do not want to minimize, but which, at the same time, is an offence to which youth at that particular stage of its career is exceedingly liable, by the weakness of our human nature, to find itself guilty of. But as I have said, I am quite prepared to take the view of the committee upon that question.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am glad to hear the minister say that he is not wedded to this legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not wedded to subsection 2.

Mr. DEVLIN: I feel moreover that the Minister of Justice had nothing to do with the drawing up or the dictating of this subsection. I know him too well for that. To my mind this is about the most damnable piece of legislation I have ever seen brought before this House. Subsection 2 simply gives to the young man up to the age of twenty-one license to go round the country committing a certain act which I will not mention, an act that is even too repugnant to mention here, and the Government will simply say to that young man: "Well done, go and do it again."

Mr. DOHERTY: Might I suggest then that if that be so all governments in the past have been saying to "all" men: "Well done, go and do it again."

Mr. DEVLIN: But governments have not been saying that, because answering my hon. friend's remark, I will give him what all governments have been saying. Section 211 of the Criminal Code reads as follows:

12 noon

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who seduces or has illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character, of or above the age of fourteen years and under the age of sixteen years.

It does not tell the man that he goes scot-free; it punishes the man. But by subsec-

tion 2 of this Bill you say to the young man:

No male person under the age of twenty-one years shall be prosecuted for any offence under the provisions of this section.

If I have a suggestion to make respecting this legislation, it is to strike out the whole of the proposed new section 211 and amend section 211 of the Code as follows:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable—

Not to two years but—

—to six years' imprisonment who seduces or has illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character.

That is the first amendment I would make. And the second amendment I would make would be to leave out all words after the word "character." The words in the present Criminal Code which I propose to leave out are as follows:

Of or above the age of fourteen years and under the age of sixteen years.

The clause as I propose it would then read:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to six years' imprisonment who seduces or has illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character.

Mr. McMASTER: How would you define "girl"?

Mr. DEVLIN: I define a girl just as she is defined under the Criminal Code. I would not limit her age, provided she was of previously chaste character. I say that no man, especially the class of men the Minister of Justice referred to as most apt to show their passions and to commit this crime, would be entitled to have illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character.

An Hon. MEMBER: Even if she were fifty years of age?

Mr. DEVLIN: I am not particular about the age. I have know of cases where girls over that age were before the courts. If there are hon. gentlemen in this House so very particular as to limiting the girl's age, then they can suggest a limit to the age. But I have known cases such as this: a woman who was not in full possession of her faculties has been seduced by a young man of twenty years of age. By this proposed new legislation that woman would have no redress before the courts. We are dealing with a section of the code which gives a free hand to every young man up to twenty-one years of age to commit a crime. Such legislation ought not to be tolerated.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Westminster District): I congratulate the Minister of Justice upon the general character of the amendments proposed in this Bill. I am sure it will be a cause of deep satisfaction to the right-thinking citizens of this country, comprising, I believe, the great majority of the population, that the minister has brought down such important amendments to the Criminad Code. This Bill, perhaps more than ordinary Bills, lends itself to a discussion that is comparatively, if not entirely, free from all sectional considerations, and, therefore, in my remarks I shall try to speak as a man to men, irrespective of race, religion, or party. I have reason to believe that there are great numbers of our best Canadian citizens who would go even further than the minister has gone, and would favour raising both the age of consent and the age of seduction higher than is provided for in his amendments. With this view I do not hesitate to declare myself in full sympathy, but I do not intend to suggest any further change at present. I mention it merely to indicate to the minister that he has not gone beyond the judgment of hundreds of thousands of the best people of our country. I do, however, ask that the minister will accept an amendment to clause 2 of section 211, and which I have drafted as follows:

That the word "twenty-one" be striken out of line 16 and the word "eighteen" be substituted therefor.

It will then read:

No male person under the age of eighteen years shall be prosecuted for any offence under the provisions of this section.

It will readily be acknowledged that the subject matter of this clause has a direct and vital bearing upon the domestic life of the people of Canada and I submit that any matter so closely related to the welfare and happiness of our Canadian homes is worthy of our most serious consideration. It is considered by some people that it is scarcely within the scope of Federal legislation to have very much to say or to do with family life. This idea is probably based on the assumption underlying the well-known phrase that an Englishman's house is his castle; but we have learned that if it is necessary to do so to protect the interests of society, any man's castle may be invaded by the State. It is not necessary to argue to-day that what Canada needs is more homes; that the social and

economic conditions of society be so adjusted that early marriages may be encouraged and that the State should give some attention to and some instruction regarding the vital subject of child welfare. When it is remembered that more children under five years of age die in Canada every year than the total number of Canadian fatalities during the first three years of the war; when we remember also that great numbers of these children might, under proper conditions, have lived, we will at once admit that every fact or consideration bearing upon the home life of our citizens is of supreme importance. I fear that this clause granting exemption from prosecution to all offenders under twenty-one, will, instead of affording protection to our Canadian homes, tend to lessen their number and destroy the happiness of many remaining. If a young man under twenty-one takes advantage of this clause and seduces a young girl, what follows? An unmarried motherhood, with one woman living under a cloud during the remainder of her life, and drawing other homes into the shadow; or, on the other hand, too often the beginning of a life of shame. So far as records are available I believe that a very small percentage of girls go wrong after twenty-one years of age, and consequently, so far as legislation touches this question at all, it should seek to protect in every way possible the young women of our country.

Another reason for this amendment is found in the fact that as the clause stands it appears at least to endorse a double standard of morals.

I am sure that this House only needs to be reminded that if there is any one thing in the whole realm of sociology which the best manhood and the best womanhood of this country deprecates and is most anxious to eliminate, it is this two-fold standard of morals. I fear that this clause as it stands will tend to encourage, if not indeed actually to sanction, that very distinction which our best citizenship is seeking to abolish. Must I speak plainly to be understood? This clause seeks to protect girls up to 18 years of age from seduction by men over 21 years of age, but it says to every young man under 21: Go to, yield to every passion, ruin every girl you desire of 16 years of age and upwards, and no prosecution will follow, we give you special permission until you are 21 years of age to live an unbridled sexual life, but after that you must settle down and behave yourself; it is true we have tacitly encouraged you to start on an evil road; nevertheless, if you keep on that road after you are 21, we will punish you severely. I am sure this committee will not endorse that policy. If any cynical critic either inside or outside the House should retort: Oh, you are only trying to make people virtuous by legislation; my answer is brief and direct: I am trying by legislation to make it difficult and as dangerous as possible for them to be vicious, especially when the life-long welfare of others is involved in such vicious self-indulgence.

One other reason only I shall briefly state. Our country is made up of a cosmopolitan population. From ocean to ocean, in every province of this Dominion, we have representatives of nearly every nation under Heaven. That simple statement is a warning in itself. We know that the morals of certain nationalities are exceedingly lax and that with many others of all races the animal passions are at a maximum between nineteen and twenty-one years of age. We must not consider this question merely from the viewpoint of our own households, but from the national viewpoint, and with the coming generations in sight. One thing I believe every man in this House wishes to escape and that is the accusation of an outraged public conscience, voiced too often by a broken hearted and spirit-crushed father or mother in the sad words: "My girl must suffer, but the man goes scot free." I submit that the amendment which I suggest would help in some measure to save us from that awful indictment.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Westminster District formally move an amendment, or does he merely offer it as a suggestion?

Mr. STACEY: I have submitted my amendment in the hope that the minister will incorporate it in the Bill.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: If there is anything disgraceful in our modern civilization which has not been cured by the advance in sociality, it is the double system of morals. Any man who recognizes that system has not advanced far enough in the scale of sociality to vote to give women the franchise. I do not understand, and never could, why my sister should be tabooed for a breach of the social law while my brother for the same act should not. In bringing down a Bill, therefore, which introduces a double standard of morals for men—not as between men and women, but as between young men and older men— my hon. friend

is making a great mistake. The member for Westminster District (Mr. Stacey) points out that certain people think we have no right to pass legislation with regard to young girls. But this is not altogether a moral question: it is a physiological question as well. A man who indulges once is likely to do it again, whereas if he is kept chaste, he has no desire to do it. I speak with some authority with regard to this matter, because I have been an observer of men whom I have had under my control, men who have been closely associated with me, locked up with me, so to speak, for weeks and months. I have observed the practice of a vicious system of ignorance: some of these men teaching younger men that they would have to do certain things in order to be men. This is the greatest rot that was ever taught to young men. I repeat that the question is one of physiology as well as of morals. Young men may be and ought to be so educated that there would be no necessity for such a law, in the meantime let us protect them from their present ignorance. I certainly hope the minister will strike out subsection 2, and I would suggest that he raise the age of consent to twenty-one. A man has no right to take advantage of a woman at any time, at any rate, not until she is twenty-one.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I am in full and complete accord with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), and I believe the time is not very far distant, if it is not here now, when that principle will be incorporated into the Criminal Code of Canada. I believe, however, in being practical if I can, and I do not think there would be much use in pressing, at the present moment, an amendment quite so drastic as that, but I strongly urge on the minister that if he does not eliminate subsection 2 entirely, he will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Westminster district (Mr. Stacey), and, at least, amend the subsection so as to make the ages similar. As regards what the minister said as to branding as a criminal a young man between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, let us just reverse the order and see what takes place with regard to the girl. Assuming that we set the age limit in each case at eighteen, assuming that the young man and the young woman are alike up to eighteen years of age and that they commit that offence, what happens? The young woman goes through life branded, if not as a criminal, at least as an outcast, while the young man goes through life free. We proceed further along that line, and under subsection 2 we say to the young woman: You will be branded as an outcast, sinking possibly lower and lower in the social scale until you become a menace, not only to your own sex, but to the opposite sex, the younger boys, if you will, and we say to the young man between eighteen and twenty-one years of age, who brings the young woman into that position: You go scot-free, and we thus encourage that sort of thing to continue. I would like to see the clause struck out entirely, or if not, that the minister should accept the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Westminster district (Mr. Stacey).

Mr. PROULX: I approve the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Westminster district (Mr. Stacey). In some of the provinces a young man is considered old enough at eighteen to be married without the consent of his parents, so, as my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) has said, a young man of eighteen years of age can commit as much damage as a young man over the age of twenty-one. It would be conducive to morality if the age, so far as the young man is concerned, was reduced to eighteen.

Mr. VIEN: The only argument that has been brought forward against striking out subsection 2 is that the young man between eighteen and twenty-one years of age should be protected and not be branded as a criminal. I think, on the contrary; it will be a preventive to the young man of that age if he knows that his action constitutes a criminal offence. Moreover, while the maximum punishment provided for is imprisonment for two years, the sentence may be for imprisonment for from one day up to two years, and I think that, if a young man between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one committed the criminal offence which is foreseen by this amendment to the Criminal Code, the court before which he would have to appear would take into consideration the particular circumstances of the case and, instead of branding him with a sentence of imprisonment for two years, the court might sentence him to imprisonment for an hour, a day, a week, two weeks, or two months. It would be a good thing to strike out subsection 2 and leave subsection 1 alone, thus leaving it to the courts to decide in each case what punishment should be inflicted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Justice might also take this into consideration, that since we call a young man of the age of nineteen or twenty to the colours, he should not be put above the law, as under subsection 2 he will be put. I agree with the hon. member for Westminster district as to the merits of the Bill. It is a good Bill and it should be passed by the House, but subsection 2 should be struck out.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am one of the few hon. members who agree with the Minister of Justice as to subsection 2. When I first read the Bill, I was going to ask for an explanation as to the age limit in subsection 2. The reasons given by the Minister of Justice have convinced me that subsection 2 should be retained in the Bill. There are certainly cases where the responsibility should not fall entirely on the young man under twenty-one years of age, and where the girl should be let go scot free. Surely my hon. friend from Wright and the hon. member for East Algoma are not serious when they say a young man under twenty-one years of age should be prosecuted for having seduced a maid of forty or forty-five years of age. The proposition is absolutely absurd. The reasons given by the Minister of Justice are sound, and I think the subsection should be kept as it is.

Mr. COWAN: I think the case cited by my hon. friend is so exceptional that it should not be considered at all. The vast majority of these cases occur between the young man of twenty and girls of the same age. Instances of the kind cited by my hon. friend are very rare, indeed, and should not form the basis of our legislation. I would sooner trust a man at any period of his life than between eighteen and twenty-one years, when his passions are matured but he has not the wisdom of maturity. Our ordinary legislation recognizes that. I see no reason why we should make any distinction between the two sexes. The law of Canada provides that where the two parties agree to marry all criminal proceedings shall be stopped. If we remove the penalty from young men up to the age of twenty-one years he will certainly not be any the more likely to marry the girl; whereas when he is liable to a penalty of two years he is more likely to do justice to her. I do not believe in forced marriages, but I believe that is better than to turn a young woman out blighted for the rest of her life. I therefore support the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. DEVLIN: In order to settle the qualms of conscience of my hon. friend from Kamouraska, when I spoke of a woman of forty-five or fifty I was simply instancing how far young men might carry their crimes. I did not cite that as a basis for any argument at all, and I hope my hon. friend, knowing me as well as he does, will not think I meant that as the essence of any argument I was trying to make. I am thoroughly aware of the fact that the Criminal Code provides for cases of idiots and so on, but I had in mind cases occurring in the country. I am addressing myself particularly to hon. gentlemen representing rural constituencies, because apparently this legislation does not consider the cities at all. Hon. gentlemen representing the cities can draw up their own code of morals, but we are here trying to protect the people in the rural constituencies.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: These things do not occur in rural constituencies.

Mr. DEVLIN: The hon. member for Kamouraska has the advantage of representing one of the ideal constituencies of the Dominion. As a matter of fact, there is less crime in rural constituencies than in cities.

An hon. MEMBER: Less known crime.

Mr. DEVLIN: I have lived in cities and I have lived in the country, and I know whereof I speak. In the rural parts of Canada there is far less crime than there is in the cities, but it is in the rural constituencies where an odd case such as I have cited comes to the notice of the criminal authorities. You gentlemen who come from the cities are framing your code of morals every day for yourselves, and are perhaps not paying the same keen attention to this matter that we are who represent rural constituencies. I think, after all the arguments that have been advanced, there is nothing further for me to add. I am grieved, however, beyond measure to see that my hon. friend from Kamouraska, who is the very incarnation of virtue, respectable beyond his outward appearance, wants us to swallow subsection 2 of section 211. I am not going to attempt to answer my hon. friend. I shall leave him to settle the matter with his conscience.

Mr. McMASTER: It is a matter of gratification to see the unanimity with which the principle of this Bill is accepted by the House. I would urge that this clause be retained, not necessarily retaining the word "twenty-one," but some protection should

be given to young boys. If you eliminate this clause altogether, a girl of eighteen, of a passionate nature, might have illicit connection with a young lad of sixteen, and she would not be liable under the Criminal Code, while the boy would; and that is something we have to provide against. We do not want a double standard of morality, and we do not want a double standard that will punish the boy of sixteen and allow the girl of eighteen to go almost scot-free. I am in favour of retaining the clause, and while not prepared to go quite so far perhaps as the hon. member for Westminster, I am prepared to go with him a considerable length. That a young man of almost twenty-one, with all the matured discretion of a grown man, should go scot-free is not right. At the same time there must be some protection to the mere lad, who perhaps through ignorance is led astray by a young girl a little older. I cherish this view that where two young people have misconducted themselves, as a rule the girl is just as much to blame as the boy, and I would suggest that as we are all agreed on the principle, it might meet the views of the House if we substituted the word "nineteen" for the word "twenty-one."

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I should like to emphasize the point I have already tried to make. In the case just cited by my hon. friend, what does a thirty-day term in jail mean to a boy of sixteen compared with the stigma the girl of eighteen will carry for the rest of her life? The girl you say, goes scot free but the girl who has wilfully got herself into that position, which is a most unusual thing to contemplate, or who has been brought into that condition by the wiles of a devilish young man, is branded for the rest of her life and no sentence you could impose on any young man could brand him to the same degree as the girl is branded before society by that very act. If the suggestion of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) was accepted by which this clause would be stricken out and the determination of the punishment left to the courts you would eliminate the license you have given to the young man and place in the hands of men who are able to put a proper estimate upon the nature and extent of the offence, the opportunity to determine what the punishment should be. You will make the Bill clean and acceptable, and not hold out to any class of young men that liberty or license which has been spoken about during this discussion, if you simply strike

out this paragraph as the hon. member for Lotbinière has suggested.

Mr. VIEN: Under the ordinary rules of criminal procedure a judge can even suspend sentence and no provisions are necessary in this Act to allow him to do so. The judge could suspend sentence, if paragraph two of this sentence were struck out, and exercise his discretion in each case.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am pleased to have had the advantage of listening to the different views which have been put forward. I was very gratified indeed to have had the endorsement of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), particularly as I endorse the description of him given by the hon, member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) as being the incarnation of virtue. That little consolation perhaps makes it easier for me, remembering some of the very strong language that has been used in regard to this section, to express my readiness to accept the modification which is suggested. I would not like to leave out entirely a provision, not holding out a license to do things, but merely, when we are making a new criminal law, making it applicable to men above a certain age. If the description of this legislation is correct as being a legislative holding out of a license to all young men up to twenty-one to commit this offence, we must inevitably conclude that as regards girls between fourteen and sixteen, or girls over fourteen, the law up to the present has held forth a license to all men to commit this offence. We would be making a step in advance if we cut that license down to a young man over twenty-one. However, I do not want to elaborate the argument that might be made. I do not want either to convey the idea that in the argument that might be made on the other side there is not very considerable force, but I cannot say that I am absolutely convinced by what has been said that the clause as it stands is objectionable. On the other hand, I am quite prepared, in a matter of this kind, to defer to the judgment of this committee as to the age which can be fixed and to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Westminster District (Mr. Steacey) that we should substitute eighteen for twenty-one. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) suggested nineteen. It was hardly worth while, for the sake of a difference of one year, to depart from the principle of putting both girl and boy, from the point of view of the criminal law at all events, on a footing of equality. There is

nothing we can do by the criminal law which will minimize the social consequences to the girl. That, unfortunately, will always be the case. I say "unfortunately," and no doubt it is unfortunate for the individual girl, but perhaps not absolutely unfortunate for the good of society in general. However, I need not go into that question. We cannot modify the position of the girl by anything the criminal law does. I will be prepared to accept the suggestion that eighteen be substituted for twenty-one, in the hope that that will meet the view of the committee generally. I therefore beg to move:

That subsection two of the proposed section be amended by striking out "twenty-one" in the first line thereof and substituting "eighteen."

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Unmarried man and woman registering as man and wife at hotel:

Mr. COOPER: I would like to ask whether, in the framing of this section, any notice has been taken of what is commonly known as a common law wife. All over the British Empire and in the United States they have acknowledged that principle by paying separation allowance to the dependents of a soldier whether he was married to a woman or not. It seems to me that this is a very drastic law, and makes a criminal of two people who have arrived at the age of discretion and ought to know their own intentions. I would think that before this is enacted it would be made the subject of discussion.

Mr. DOHERTY: All that is made an offence is the false statement. It is made an offence for people who are not man and wife to register themselves at any hotel or boarding house as being man and wife. There may be cases—I do not know to what extent if such is the fact—in parts of this country where what the hon. member describes as the common law wife is recognized as being validly married. But, after all, nobody has any right to live together as man and wife, unless they are legally and properly so, and the evil which is aimed at here has been represented to me as being largely prevalent. It has to do with people with regard to whom there is no pretence of common law relationship, or anything of the kind. On the contrary I am told that it is not at all an uncommon practice for people who have possibly met each other on a particular day or evening, and who make no pretence of conjugal relationship whatsoever, to go into hotels and boarding houses and use them simply as convenient places for prostitution, covering up their doings by registering themselves as man and wife. Large numbers of very respectable hotelkeepers have supported the suggested legislation because to-day they are not in a position to protect themselves by telling the parties concerned, "You are not married," and there is no consequence attaching to the registration falsely of these people as married persons. I think that the possible injury that might happen, if it be considered an injury, in the cases suggested by the hon. gentleman, sinks into insignificance in view of the real evil that is struck at.

Mr. MORPHY: Under the proposed section the Minister of Justice wants to reach the case of the man who goes to an hotel with a woman who is not his wife. But suppose the woman does the registering and the pretending, how are you going to reach her? I think the woman in such an event should be punished as well as the man, if we want to enact legislation that will prove effective. It may be said that the clause does cover the point that I have raised, but I do not think so. From a critical reading of it it seems to me that the clause would be quite inoperative and absolute nullity if it were left in the position in which it is at present.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think it would be desirable that we should make the section clear beyond the possibility of all doubt, and I have no objection to amending it with that object in view. I therefore move to amend section 220A by inserting in the second last line thereof after the word "woman," the words "or a man," and by inserting in the last line thereof before the word, "is" the words "or she" and adding to the last line after word "wife" the words "or her husband, as the case may be."

The CHAIRMAN: The section as proposed to be amended will now read:

Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, upon summary conviction, to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars or six months' imprisonment, who, at any hotel, boarding or lodging house, whether by registering in any book kept in such hotel, boarding or lodging house, or otherwise, represents or pretends that a woman, or a man, to whom he or she is not married, is his wife, or her husband, as the case may be.

Mr. BUREAU: That makes both liable.

Mr. DOHERTY: Both liable.

Mr. BUREAU: In case the law is violated that will prove to be a very dear signature.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 220B—corrupting children.

Mr. VIEN: I think this section of the Act would afford the so-called social reformers the opportunity of entering any house, or of complaining of the internal economy of any house, making complaints in court, and compelling anybody to go and defend themselves against such complaint. The scope of the section is so wide that its operation will be mischievous and it should, therefore, be cut out entirely. As proposed the section reads:

> Any person who by indulgence in sexual immorality, in habitual drunkenness, or in any other form of vice, causes a child to be in danger of being or becoming immoral, dissolute, or criminal, or tends injuriously to affect the morals of a child, or renders the home of a child an unfit place for such child to be in, shall be liable—

and so on. It would seem that whether you are in your own house or in the house of another person, any social reformer will be entitled to make complaint against you, and you will have to face the complaint in court whether it is well founded or not. It seems to me that the section opens a door to blackmail of the worst character, and should be struck out.

Mr. DOHERTY: The clause, while new in our Criminal Code, already appears in Canadian legislation. It is taken substantially from a provision in the Juvenile Delinquents Act of the province of Ontario, which has been in operation for quite some time now, and is considered invaluable by good and wise people who have interested themselves in the Child Welfare movement, and in the experience of the province of Ontario it has not given rise to the suggested abuses. The reason I am asking the House to introduce this clause into the Criminal Code of Canada is that though it had been applied for no inconsiderable time in the province of Ontario with what are represented to be the most beneficial results, it has recently been held, and I think properly, by one of the judges of the High Court of Ontario, before whom such a case came, that the provision properly and rightly constituted criminal law, and was not within the legislative jurisdiction of the legislature of a province.

As regards what the hon. gentleman points out, this clause gives no right of search or intrusion into anybody's house. What it does is to make it a criminal offence for people by their immoral acts to expose to corruption young children. Now, whatever view one may take of the desirability of making certain immoral acts criminal, I think there will be a general consensus of opinion that where people perpetrate these acts in the presence of young children in such a manner as to deprave and corrupt, surely that is an evil to suppress, and I do not think that there is any real danger to be apprehended with regard to the privacy of our own households. The charitable societies and the child-welfare societies have found this a most useful and effective provision, and I have not heard in the province in which it has been in force any suggestion that there has been any abuse such as has been mentioned. What I would like to emphasize is that the section confers on nobody any right of search or intrusion into a house which does not exist already. If there be a right on the part of moral reformers to intrude, they have it, and they will have it, whether this section is passed or not. As I have said, it has been found in practice—that information I have upon the authority of people competent to speak — a most useful section, and one particularly useful to restrain the practice of immorality on the part of men who intrude themselves into houses when the husband is absent or away from one cause or another, and so conduct themselves with the woman of the house in the presence of young children as to create a condition where it is almost hopeless that the children will be brought up with any proper ideas of morality.

Mr. VIEN: I do not desire to be misunderstood. I understand there is no right of search, but it is left to anybody to make a complaint. I am fully in accord with the principle embodied in this section, that children should be protected as much as possible, and I am glad to hear that this law has been in operation in Ontario and that it has not, thus far at least, given rise to any abuses. But I think the minister will agree with me that the right to make the complaint should not be open, but that the complaint should come through the instrumentality of the Attorney-General of the province, so that it would not be possible to use the right of complaint as an instrument of blackmail. This right should not be open to any body who would like to be a complainant. Even if the complaint were unfounded, it would be quite awkward for any respectable persons to

have to face such a complaint in the criminal courts. Then the section is very wide in the definition of vice when it says "or in any other form of vice." I should not like the public at large to be confronted with the possibility of having to face a charge on any ground that the so-called social reformers could interpret as vice. There is no such thing as a definition of vice in the Criminal Code of Canada. I do not think the section in its present form should be adopted, but some proviso should be inserted restricting the right to make a complaint.

Mr. COWAN: I do not know what happens to blackmailers in the province of Quebec, but I do know that in my province if professional blackmailers or social reformers attempted to use blackmail under the circumstances mentioned in this section, they would be punished even more severely than would the persons against whom the complaint had been laid, if the charge were proven.

Mr. VIEN: The motive may not always come under the definition of blackmail, but suppose the motive was vengeance. By this Bill you give an instrument to avenge against a person by making the right to complain open.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU: When the committee rose the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) was taking objection to the clause under consideration, on the ground, first, that it was too vague, and, second, that it opened the door to blackmail. One of the members on the other side took exception to the word "blackmail," saying that if anything of that kind arose, there were means of dealing with it. But we must consider this clause as it is proposed to be enacted. We assume that those who asked for its enactment had a purpose in view. We are all human; we cannot create heavenly conditions on this earth by legislation; on the other hand, we do not want to ruin reputations by trying to be over-good. If I had a room in a house where there were small children and chanced to bring and use a couple of bottles of whisky or wine, some goody-goody gentleman who wished to get after me, contending that, in the words of the Act, my conduct would "tend injuriously to affect the morals of a child," could bring me before a magistrate and I should be disgraced for life, simply because, in a house where there were children, I happened to have more whisky than I should have had. I do not believe that is right.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Act deals only with habitual drunkenness, so that the instance my hon. friend cites does not constitute a case.

Mr. BUREAU: Habitual drunkenness would be a case outside the one I am citing. I am willing that strict measures be taken to protect the youth of the country; we cannot be too severe on those who teach younger children vice, or bad habits, or immorality. I do not go so far as the member for Lotbinière in reference to blackmail or the vengeance side of the matter, but I submit that persons acting in good faith, impelled by their zeal to do good and to see that everybody else in the community is good, may drag to dishonour a respectable person who may have had the misfortune to fall under circumstances rendering him liable to provisions of the law under which he may be fined $500 or sentenced to six months in jail. I suggest that the wording of the clause be so changed as to put a kind of limitation on the zeal of persons who, in their desire to do good, may make things worse than they otherwise would have been.

Mr. MORPHY: I agree with the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) that the clause is not happily worded, that it is too broad to get at the evil for which we should provide a remedy. I suggest that if the minister is not going to define the meaning of the word "vice," he insert between the words "other" and "from," in the second line of 220B, the word "habitual," thus restricting the section by specifying that it is a vicious habit that is aimed at. It is a question whether a time of war is the best time for the enactment of legislation along the line of social reform. The public mind is excited, the nerves of the people are subjected to certain strain, and we are apt to go too far in this direction; legislation of this kind is apt to be put through too hastily. There is something in the argument of the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) that this section as it stands may be taken advantage of by persons who are actuated by spite or malice. In connection with the work of the Children's Aid Society in Ontario, some cases have come under my attention where people actuated by malice have taken advantage of this kind of provision in the Criminal Code and of others as well. We should avoid that as far as possible. The minister should frame a

clause defining vice, and should provide that in cases of wrong practices liable to depreciate the morals of children, no prosecution shall be made except through the medium of associations in the various provinces and districts which are engaged in child welfare work. These institutions are of high standing, and are accustomed to proceeding carefully along these lines and investigating very thoroughly before they make a complaint. It would be good policy also to make a further provision that in cases where no such society exists in any particular district, no prosecution shall be commenced without a fiat from the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General of the province, or such other well-constituted authority as may be designated. In this way such prosecutions would be thrown largely into the hands of societies which are peculiarly fitted to deal with the matter. I have had frequent opportunity of observing the splendid work done by the child welfare societies throughout large districts in Ontario.

The work of these societies has been the means of preserving the morals of thousands of children throughout Ontario, because those societies, being organized in a judicial manner, have made their investigations and have taken children bodily from their parents and away from the bad and immoral atmosphere which is aimed at in this Bill.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I do not agree with the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) at all. In the province of Alberta there is an Act governing the conduct of children by their parents, and, so far as I know, there has never been any attempt to use it for the purpose of blackmail against any individual by way of spite or otherwise. To say that such legislation should not be enacted because this is war time is, to my mind, no argument at all. The section is quite a reasonable one. There surely cannot be any vagueness in the phrase:

Any person who by indulgence in sexual immorality.

The phrase itself is sufficient to indicate that the indulgence cannot be a mistake, such as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). It surely cannot be understood by the expression—

Any person who by indulgence in habitual drunkenness.

[Mr. Morphy.]

—that a man may make a mistake by having a few friends in a room where children may be

Mr. BUREAU: I accepted that too.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The section aims at creating character in children. Habits are created by repeated acts, and habits create character in a child. This section is intended to lead parents to be careful in bringing up their children. If there is any possibility that the section might be used for the purpose alleged by the hon. member, then the suggestion that a fiat should be obtained from the Attorney General is a good one, and that would be the proper course to follow. The Attorney General would have the whole case submitted to him, and he would thus be able to see whether there was a violation of the law or not. Outside of that, I do not see why any amendment should be made, and when there are so many people coming from countries in which there is a different standard of morals from ours, they should learn that there is a standard of morals in Canada, and this section should be passed expressly for the purpose of bringing them up to the standard of morals which we Canadians have. I, therefore, heartily support the section.

Mr. BUREAU: The Minister of Justice this morning said that this section was copied from the Ontario Act, which was working very well. Is that the reason for enacting this legislation to-day, or is this legislation brought before Parliament because there has been a demand for it on the part of the people generally throughout Canada? If it is based only upon the fact that the Ontario Act is working well and that the minister thought that Canada should have uniform legislation in regard to the matter, all well and good. On the other hand, if this legislation has been introduced by reason of a demand from an association or of a particular class of people, we should, because they are extremists, be on our guard as to what they may do later on. They might go much further than this legislation intends. My hon. friend (Mr. H. A. Mackie) takes exception to my statement. He bases his answer on two things that I did not touch on, and he fails to answer the third. I do not take exception to the expression "habitual drunkenness or habitual indulgence in immorality," but I take exception to the vagueness of the third clause, which says:

Or in any other form of vice.

When the word "vice" is not defined in the Bill, those over-good people may, with the best intention in the world, go further than the presumed intent of this legislation, as it stands at present. That is the exception I make to this. I agree with my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) that the word "habitual" ought to be inserted before the word "form" so that the clause would read:

In habitual drunkenness or in any other habitual form of vice.

It is common knowledge that there are persons who make it their business to run after young boys and young girls to endeavour to induce them to do wrong, and, for my part I do not think we can be too severe in dealing with such people. They are the ones whom we want to punish and of whom we want to purge society. But if we are going to pass this legislation as it is, there is an opportunity for such cases as I have suggested. Those who wish to have the legislation in its present form are extremists, and we must always be afraid of extremists. When the law is enforced, they may be extreme in carrying it out, and injury may result to good people, who may be dishonoured for life.

Mr. DOHERTY: We heard this morning about the Ontario Act, but this legislation is in existence not only in Ontario. An hon. member has spoken about Alberta, and, if I am not mistaken, there are similar provisions of the law in other provinces. The reason why this legislation was introduced here was not merely because it had been in force in Ontario and had proved a good law, but because it was found—and the court so decided—that this law, which had worked so admirably, was not within the legislative competency of a provincial legislature, and, therefore, if any portion of Canada was to have the benefit of it, it should and could be enacted only by this Parliament. Testimony as to this being good legislation has been given to me by most reliable people who certainly cannot be described as extremists, unless the fact that one is willing to give up his time and spend a good deal of his money and put himself to considerable trouble to protect children, constitutes a person an extremist. The gentlemen who have interested themselves in this matter can in no respect be described as extremists unless conduct such as I have mentioned is the conduct of an extremist. As to the criticism about the vagueness of the law, and the necessity of inserting the word " habitual," I put this proposition to the committee: A man will go into a household, and, in the presence of young children, commit one act of gross sexual immorality. Does that man deserve or does he not deserve punishment? Is this House going to hold its hand until he commits the offence half a dozen times?

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Mr. DOHERTY: With that suggestion I have really no sympathy at all. I do not see what exception could be taken to a man being punished for an action of that kind, even if he did it only once. In my judgment, it is a much graver offence than that of a man who steals even something of very great value. In the latter case we do not wait until the man has become a habitual thief before we punish him. I appreciate the suggestion that there should, perhaps, be some safeguard interposed in the way of requiring some responsible authority to be sponsor for the prosecution, although I think much that has been said about the danger of blackmailing would be equally applicable to a very large number of other offences that are provided for under the Criminal Code. It does not, at the first glance, seem to me to be quite clear why there is greater opportunity of blackmail presented because this particular conduct is made an offence than is presented by numerous other dispositions of the Criminal Code. Why, if somebody wants to exercise vengeance upon me he can charge me with having seduced my servant girl, for instance, and his vengeance will be just as effective, notwithstanding my innocence, as if he had prosecuted me under this section.

Mr. BUREAU: I hope he could not prove it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I trust the hon. gentleman looks upon that hope as an assured and certain hope.

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely. What I was suggesting was that any other form of vice would give a man the opportunity to exercise vengeance if he wanted to use the Act for that purpose.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The section aims at the forming of character in children, and if vice in any form is practised in a boarding house or anywhere else it would be detrimental to the formation of character. If the object in view is the protection of children, the section cannot be too wide.

Mr. VIEN: If the minister would accept my amendment, I think it would meet all the requirements. I would submit that no prosecution should be commenced without first obtaining leave of the Attorney-General. My amendment goes further and provides that the prosecution cannot be commenced after the expiration of sixty days from the time of the commission of the alleged offence. We do not want a prosecution for an offence that was committed years ago. My amendment follows the wording of the Lord's Day Act, which says:

> No action or prosecution for any violation of this Act shall be commenced without the leave of the Attorney-General for the province in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, nor after the expiration of sixty days from the time of the alleged offence.

Surely we can trust the Attorney-General of each province to apply the provisions of this Act justly.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am in accord with the principle of obtaining the leave of the Attorney-General of each province, with this one exception: I was draughting a provision that no prosecution under this section, unless initiated at the instance of a regularly organized Child Welfare Association, shall be instituted without the assent of the Attorney-General of the province. I would point this out: When you require the assent of the Attorney General, either you require a mere formality, or you make it necessary before any prosecution can be proceeded with for the Attorney General to sit down and got into the facts of each case and determine whether he thinks there ought to be a prosecution. Now, offences of this character are more numerous than I imagine all hon. gentlemen who are interested in this matter quite realize, and if they are to be handled with effective results they frequently require prompt action. If you have to wait until each case has been judged on its merits by the Attorney General you might hamper very much the operation of the Act. On the other hand, it may be wisdom not to leave it to any individual to institute a prosecution under this Act. I think we would have sufficient safeguards if we required the assent of the Attorney General save in cases where the prosecution is at the instance of a duly organized and established Child Welfare society, or an association having the like objects, and I would be willing to insert such a provision. With regard to the limitation of time, I would be quite prepared to set a limit, but I think sixty days is a very short period to fix. In order to constitute an offence proceeding from drunkenness, for instance, there has to be a conditions of habitual drunkenness, and it is very difficult to fix a particular date when a man's condition of drunkenness became habitual. I would be prepared to accept the amendment with the addition I have suggested, and to fix the limit at six months. That, I think, would surround the section with all necessary safeguards to prevent its being abused, and I understand that what all my hon. friends desire is that the law shall not lend itself easily to abuse.

Mr. MORPHY: Before the minister commits himself to the six months period, I would point out that many vicious practices which would be affected by this section will perforce be done in secret, and, if the word habitual is not inserted the practice may have continued for six months or have been committed at any time, have been kept secret, and then be discovered after the period for prosecution has elapsed. I think I am right in saying the Charlton Act contains a provision that no prosecution of a young man over twenty-one who has seduced a girl under twenty-one under promise of marriage can be commenced unless within six months from the time of the commission of the offence. I think this Act is more important in some respects that the Charlton Act, because it will be more general in its application, and I would ask the minister to consider carefully before he fixes the time at six months. I quite agree that sixty days would be entirely out of the question. I think a year would be more in the public interest.

Mr. VIEN: The character of the offence is so outrageous that, generally speaking, those who take cognizance of it will promptly bring a complaint in the police court. If twelve months are allowed to elapse it would hardly be possible to adduce such first-hand evidence that an indictment would be made out. I think we should not allow more than six months at the outside, and personally I think ninety days would be quite sufficient, considering the character of the offence.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am placed at rather a disadvantage in not having heard what the minister proposes to do, but I have a good deal of sympathy with hon. gentlemen who have urged that this clause is too drastic in its present form. I know that a great many people are prepared to do a

little wrong to accomplish a great right, but I have been always very cautious in advocating anything of that kind. I would rather see two bad men get off than punish one innocent man; I may be wrong, but that is my feeling. I approach this clause from the practical side, so far as I am able, and it does look to me that under this clause as it is some men and some families are going to be punished who should not be punished.

Let me draw the attention of the committee to what might occur in highly respectable families of comparatively slender means. In the northern part of Ontario, in the West and in the province of Quebec the new settler goes in and takes up a homestead. All that the man has in the world probably is a tent and some tools. There is probably a man, his wife and several children, and they must all live in a tent until he is able to erect, perhaps, a one-roomed shack. In that one-roomed shack or house he will have to live with his family during the first winter. It will be four or five years before that man can get a house sufficiently well built to accommodate his family as it should be accommodated. I was brought up on the scriptures just as much as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), and I want to see everything done decently and in order, but we must not be too hard upon the poor man, honest and with the best intentions, who is compelled for a time to live under such conditions as I have described, much against his will, much against the will of his wife, and much to the inconvenience of his family, but who, by reason of his slender means, is compelled to live in a house that does not accommodate his family as it should be accommodated. They will have to live in a tent or a house with one or two rooms together. Surely that man cannot be accused of vice when he has the best of intentions and lives as an honourable, upright and moral man. It does appear to me, unless you limit the term "vice" more than it is here, and unless the clause is modified in several important respects, there is danger of inflicting a wrong upon innocent people. I do not wish to be a party to that.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The argument of the hon gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Cockshutt) is based upon the premise that because a poor man may be living in a tent or a shack with one room he would necessarily be guilty of sexual immorality, habitual drunkenness, or some other form of vice. I fail to be able to follow the logic of an argument that would convict a man of being guilty of immorality, habitual drunkenness or vice simply because he was compelled to live with his family in a house possibly of one room or even in a tent.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) probably did not follow the argument of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). If a family is living in a shack, or in a one-roomed building, some social reform association might interpret it as being a case in which a child would be in danger of becoming immoral, criminal or dissolute. You never know what construction a social reform association may put upon this clause. They might find it immoral for a child to live in a room where the whole family lived habitually. What the hon. member for Brantford had in view was the elimination from the clause of anything which might be interpreted by these social reform associations as being vice when it is not vice. There are some things which some people consider as vice which other people do not. Take, for instance, the enforcement of the provisions of the Lord's Day Act. There are some things which I consider to be allowable on Sunday and to which I do not object, whereas some other people might take exception to them. We do not all have the same ideas on different matters. Some social reform association might go much farther in its construction of the Act than that which would ordinarily be applied. If, we accept the suggestion that a prosecution shall be only undertaken on the fiat of the attorney general of the province, we then have a guarantee that proceedings will not be instituted on insufficient or foolish grounds. If we were to limit it, as suggested by the hon. Minister of Justice, to benevolent associations organized for the protection of children, these associations might construe some acts and conditions as being injurious to the welfare of children whereas other people would not so consider them. That is why I would favour the restriction that no prosecution should be commenced unless the attorney general, or, for the purpose of greater speed, one of his substitutes, issues his fiat authorizing the prosecution.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The reasons for which any one might be prosecuted under this clause as specified—sexual immorality, habitual drunkenness or other forms of vice.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What are the other forms?

Mr. BUREAU: What other forms of vice?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Pardon me for a moment. Is a man living with his family under conditions that have been described guilty of any one of these acts?

Mr. BUREAU: That is a question for the jury.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It is a question for the law. I hold that the argument is specious that any one can be convicted of vice under the law simply because of the surroundings in which he is forced to live, provided he is a moral and clean man and lives in the best possible way he can.

Mr. BUREAU: Leaving that case aside, let us take the former case that I submitted. Being drunk is a form of vice which is not an uncommon one. A man, who might be the most respectable citizen in the place might get drunk once in his life, and be in that condition in the presence of children, and some fellow with a grudge to satisfy might see him and institute a prosecution under this clause.

Mr. DOHERTY: Drunkenness, to be considered as vice under this clause, must be habitual. It is other forms of vice that are spoken of, and it is only when drunkenness becomes habitual that it comes under the definition of vice.

Mr. BUREAU: Supposing a man played cards in the presence of children, smoked cigars and took a drink, that would be construed as vice.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the hon. gentleman must have a peculiar conception of the capacity of the courts of this country to understand the ordinary terms of the English language. I think "vice" has a very intelligible meaning to intelligent people.

Mr. BUREAU: He might not be convicted but he might be arrested, and that is where the harm is done.

Mr. DOHERTY: We cannot undertake to make any amendment to the Criminal Law under which no innocent man will ever be prosecuted.

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly not.

Mr. DOHERTY: If we are going to have laws against crime we have to take the risk of some innocent man some day being prosecuted.

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

Mr. BUREAU: Protect him as far as you can.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think we are protecting him as far as it is possible to do so, consistent with a reasonable enforcement of the law.

I beg to move that the section be amended by adding as subsection 4 the following provision:

No prosecution under this section shall be instituted unless it be at the instance of some organized Child Welfare Society, or Association with like object, without the authorization of the Attorney General of the province, nor shall any such prosecution be commenced after the expiration of six months from the time of the commission of the alleged offence.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 6—Theft of motor cars, punishment increased:

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister explain the object of this provision? Is this a punishment for furious driving?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, it is for stealing automobiles—that is, the stealing of automobiles exclusively for the purpose of taking a joy ride—and all that the section proposes is to increase the possible penalty. At present the penalty for this offence is a fine of $50, or imprisonment for thirty days. By this section the fine is not to exceed $500, and the imprisonment is not to exceed twelve months. It has been pointed out that this offence has become exceedingly prevalent, that in very many instances the damage to the cars taken is far beyond the $50 fine, and that there is real necessity for adding to the deterrent effect of the law. I am in a position to give some testimony as to the prevalence of the offence, inasmuch as I have observed that recently we have had a large number of applications for ticket-of-leave, or other forms of leniency, in cases of people convicted under this section. There is no obligation upon the court to impose the higher penalty. This simply makes it possible for the court, in a case that calls for it, to do so.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Instruments proof of house being gaming house:

Mr. VIEN: I think that the words "any unlawful game" in the present law are quite sufficient to cover anything that would be objectionable. Has the minister any concrete case which suggested the amendment to him?

Mr. DOHERTY: The difficulty arose from the fact that a great many instruments are

capable of being used in perfectly lawful, as well as in unlawful, games. The law imposes upon the prosecution in every instance, in order to get the benefit of its provision, the obligation of showing that the instrument is one peculiar to an unlawful game. It is to be noticed that the provision itself only makes the presence of these instruments prima facie evidence. It is perfectly open to any person who has them for lawful purposes to establish the fact; but the section with this requirement of establishing that the instruments are for an unlawful game practically nullifies itself. The purpose of the section is to facilitate the proof. As it stands now, in order that a thing should be prima facie evidence of the place being a gaming house it is required, in effect, to prove that the thing is of such a nature that it could not be used for anything else than an unlawful game, and, as I have stated, that practically nullifies the section. Nobody is exposed to any injury whatever, in the practical application of the section, by this being made purely and simply prima facie evidence. The enforcement of the law against the guilty will be facilitated, and the innocent will not be exposed to any serious consequences.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported as amended and amendments read first and second time and concurred in.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

RENEWAL FOR POSTPONEMENT OF INDEBTNESS OF THE COMPANY—EXPLANATIONS BY ACTING MINISTER OF FINANCE ON THE BILL.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask leave of the House to revert to the Order for the second reading of the Bill founded upon the Resolution numbered one upon the Order Paper, in order that I may move the second reading of the Bill with the understanding that when I have finished my statement I shall move the adjournment of the debate. This will enable me to give to the House certain information requested regarding the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent Mr. Maclean moves that Bill No. 87, an Act supplementary to chapter twenty-four of the Statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway system, be read the second time.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Upon the occasion of moving the resolution upon which this Bill is founded, certain information was requested of the Government by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I now purpose giving that information and I hope that it will in every respect be complete.

As I have already stated, when I have given this information to the House I shall acquiesce in the adjournment of the debate.

The information which I am about to present will consist largely of figures and will I fear prove uninteresting, but at least it will be available in Hansard for those interested.

I was asked the other day to give the names of the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway. The Board of Directors and officers of the company are: Sir William Mackenzie, president; Sir Donald Mann, vice-president; D. B. Hanna, third vice-president; Z. A. Lash, R. J. Mackenzie, W. J. Christie, R. M. Horne-Payne, London, England; W. K. George, E. R. Wood, and Graham A. Bell. The last three mentioned are the representatives of the Government upon the Board of Directors. I have already given a list of the short term maturities for this year, but in order that it may be before the House in a complete and consecutive form, I shall read the list of securities of the railway maturing this year:

4 p.m.

Canadian Northern Railway System.

Statement of Short Term Loans, March 1, 1918.

No.	Maturity.	Loan made by or through.	Amount.
1.	Demand.	Dominion Government, Canada	$10,000,000
2.	Demand.	Can. Bank of Commerce, Canada	5,889,066
3.	Demand.	Can. Bank of Commerce, London.....	10,074,408
4.	Demand.	Can. Bank of Commerce, Canada	1,250,000
5.	Demand.	National Trust Company, Ltd., Canada..	115,000
6.	Demand.	Dom. Sec. Corporation, Ltd., Canada..	150,000
7.	March 31, 1918.	British Empire Trust Co., London	929,533
8.	April 9, 1918.	Lazard Bros., London	1,472,167
9.	April 15, 1918.	Lazard Bros., London	2,919,026
10.	April 15, 1918.	Lloyd's Bank, London	5,201,407
11.	June 9, 1918.	Nat. Bank Scotland, London	486,667
12.	July 10, 1918.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York.....	2,700,000

Canadian Northern Railway System.
Statement of Short Term Loans, March 1, 1918.

No.	Maturity.	Loans made by or through.	Amount.
13.	July 10, 1918.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York.....	3,000,000
14.	Sept. 1, 1918.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York.....	10,000,000
15.	Jan. 10, 1919.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York.....	1,250,000
			$55,437,274

I may say that all securities maturing to date this year have been renewed in full. In addition to the maturities above mentioned there are the following securities maturing in August and January next:

16.	Aug. 12, 1918, London, £2,000,000	$9,733,333
	$2,433,333.34 C.N.R. 4% Deb. Stock (Guart. Sask.)	
	2,190,000.00 C.N.R. 4% Deb. Stock (Guart. Alta.)	
	1,460,000.00 C.N.R. 4% Deb. Stock (Guart. Man.	
	2,676,666.66 C.N.P.R. 4% Deb. Stock (Guart. B.C.)	
	3,649,999.95 C.N.R. 4% Deb. Stock.	
17.	June 12, 1919, London, £450,000	2,190,000
	$1,911,329.80 C.N.P.R. 4% Deb. Stock (Guart. B.C.)	
	862,670.18 C.N.R. 4% Deb. Stock.	

The total maturities for the year therefore amount to $67,360,607.

It may be of interest to the House to give an estimate of the requirements of the Canadian Northern Railway for this year. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the Estimates contain an item for $25,000,000, for the Canadian Northern Railway, and upon reference to the Estimates hon. gentlemen will see the purposes for which that vote is asked. That $25,000,000 vote is composed of the following amounts:

Canadian Northern Railway System, Estimate of Requirements for Year 1918.

(1.)	Balance required for Interest on Securities, Loans, etc., outstanding, including interest on Lines and works under construction	$5,389,922 89
(2.)	Payment of Principal of Equipment Bonds maturing during the year	2,995,000 00
(3.)	Estimated amount required to pay in reduction of existing Collateral Loans in connection with renewals	6,028,854 88
(4.)	Estimated amount required for Improvements, Additions and Betterments, as per detailed statement	3,400,922 02
(5.)	Construction, Completion of Western Branch Lines already graded, Terminals, etc., as per statement ..	7,185,300 21
		$25,000,000 00

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Hon. gentlemen will, of course, understand that this is merely an estimate, and it will be seen that it is anticipated that there will be an estimated deficit of over five million dollars for the year 1918, after payment of operating expenses and fixed charges.

The amount of $3,400,922.02 for improvements, additions and betterments is allocated as follows: For the western lines, $2,148,589; for the eastern lines, $1,252.333.

The amount required for construction, namely, $7,185,300.21, will be expended in the completion of western branch lines well along in construction, it being very desirable that they be completed if possible.

Since the opening of the session I think no statement showing the financial result of the recent operations of the road has been presented to the House. The fiscal year of the Canadian Northern railway ends on June 30th, and the following is a statement of the income and operating expenses for the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1917:

Earnings	$41,244,689 58	
Subsidiary Miscellaneous Earnings	2,250,386 98	
		$43,495,076 56
Working Expenses	30,840,234 17	
Taxes, Rentals, Joint Facilities, etc.	509,174 01	
		31,349,408 18
Net Earnings		12,145,668 38
Fixed Charges—Canadian Northern Railway	7,690,942 07	
Fixed Charges—Affiliated Companies ...	5,139,689 87	
Interest on Demand and Short Term Loans	3,720,268 70	
Less: Amount chargeable to Capital on Construction Account	1,943,095 29	
		14,607,805 35
Net Loss or Deficit		2,462,136 97

The following is a comparative statement of the gross earnings, operating expenses and net earnings for the fiscal years 1916 and 1917:

Gross Earnings, Operating Expenses and Net Earnings to June 30, 1917, Compared with Previous Fiscal Year.

Gross Earnings.

Per Cent.	1916.	Class.	1917.	Per Cent.
17.27	$ 6,128,470 76	Passengers	$ 7,611,807 94	17.50
74.87	26,560,213 12	Freight	32,188,799 93	74.01
00.64	225,718 70	Mails	238,978 68	00.55
02.37	839,557 69	Express	1,096,264 37	00.52
04.85	1,722,314 79	Miscellaneous	2,359,225 64	05.42
100.00	35,476,275 06	Total	43,495,076 56	100.00

Operating Expenses.

Per Cent.	1916.	Class.	1917.	Per Cent.
22.60	$ 5,899,540 27	Maintenance of Way and Structures	$ 7,160,338 18	22.84
15.69	4,095,745 88	Maintenance of Equipment Traffic	$ 4,867,208 64	15.53
02.12	553,075 79	Traffic Expenses	712,809 04	02.27
51.28	13,384,547 71	Transportation Expenses	16,100,826 57	51.36
01.45	379,646 48	Miscellaneous Operations	509,853 69	01.63
06.86	1,790,188 39	General Expenses	1,998,372 06	06.37
100.00	$26,102,744 52	Total	$31,349,408 18	100.00

Summary of Earnings and Expenses.

Per Cent.	1916.	Class.	1917.	Per Cent.
	$35,476,275 06	Gross Earnings	$43,495,076 56	
73.58	26,102,744 52	Operating Expenses	31,349,408 18	72.08
26.42	9,373,530 54	Net Earnings	12,145,668 38	27.92
100.00				100.00

I now present a statement showing the estimated cost of completing lines and terminals under construction. It would take a long time to read it, and if the House will allow me, I shall insert it in Hansard so that hon. members may be able to obtain the information in detail.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only in very exceptional circumstances may a document be placed on Hansard without having been read, but in view of the undoubted importance of these figures I assume that there will be no objection.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The statement is as follows:

Canadian Northern Railway System, Estimates of cost to complete Lines and Terminals under construction, September 30, 1917.

Western Lines.

Name of Lines.	Milage.	Cost to Complete.
Prairie Lines (Saskatchewan)—		
Swift Current	55.75	$ 825,771
C. N. Sask. (Elrose Ext.)	50.00	383,073
Vonda North-East	25.00	240,212
Thunderhill	47.27	452,772
Luck Lake Branch	35.00	473,626
North Battleford—Turtleford	5.21	52,876
Prairie Lines (Alberta)—		
Hanna—Medicine Hat	144.76	3,344,296
Calgary—MacLeod	103.28	1,609,392
Strathcona—Calgary	32.66	566,029
Peace River	42.52	571,178
Oliver North	115.00	911,978
MacLeod—Pincher Creek	34.00	463,836
Prairie Lines (Manitoba)—		
Portage Junction — Paddington	4.58	681,822
	695.03	$10,576,861
Branch Lines, B. C.—		
Vancouver Island Division A. B. & C.	100.00	$ 682,368
Division D.	45.57	1,182,603
Okanaga Branches	141.00	4,460,335
New Westminister to Steveston	13.35	138.049
	299.92	$ 6,463,375

Terminals.

British Columbia Terminals—		
Vancouver		$ 2,162,309
Car Ferry		99,169
Steveston		3,456,112
Port Mann		54,679
New Westminister		226,085
Victoria		853,125
		$ 3 456,112
Moose Jaw Terminals	7.95	$ 461,794
	7.95	$ 461,794
Grand Total	1,002.90	$20,958,142

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can the hon. gentleman tell when these works will be completed?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot give the information at the moment, but when the second reading of the Bill is resumed later, I shall endeavour to have it for my hon. friend.

A statement was presented to Parliament last year showing the securities issued and outstanding by the Canadian Northern system, and it may be found in sessional paper No. 237. There has really been no

change in the amount of securities issued since that date. I wish however to submit a fresh statement showing the total amount of securities outstanding, comprising securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government and by provincial governments, securities unguaranteed, and also the amount of issued securities held by the public, the amount pledged by the company, and also the amount of note issues. I, of course, cannot read the whole statement, but if the House so desires, I shall be very glad to have it placed on Hansard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The statement is as follows:

Canadian Northern Railway System.

Statement of Securities Outstanding, showing Securities guaranteed by Dominion Government, Securities guaranteed by Provincial Governments, Securities unguaranteed, Maturities of all Issues, Securities held by Public, Securities Pledged and amount of Note Issues, June 30, 1917.

Security.	Date of Maturity.	Total Issue.	Held by Public.	Pledged.	Note Issues.
Guaranteed by Dominion Government.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Canadian Northern Railway—					
3% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock...	July, 1953..	9,359,996 72	9,359,996 72	.....	
3½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock.	July, 1958..	7,896,588 26	7,896,588 26	.....	
4% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock..	Sept., 1934..	44,866,667 33	17,033,333 33	27,833,334 00	
Canadian Northern Alberta Railway—					
3½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	May, 1960..	3,149,998 66	3,149,998 66	.....	
3½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	April, 1962 .	3,569,996 86	.....	3,569,996 86	
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway—					
3½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	May, 1961..	35,770,000 00	34,229,996 87	1,540,003 13	
Total Dominion.....	....	104,613,247 83	71,669,913 84	32,943,333 99	.....
Guaranteed by Province of Ontario.					
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway—					
8½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock.	June, 1938..	6,724,015 40	6,724,015 40		
3½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock.	July, 1936..	1,135,982 19	1,135,982 19		
		7,859,997 59	7,859,997 59		
Guaranteed by Manitoba Government.					
Canadian Northern Railway—					
4% 1st Mtge. Deb. Bonds.	June, 1930..	12,436,279 99	12,436,279 99		
4% 1st Mtge. Deb. Bonds.....	June, 1930..	4,319,998 87	2,859,998 87	1,460,000 00	
4% 1st Mtge. Wpg. Term'l Bonds	June, 1930.	3,000,000 00	3,000,000 00		
4% Ontario Division Bonds.....	June, 1930..	5,580,606 66	5,580,606 66		
4½% Ontario Division Bonds....	June, 1930..	164,980 00	164,980 00		
Canadian Northern Manitoba Ry.					
4½% 1st Mtge. Deb. Stock	June, 1930..	160,680 00	.. ..	160,680 00	
		25,662,545 52	24,041,865 52	1,620,680 00	
Guaranteed by Saskatchewan Government.					
Canadian Northern Railway—					
4% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock..	Jun.. 1939..	13,709,399 99	8,029,999 99	5,679,400 00	
Canadian Northern Sask. Ry.....					
4½% 1st Mtge. Deb. Stock.....	Dec., 1943 .	1,174,813 33	....	1,174,813 33	
		14,884,213 32	8,029,999 99	6,854,213 33	

Canadian Northern Railway System.

Statement of Securities Outstanding, showing Securities guaranteed by Dominion Government, Securities guaranteed by Provincial Governments, Securities unguaranteed, Maturities of all Issues, Securities held by Public, Securities Pledged and amount of Note Issues, June 30, 1917.

Security.	Date of Maturity.	Total Issue.	Held by Public.	Pledged.	Note Issues.
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Guaranteed by Alberta Government.					
Canadian Northern Railway—					
4% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	Feb., 1939.	9,726,364 24	5,586,665 64	4,139,698 60	
Canadian Northwestern Railway—					
4½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	Feb., 1942.	6,424,000 00	6,424,000 00		
4½% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	Oct., 1943.	2,799,997 73	2,799,997 73		
		18,950,361 97	14,810,663 37	4,139,698 60	
Guaranteed by British Columbia Government.					
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry.—					
4% 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	April, 1950.	20,999,997 59	16,412,001 13	4,587,996 46	
4½% 1st Mtge. Terminal Stock	April, 1950.	8,614,000 00	8,614,000 00		
4½% 1st Mtge. Branch Lines Stock	April, 1950.	5,543,527 54	.....	5,543,527 54	
4½ 2nd charge Debenture Stock	April, 1950.	4,999,998 73	.....	4.999,998 73	
		40,157,523 86	25,026,001 13	15,131,522 73	
Total Provincial		107,514,642 26	79,768,527 60	27,746,114 66	
Unguaranteed Securities.					
Canadian Northern Railway—					
4% Perp. Cons. Debenture Stock	Perpetual.	61,837,788 96	44,943,019 40	16,894,769 56	
4% 1st Mtge. Pas Mission Bds.	April, 1939.	880,000 00	.....	880,000 00	
4½% 1st Mtge. Gunflint Br. Bonds	June, 1930.	669,000 00	.....	669,000 00	
4½% 1st Mtge. Pr. Albert Bonds	June, 1930.	693,900 00	300,000 00	393,900 00	
Minnesota & Manitoba Railway 4%	Sept., 1931.	349,000 00	349,000 00		
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway—					
4% Perpetual Cons. Deb. Stock	Perpetual.	12,658,910 51	9,083,628 46	3,575,282 05	
Central Ontario Railway—					
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Jan., 1934.	945,593 33	945,593 33		
Bay of Quinte Railway—					
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Jan., 1927.	780,000 00	780,000 00		
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry.—					
4% Perpetual Cons. Debenture Stock	Perpetual.	5,435,127 39	5,250,369 26	184,758 13	
Great Northern Railway of Canada—					
4% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Oct., 1934.	3,505,750 00	3,505,750 00		
Quebec & Lake St. John Railway,					
4% Perpetual 1st Mtge. Debenture Stock	Perpetual.	4,486,813 60	4,359,014 93	127,798 67	
Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway, 4% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	June, 1939.	8,221,907 27	7,011,323 93	1,210,583 34	
Duluth, Rainy Lake & Winnipeg Ry., 5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Jan., 1916 (exted. 1921)	2,000,000 00	2,000,000 00		
Halifax & South Western Railway, 3½% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Sept., 1942.	5,663,666 66	4,447,000 00	1,216,666 66	

Canadian Northern Railway System.

Statement of Securities Outstanding, showing Securities guaranteed by Dominion Government Securities guaranteed by Provincial Governments, Securities unguaranteed, Maturities of all Issues, Securities held by Public, Securities Pledged and amount of Note Issues, June 30, 1917

Security.	Date of Maturity.	Total Issue.	Held by Public.	Pledged.	Note Issues.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Unguaranteed Securities—*Con.*					
Niagara, St. Catharines & Toronto Railway—					
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Nov., 1929.	1,504,000 00	1,098,000 00	406,000 00	
5% 2nd Mortgage Bonds	Nov., 1929.	536,500 00	.....	536,500 00	
Mount Royal Tunnel & Terminal Co., Ltd., 5% 1st Mtge. Rent Charge Stock	April, 1970.	11,420,033 39	2,238,666 66	9,191,366 73	
Qu'Appelle, L.L. & S. Ry. & C.B. Co., 4% 1st Mortgage Deb. Stock	July, 1936.	5,019,539 86	5,019,539 86		
James Bay & Eastern Railway, 5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	Sept., 1945.	300,000 00	.....	300,000 00	
Land Securities—					
Canadian Northern Railway—					
4% (1909) Land Grant Bonds	July, 1938.	1,852,740 01	1,852,740 01		
X4% (1899) Land Grant Bonds.	Feb., 1919.	2,000,000 00	2,000,000 00		
5% Land Mortgage Deb.	June, 1923.	17,033,333 33	7,300,000 00	9,733,333 33	
Total unguaranteed	.....	147,803,104 31	102,483,645 84	45,319,958 47	
Note issues.					
6% 1 Year Secured Notes	July, 1918.	.....	.....	.....	3,000,000 00
6% 1 Year Secured Notes	July, 1918.	.....	.....	.....	3,000,000 00
5% Secured Notes	Aug., 1918.	.....	.....	.....	9,733,333 33
5% 1 Year Notes	Sept., 1917.	(extended to Dec., 1917)	.....	.....	1,750,000 00
5% Secured Notes	June, 1919.	.....	.....	.....	2,190,000 00
6% 1 Year Collateral Notes	Sept., 1918.	.....	.....	.....	11,500,000 00
6% 1 & 2 Yr. Sec. Notes	Jan., 1918 & 1919	.....	.....	.....	2,500,000 00
Total Note Issues	.....	.....	.....	.....	32,673,333 33
Grand Total	.....	359,931,494 40	253,922,087 28	106,009,407 12	33,673,333 33
Total Securities held by Public	.....	253,922,087 28			
Total Short Term Notes Outstanding	.....	33,673,333 33			
Total Funded Debt as shown on Balance Sheet	.....	287,395,420 61			

Notes: 1. Interest Payable from Funds in hands of National Trust Company, Ltd.
2. In addition to the above the following are authorized and issued:—
(a). Canadian Northern Ry. 5% Income Charge Convertible Debenture Stock $25,000,000.00.
(b). Imperial Rolling Stock Equipment Trusts $14,846,500.00.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A great many of the securities are pledged. With whom are they pledged, and for what?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are pledged with the persons from whom loans were made by the company.

Mr. VIEN: With banks?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: With banks and brokerage houses.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: It seems that my hon. friend has missed some provinces. Will he name the provinces that have guaranteed securities?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Nothing guaranteed by Nova Scotia?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. The Halifax and Southwestern railway was financed in

a different way. No securities of the Canadian Northern railway were guaranteed by the Government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about lines that were afterwards assumed by the Canadian Northern Railway system?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Halifax and Southwestern railway forms a part of the Canadian Northern Railway system, but no securities were guaranteed by the Government of Nova Scotia. The Government of Nova Scotia incurred a direct liability in connection with the construction of this road.

Mr. ROSS: Will the minister give the grand total of the liabilities and the notes?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The total issue is $359,931,494.40.

Mr. ROSS: And the notes are in addition?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: What is the grand total?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: $393,604,827.73. The total amount held by the public is $253,922,087.28. That is the total issue less the amount pledged as collateral but unsold. I am informed that inclusive of the equipment and temporary loans, the total would amount to about $400,000,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the $98,000,000 which the minister mentions included in the $359,931,494.40 with the notes?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it would be included in the total amount of $400,000,000.

Mr. CAHILL: According to the statement there is a total issue of securities in round figures $359,000,000 and $33,000,000 of notes, and there is another item of $98,000,000. Is the $98,000,000 included in any way in the total of $359,000,000? There are three items, one of guarantees by the Dominion Government of, in round figures, $104,000,000, one of guarantees by the provinces of $107,000,000, and a third of unguaranteed securities of $147,000,000, making in all a total of $359,000,000 up to June, 1916.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The floating liabilities are not included.

Mr. CAHILL: The $98,000,000 is in floating liabilities?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know just what my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. CAHILL: Then there would be a total indebtedness of about $500,000,000 including the floating liabilities?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. I shall give to the house the floating liabilities in a moment. I have in my hand a condensed general balance sheet as of June 30, 1917. The report which the leader of the Opposition now has in his hand contains a general balance sheet, but as of an earlier date. This condensed general balance sheet is as follows:

Canadian Northern Railway System.

Condensed General Balance Sheet.

At September 30, 1917.

ASSETS.

	$ cts.	$ cts.
Property Investment:—Railway and Equipment at Cost to the System, including discount on Securities of Constituent and Subsidiary Companies and Acquired Securities		510,637,572 92
Other Investments		2,753,780 19
National Trust Company Certificates *re* Land Grant Bonds, Issue 1899—These securities held as collateral to loans		1,657,500 00
Terminal and other Properties		6,257,366 37
Land Assets:—		
Deferred Payments and Accrued Interest on Sales	6,262,084 27	
Cash with National Trust Company account of Land Sales	2,355,136 47	
Lands Unsold	20,427,570 00	
		29,044,790 74
Current Assets:—		
Cash Held on Ac. of:		
Dominion Govert	2,153,049 27	
Prov. of Manitoba	45,920 63	
Pr. of Saskatchewan	1,202,825 24	
Province of Alberta	2,691,130 52	
Province of Ontario	419,803 94	
Province of British Columbia	3,772,963 70	
Central Trust Company of New-York	38,902 06	
National Trust Co	2,092,932 77	
British Empire Trust Co., Trustees Ac	20,621 51	
Sinking Funds	76,765 07	
	12,514,914 71	
Value of Material and Supplies on hand	6,083,878 74	
Due from Agents, Station Balances, etc	2,052,591 61	
Miscellaneous Accounts Receivable	7,111,697 09	
British Admiralty	664,070 84	
Cash on hand	2,331,860 96	
		30,759,013 95
Insurance paid in advance		823,708 51
Advances by the Canadian Northern Co. to Affiliated Companies		9,379,581 94
Deferred Charges—Unadjusted Debits—Balance		860,113 95
		$592,173,428 57

LIABILITIES.

	$ cts.	$ cts.
Capital stock—Common		100,000,000 00
Capital stock—Affiliated companies	75,429,500 00	
Less Held in Treasury	69,482,400 00	
		5,947,100 00
Five per cent income charge convertible debenture stock		25,000,000 00
Funded debt.		
Canadian Northern Railway	160,566,542 20	
Affiliated Companies	125,228,878 41	
		285,795,420 61
Equipment trust obligations		13,526,000 00
Demand and short term loans secured by collateral		58,056,961 11
Due to other companies on construction account (Secured)		30,502,392 04
Current liabilities.		
Pay Rolls	2,129,912 11	
Audited Vouchers and Other Floating Liabilities	17,278,583 68	
		19,408,495 79
Coupon and Dividend warrants due 1st Oct. (Since Paid)	1,677,859 79	
Accrued interest on bonds, loans and equipment securities:—		
Operating 2,746,423 87		
Construction 305,786 27	3,052,210 14	
		4,730,069 93
Reserves:—		
Steamship Replacement Fund	2,047,066 04	
Equipment Replacement Fund	1,693,229 00	
Insurance Account	745,038 19	
Taxes Accrued	500,000 00	
		4,985,333 23
Affiliated companies—Advances Account		9,379,581 94
Surplus		34,842,073 92
		592,173,428 57

Certified correct,

(Sgd.) H. O. FOREMAN,

Chief Accountant.

I might give a few details of the floating liabilities. It will not be necessary for me to state them all, as they would not be very informing. There is of accounts payable and audited, $5,660,000; bills payable, $489,-367; due on account of terminal properties, $1,175,000. There are other miscellaneous liabilities of various amounts totalling $10,-130,000. The floating liabilities aggregate $17,278,583, as appears in the balance sheet.

Mr. MURPHY: Are all those figures as of September 30 last?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The balance sheet was brought down to September 30 last. The maturities are inclusive of everything down to the present date.

Upon my instructions, Mr. Hanna, Third Vice-President of the Canadian Northern Railway, was requested to prepare a statement giving information not contained in the statements I have already presented to the House, and showing particularly the gross earnings and operating expenses of the railway system since last June. I think I cannot do better than read his letter, which is addressed to Mr. Graham Bell, of the Railway Department:

May 9th, 1918.

Major G. A. Bell, C.M.G.,
Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—

Complying with request contained in your telegram and as referred to in my reply, I enclose herewith statement of gross earnings, expenses and net earnings for the nine months ended March 31st, 1918, compared with those of the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year, the figures being as follows:—

	Ended March 31st 1918.	Ended March 31st 1917.
Total Gross Earnings..	$30,699,391 20	$30,095,886 66
Operating Expenses .	28,209,439 57	22,591,432 08
Net Earnings .	2,489,951 63	7,504,454 58

It will be seen that gross earnings increased by $603,504.54 over the same period of 1917, so that if normal conditions had continued, the net earnings for the nine months ended 31st March, 1918, would have been approximately $7,675,000. Unfortunately, however, conditions did not remain normal, winter weather of unprecedented severity was experienced, and, due also to increased fuel cost, higher wages in every department, coupled with increased prices for all materials and supplies used in operation of the Railway, the operating expenses were increased by $5,618,007.49 resulting in a decrease in net earnings of $5,014,502.95—a decrease of 66.82%.

The increased cost of fuel for locomotives for the two nine month periods is shown by the following figures:—

	1918.	1917.
Fuel for Train Locomotives .	$5,241,560 23	$3,197,131 04
Fuel for Yard Locomotives. .	667,919 59	340,324 47
Total. . . .	$5,909,479 82	$3,537,455 51
Increase of 1918 over 1917.. ..		$2,372,024 31

This is the increased cost of fuel as shown merely by the difference in the totals charged to the above two accounts and does not show up the loss in efficiency due to poorer grade of coal available, and takes no account of increased cost of coal used for operating snow plough trains, heating buildings, etc.

Increased cost of labour accounts for increases in principal Maintenance of Way and Structures accounts to the extent of $470,715.70, and accounts which combine Material and Labour have increased by approximately the same amount.

Maintenance of Equipment accounts, including labour and material, show heavy increases. The principal accounts compared show the following increases for the nine months:—

	1918.	1917.	Increase.
Repairs to Locomotives..	$1,936,542 15	$1,508,608 00	$427,934 15
Repairs to Freight Cars..	1,790,521 53	1,302,183 10	488,338 43
Repairs to Passenger Cars..	641,695 56	545,151 30	96,544 26
Repairs to Work Equipment..	187,737 04	124,638 02	63,099 02
Mtce. of Shop Machinery..	152,511 53	105,768 50	46,743 03
Increase of 1918 over 1917..	.....	.....	$1,122,658 89

In addition to fuel cost, other items of transportation expenses have increased as follows:—

Item.	1918.	1917.	Increase.
Dispatching trains..	$ 172,079 83	$ 138,914 11	$ 33,165 72
Station employees..	1,695,413 36	1,410,959 62	284,453 74
Yard employees (a/cs 377-380)..	823,020 83	687,053 89	135,966 94
Enginemen..	1,653,626 89	1,421,638 33	231,988 56
Enginemen..	1,539,907 47	1,479,828 04	60,079 43
Total of these increases..	.....	.....	$745,654 39

* NOTE.—As regards the items shown above for trainmen, it must be explained that there will be increases to these men which will date back to January, dependent upon the increases granted by the Director General of United States Railways.

The above are items of labour alone, and there are besides increases in other transportation accounts which combine labour and material amounting to an additional $939,861.98 of which the principal are:—

	1918.	1917.	Increase.
Station suplpies	$178,183 92	$131,821 07	$ 46,362 85
Water Stations	292,257 63	242,085 59	50,172 04
Engine House Exp.	815,739 87	545,407 41	270,332 46
Train supplies and expenses	661,045 73	545,928 04	115,117 69
			$481,985 04

These increases in operating expenses summarised in round figures are as follows:—

Fuel	$2,370,000
Maintenance of Way Expenses	940,000
Maintenance of Equipment	1,222,000
Transportation expenses	1,228,000
Total	$5,760,000

The increase in the cost of coal during the last four years is shown by the following figures:—

Year.	Tons of Coal used by Locomotives.	Total charge to Fuel Accounts for train and yard locomotives.	Average cost per ton.
1915	795,054	$2,659,712 89	$3.34
1916	1,097,574	3,926,697 04	3.57
1917	1,282,341	4,828,425 70	3.76
Estimated for year 1918	1,448,000	8,256,010 00	5.70

Not only are we paying an excessively high price for our fuel, but due to restrictions in supply from the United States, this Company has had to take freight cars out of revenue service and use them in the haulage of locomotive coal for very long distances, and this condition absolutely beyond our control, reduces our revenue as well as increases our operating expenses.

The enclosed statement showing increases in cost of some of the principal items of railway materials and supplies covers the period during which these prices advanced most alarmingly as reflected by our operating statements.

While high percentage increases in wages have taken place in the last eighteen months, yet some substantial increases were also granted in 1915 and 1916.

The following comparison of increases shows the increases on a percentage basis obtained since 1914 by the main groups of employees. In this computation changes in the working rules, involving overtime, etc., are not considered, which make the actual increases considerably above those shown, which apply to rates alone:

Fiscal Years.	1914 Taken as standard	1915 % of Std.	1916 % of Std.	1917 and to Dec. 1917 % of Std.
Trainmen	100	100	119.25	120.57
Enginemen	100	117.41	118.93	130.81
Telegraphers	100	100.11	119.49	131.63
Mechanical	100	100.59	108.13	127.00
Maintenance of Way	100	100.00	105.12	123.81

The percentage for Trainmen in last column does not include increases to be given dependant on increases granted by Director General to Trainmen on U.S. Railways from January 1st, 1918, and adoption of eight hour day. Maintenance of Way employees on Western Lines obtained increases of from 45 cents to 35 cents per man per day effective 1st January last, which in respect to the Western men would increase the above ratio to 141.14. The Shopmen on all lines have asked for a very large increase, and at the present time a board is sitting to consider the demands of the federated trades, and even if a portion of the request is granted, the increase will be serious. The Telegraphers and Maintenance of Way employees on Eastern Lines are now asking for substantial increases which, if granted in whole or in part, will considerably augment the above percentage for the present year.

As the Freight and Passenger rate increases went into effect on March 15th—except the increase in grain rates which is not effective until 1st June next—practically no benefit is reflected in the gross earnings for the nine months.

Gross earnings, however, for April show an increase of $642,600 reflecting, to some extent, the benefits which may be expected from the rate increases. The comparative figures are as follows:

April 1918	$3,958,100
April 1917	3,315,500
Increase	642,600

It is impossible to say how far the increase in gross earnings will go towards meeting the increased cost of operating, as the conditions affecting the expenses are altogether unusual. The best that can be said is that the same close scrutiny which has obtained in the past by the Management in respect of costs will continue in the future.

If further information is desired, we shall be glad to supply it.

Yours truly,

D. B. HANNA,

Third Vice-President.

Attached to this letter is a comparative statement of the earnings and expenses for nine months, but that already appears in the letter as read and I need not again state it to the House. I thought it well to read that letter because it particularly brings up to March 31, last the figures in respect to the earnings and operating expenses of the road, besides affording other valuable information. That is all I have to submit to the House and I trust I have given all the information desired. I shall be glad to supply any further information required on the debate on the second reading of the Bill.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Has the minister any evidence, or guarantee, that all the floating liabilities have been got possession of by the department? If any such are not yet in, and should turn up later, what course does the minister purpose to pursue in regard to them?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Government are satisfied that they have a complete statement of all the floating liabilities of the company.

Mr. CAHILL: Would the minister, tomorrow, be able to give us a statement of what the assets controlled by the subsidiary companies consist of?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the hon. gentleman send me a note covering the information he desires?

Mr. J. READ: Who are the owners, other than Mackenzie and Mann, of the one-sixth of the stock that has not been acquired by the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As I stated the other day, the Government now hold $97,500,000 of the $100,000,000 of the common share issue of the company. The balance is held largely in England. I was hoping to have some more definite information as to the holders of those shares but it has not yet reached me. I will give it to the House when it is received.

Mr. J. READ: You did not acquire it all from Mackenzie and Mann. Who is the other nigger in the wood pile?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not catch the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. J. READ: Apart from the $97,500,000 which you acquire from Mackenzie and Mann, who were the other parties from whom you acquired stock?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Government were in possession of some $40,000,000 of the total issue two or three years ago. The difference between the $40,000,000 and the $97,500,000 was transferred to the Government by Mackenzie, Mann and Company, Limited.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see that much of this information which is given by Mr. Hanna, and which has been communicated to us this afternoon by my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is being contested at the investigation which is taking place in Toronto before the commission of which Sir William Meredith, Chief Justice of Ontario, is the chairman. Would it not be well to have the evidence which has been taken before that commission before we deal with this matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: None of the information which I gave to the House can be contested before the commission. The general balance sheet might be open to dispute, but I cannot possibly think of anything else that might be open to question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I noticed the other day that the Premier of British Columbia, the hon. Mr. Oliver, contested very materially the figures which were given by the Canadian Northern Railway representative before that commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is true. I observed in the press myself that the Premier of British Columbia makes a claim against the Canadian Northern Railway, but I know nothing more about it than does my hon. friend. Of course, the claim is not admitted, by the railway.

Mr. MURPHY: Might I suggest to my hon. friend that in view of the importance of this matter, and as the Premier of British Columbia is at present in Ottawa, my hon. friend might familiarize himself with the details of that claim so as to acquaint the House with the facts before we discuss the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will do my best. I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

BILL TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TO BRING THE OUTSIDE SERVICE UNDER ITS PROVISIONS.

On motion of Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance), Bill No. 53, respecting Civil Service of Canada was read a second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The progress made with this Bill has been much more expeditious than I anticipated. Probably there are some hon. gentlemen who wish to offer some general observations in regard to it, and I would not like to see them debarred from giving their views to the House. I would, therefore, suggest that after the several clauses have been considered, an opportunity should be afforded members to discuss the Bill generally upon the motion to adopt the preamble.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The discussion had better take place now, otherwise there can-

not be a general discussion on the principle of the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall be quite satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN: Under the rules of the House, hon. members should have taken advantage of the second reading to discuss the principle of the Bill. It is only with the unanimous consent of the Committee that this general discussion may take place now. When it has been completed, I hope the Chairman will have the assistance of hon. members in securing the observance of section 5 of rule 13.

Mr. MOWAT: I would like to say how gratifying it is to many members of the House that the Government has seen fit to bring in a Bill of this nature. The measure is bound to be unpopular in certain quarters because of its radical provisions, but for that reason the Government is entitled to all the greater credit for having brought it forward. Did we not have a Union Government in Canada at the present time I doubt very much whether we should have seen such a Bill introduced, in view of the manner in which the Civil Service has been administered for so many years. The fact that it has done so is to me a proof that it does not fear unpopularity. For that reason I am glad to be a supporter, for the time being, of a Union Government. Legislation of this kind is bound to make the Government unpopular in certain directions. I am glad, for one, even if unpopularity should result, because it will demonstrate to the people that even at the risk of unpopularity the Government will enact such measures at it believes to be in the interest of the country as a whole.

We are only beginning here a policy which was inaugurated in older countries many years ago and hon. gentlemen will perhaps pardon me if I give a short resume of what has transpired in Great Britain with respect to this important question. As far back as 1823, nearly a hundred years ago, the evils of patronage were first drawn attention to in the British House of Commons. At that time Lord John Russell made use of these remarks:

> Offices in the Post Office and Customs are made part of the patronage of members voting with the Government. When an office is vacant the Minister seeing his advantage, writes to the member for the county and asks his recommendation.

In 1829, the Duke of Wellington said:

> The whole system of the patronage is, in my opinion, erroneous.

Coming down to 1849, we find that competent old statesman, Sir Charles Trevelyan, taking special charge of the question of Civil Service and of patronage. He said in a report of that year:

> The dregs of all other professions, and young men who have no chance in open competition are attracted towards the Civil Service, as to a secure asylum.

Readers of Charles Dickens, who are familiar with the novel "Little Dorrit," will recall how he described the efforts made by Arthur Clennam to interest himself, and how Little Dorrit was uneasy, and her great fear was that he was entering upon a dangerous proceeding. That exhibits the Civil Service as it was then. You will remember how Clennam went to the Circumlocution Office and first saw the son of Mr. Tite Barnacle, and how young Barnacle treated him when he began the sentence, "I want to know"— Young Barnacle said: "My dear fellow, you must not come round here saying 'I want to know,' you know, because that's very irregular." And so on, and how Clennam was passed down to Wobbler and then to Tite Barnacle at his house, and on to Clive, then how the old man in the other office advised him very tenderly not to proceed with the inquiry he was making because it would take a lifetime to get an answer. The writings of Charles Dickens exercised great influence in the change in the Civil Service in England. Then, in 1855, there was a joint report by Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir Charles Trevelyan, which provided for a personal examination to qualify only, and this is the same law as we have at the present time with regard to what is called the Outside Service. In the second place, it precluded a commission for interfering with the appointment of those who had the duty of nomination or appointment, and finally provided for the appointment of mature persons without examination. This consequently did not take the whole of the patronage away from political control.

Then Mr. Layard, afterwards Sir Henry Layard, moved a resolution with respect to merit and efficiency having been sacrificed in public appointments to party and family influences and to a blind adherence to routine which threatened to bring discredit upon the national character.

In 1860 a select committee recommended that a moderate and modified competition be held for these appointments. In 1870, which is a record year in the history of the Civil Service, Mr. Lowe, who

afterwards became Lord Sherbrooke, approved an Order in Council making competitive tests obligatory in certain departments of the Civil Service, and he said—and with this I think many in this House will agree at the present time:

> Men who up to twenty-two years have been in no business or profession are superior to men who at eighteen have devoted themselves to the special duties of their calling.

In other words he believed that the best kind of civil servant was a man trained not only in business but in general literature and education, and who was not appointed until a more mature age. Such a man is more valuable to the state than one who entered the service and learned the routine of business at a very young age. In 1874, under Mr. Gladstone, as a result of the work of the Playfair Commission, the Civil Service was divided into four classes. First, administrative officers, appointed by promotion on account of their ability. Second, those in the higher branches of the Civil Service who obtained their offices by competitive examination. The third class were those for the lower branches appointed after a simpler competitive examination. The fourth class were the men on day wages who were appointed upon a qualifying examination only. In 1876, followed an Order in Council providing for a higher scale of pay. Then, in 1890, Sir Matthew White Ridley's Commission mentioned that men of more liberal culture were required, and that certain special appointments required men of professional and technical knowledge. In 1910, an Order in Council was passed, amending and consolidating former Orders, and which may be looked upon as the code of Civil Service regulation in the British Empire.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That was in 1910?

Mr. MOWAT: Yes. In 1914, a very important report was made by leading members of all classes, including our present Governor General, the Duke of Devonshire, who devoted a good deal of thought and consideration to the report, and who, at times, dissented in minority reports from the majority of the committee. Some other members were Lord Macdonell, a very competent and distinguished civil servant; Mr. Philip Snowdon, representing the Labour party or the socialist branch of it; and Mrs. Streatfield, representing the women of the country, who have more and more shown their ability to become efficient public servants. Their report is most comprehensive in dealing with the whole question both in theory and in practice, and reference to it may be of great value to those who are considering this question.

I propose to quote some extracts to the House for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of making the Civil Service of Canada not a mere trade or employment, but a profession. There is no reason why men should not go into the Civil Service profession as they go into medicine, law or engineering, because the Civil Service of Canada includes men who must be scientific in many branches, in matters of marine, of fisheries, of militia, of justice, copyright patents, and so. We cannot expect to obtain the best type of men unless we dignify the service and put it on a higher plane, taking it away from the influence of party politics, and giving opportunity for promotion and for increase in emolument, so that a civil servant can bring up his family in decency and give his children a good education. He cannot expect to do that unless we have a Bill which contains the principle of the Bill now before the House. It is a dreadful thing to me to think of a man, perhaps a graduate of a university, spending many years perfecting himself in the details of his department, studying the general literature which pertains to that department, giving his whole life to the service of his country in the Civil Service, having some one appointed over him because that person has had more practical experience in the political field and must receive a party reward. While men of that kind may be quite as good public servants as others—and it has proven so in our present public service—yet, taking the general run of things, the man who has devoted himself to the affairs of practical politics, and has acquired an influence which has enabled him to be shoved into the Civil Service, is not likely to be as valuable to the country as the man who has given his life to the profession. Therefore, it is gratifying to many members of the House on both sides, I am sure, that the Government have seen fit at last, after years of experiment in the Old Country and the United States, to bring in a measure of this range and character.

5 p.m.

Mr. Dorman B. Eaton, who was Chairman, I think, of a House of Representatives Civil Service Commission in the United States in 1880, made these remarks upon the state of affairs which had come into existence with regard to their Civil Service. After the war an innumerable number of men besieged the departments at

Washington to exercise their influence to secure appointments both for themselves and their friends, and the Civil Service got into a sorry plight; and American statesmen saw that they could not go on like that, that the public offices were overmanned, filled with incompetents and with men who did not give their whole time to the performance of their duties, and who could evade their strict duty because of the political influence they could bring to bear upon the heads of the departments. Mr. Dorman B. Eaton said this:

> Patronage creates a mercenary political class, an oligarchy of stipendiaries, a bureaucracy of the worst kind, which controls parties with relentless despotism, imposing upon them at the election issues which are prescribed not by the actual feeling and interest of the country, but solely by the necessities and profit of the oligarcy, while to secure this advantage, party spirit, the constant and mortal enemy of republics, is inflamed to the utmost. . . . . This system disgusts with politics and repels from them good citizens who cannot compete with the professional political class which gives all its time to a pursuit by which it profits.

While I do not say by any means that our Civil Service has got into any such direful condition as is depicted in that description, yet that is that tendency provided we go on with our present system. It is quite true that many of the best citizens of our country have not a high opinion of our political institutions and have a distrust of the doings of politicians, in the House of Commons or the Senate, or in the Civil Service. The reason probably is that he is unable to exercise any influence upon it; his relatives or his sons should, in his opinion, because of their possessing abilities superior to those of many public servants, have a chance to enter the Civil Service, but because they are not party politicians they cannot get a place.

The Civil Service would benefit by a system of competitive examination in the Outside Service. Since 1908 a system of competitive examination has been followed in the Inside Service, but in the Outside Service the examination has been merely a qualifying one and is quite insufficient. The Outside Service should have the same standing as the Inside Service. The practical result of a system of competitive examination in the Outside as well as the Inside Service would be the establishing of a public service consisting of a better class of employees than those who have hitherto been appointed. It may be said that a man who, because of his peculiar facility for answering examination questions and his knowledge of school and college work, may get a good place in a Civil Service examination, and yet may not be sufficiently practical or have the qualifications required of an efficient employee in the public service. That may be true in a few cases, but what we are trying to get at is a general principle under which we may arrive at the best results. The Civil Service Commission in England, which is composed of some of the best statesmen of that country, was correct when it reported that, on the whole, men who as a result of their school and college work succeeded in the Civil Service examinations made the most competent civil servants. So that if we get nothing else from this Bill than a system of examination for the Outside Service, we shall bring about good results. Some men who have been politicians and who are now in the Service have done well; we all know who and how competent they are; I need not mention names. But men in the Service with ambition to go ahead; men who desire to increase their efficiency and their standing, are dulled and frozen in the attempt; they become mere drones, doing their work day by day without hope of promotion or of increase in their salaries or standing; without hope of satisfying their reasonable ambition to become successful men as have their compeers and companions in the ranks of the private professions.

The working out of this Bill will produce complications at first; will give rise to troubles and irritations because of its newness. The same thing happened in England; the men of one department were known to resign in a body because they considered themselves unfairly treated. The member of Parliament became disgusted because his influence waned and he felt receding from him the committees which had steadfastly supported him in his constituency because they knew that Civil Service appointments would be given them or their relatives and friends. But the member acquired a new political backing; he acquired committees of a new kind and has been able to get very efficient political services from them—but not from those who expect to be Civil Servants. While the change, therefore, may cause temporary inconvenience and give rise to temporary irritations and opposition on the part of politicians, in a very few years it will so work out that the Service will be benefitted and political patronage will be forever eliminated.

A good feature of the Bill is that the status of those who are at present Civil Servants shall not be interfered with. This takes away a good deal of opposition to the

Bill. The Civil Servants of Ottawa, of whom there are now thousands, welcome this Bill with enthusiasm—not the mere class enthusiasm which might be called selfish, but the enthusiasm of men who have thought on these subjects for years, and who have groaned under the inequalities and injustices of the Service. Undoubtedly these injustices have not been deliberate; they have arisen of necessity through various circumstances connected with our present system.

Under this Bill all appointments are relegated to a commission. We do not expect the commission at once to produce the condition of affairs in the public service which prevails in older countries, but we anticipate that by fair attention to their duties, by an intelligent grasp of the needs of the Service and by loyal support of the principles embodied in this Bill, they will eventually enable us to be freed from the injustices and inefficiency which have prevailed in many branches of the Service since Confederation.

Unquestionably a Civil Service Commission sitting in Ottawa cannot be expected to know the personal characteristics of their appointees; in that respect they will have to depend upon reports of post office inspectors, collectors of customs and other leading officials in the Service throughout the country.

I hope that the circumstances will not result in the impression being created that once a man passes an examination he is given a life job. Nothing could be more hurtful to the interests of the Service. If there is one thing that is a nuisance in this country it is the curt, impolite, grudging public servant. He does exist in places; we all know him and we have all been troubled by him. If a public servant of this kind is the result of the system of political appointments, then we can none too soon get rid of the system. The public servant should understand that it is his duty to be courteous and obliging, and if this Bill fails to reach that phase of the subject the principle of efficiency in the public service cannot be fully carried out. We must have men not only who understand the duties of their office, but who have common sense, who will take the trouble to satisfy the public with whom they deal. This result is much more apt to be obtained under a commission, which, on complaint being made regarding the manners or inattention of a public servant, have power at once to " sit upon him " and thus to make it generally known that the administration of the Civil Service is in charge of a businesslike commission which will see to it that public servants attend to their duties as they should.

On the whole, I congratulate the Government and, in particular, the Acting Minister of Finance who introduced this Bill, on their courage in attacking a grievance, belated as this action may be. We are, of course, not yet a great country, and we naturally must be somewhat imitative of others. We all regret that. I regret that we have not, to any great extent, customs and fashions of our own. We depend largely upon what goes on in other countries. The great country to the south of us is richer than we are, and it has a very active life; it has its own fashions and customs, and we are naturally inclined to copy them rather than to have our own. I sometimes wish we copied the customs of some older countries rather than those of newer countries, because we often imitate what is bad in the newer country to the South of us instead of what is good in it. Be that as it may, we cannot help being imitative, and we have now reached a stage when we are getting into this frame of mind, that we must have a modern Civil Service Bill of our own. We are ceasing to take things haphazard. By this concrete code of regulations, because that is what the Civil Service Bill amounts to; I believe we shall do good to our country and to the Civil Service; we shall elevate the Civil Service to a position it has never had before; we shall give new heart to those who have laboured for years in the service, and ten years from now, when this legislation works out as I hope it will, under the Civil Service Commission, we shall wonder why we ever permitted so long things to go on in their present shape.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I desire heartily to concur in the remarks that have been made with regard to the wisdom of the measure brought down by the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and at the same time to agree very largely with what my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) has just said. I am pleased that the minister has allowed a little general discussion. I desire, in the first place, to approve entirely the principle of the Bill, and I think it would have been well if, in Canada, we could have had this legislation at an earlier date than this. The salaries paid in nearly all of the departments of the Government are less than they should be. Particularly is that the case in the Outside Service with which I am more

familiar than I am with the salaries paid to civil servants in the city of Ottawa. But I believe, to a less or greater extent, it prevails in all branches of the service that, during war time, the men who have had to live on fixed salaries, have had very much the worst of it. The very high cost of living has not enabled those men to live in the comfort in which they lived in pre-war days. The advances that have been made in the various branches of the Civil Service are not such as; in my judgment, should have been made, nor have they been made as readily as they should. I speak with a good deal of feeling in regard to this phase of the question. What I say is particularly true of the Post Office Department. I think within the last two years at least ten representations have been sent in to the Post Office Department as to the under-payment of letter carriers and clerks in our cities and towns. The salaries of those men are not at all commensurate with the very important work they have to do. They are entrusted with handling registered letters, money orders, postal notes and thousands of dollars' worth of other valuable property in the way of parcels, and yet their scale of pay is not as high as an ordinary labouring man could get at the present time. Further, during this war time, men have been employed in the post office in my own district, the city of Brantford, for three and a half years, and the are still called temporaries. When the law was made in regard to temporary employees, a man was not allowed to be employed temporarily in the post office for more than six months at any one time or in any one year. That was, in my opinion a very strange law in itself; yet there are men who, during the war, have beeen acting as temporary clerks or letter carriers, that are still on the non-permanent staff and that are paid on the basis of temporary employees, and, in some cases, uniforms are not supplied as they are to the permanent letter carriers. That sort of thing should have ceased long ago, and I have put in very strong representations to all the Acting Pastmaster Generals that we have had in such plenty during the last two or three years. I regret we have not a Postmaster General to whom we can go and talk, and whom we can get to rectify these matters, but we have been in that position for a long time. I have, within the last six months, had five or six deputations on this matter alone, and I have told those deputations I shall do all I possibly can. I, therefore, take this first opportunity of impressing upon the Acting Minister of Finance, who, for the moment, controls the purse-strings of the public treasury, that he limber up a little on them, and that all of our permanent staff, whether they be in the city of Ottawa or in any of the outlying cities of Canada, or in the country districts, down to the man who carries the rural mail and the man who receives $30 a year for furnishing a place for a post office and for lighting and heating it, should receive better consideration. The whole Service is run on far too parsimonious a scale for the public to get the service we should receive. I am strongly in favour of having an all round advance for efficient service, and wherever service is not efficient, I would get rid of it. That is the way I do in business. I believe with my hon. friend (Mr. Mowat) that a man in a public office should be just as civil as if he had half a dozen others to compete with. Some public servants, by their attitude, seem to say: You can come or go; you can take this or that, and that is all you are going to get; you will have to do as I choose, or you will not do business with me. That should not be. A civil servant is given a position to serve the public courteously, and courtesy should be insisted on in every branch of the Civil Service. Most of our civil servants treat the public in a courteous manner, but there are some who do not. I should like to see this question of pay and this question of courteous treatment to the public receive attention, and I believe that the system of promotion for fitness, for efficiency, should, as far as possible, be carried out. A man who has been doing good service should be given promotion. I have endeavoured to make myself clear in regard to the matter of recompense. I have not read the Bill very carefully all through, but I do not think the salaries to be paid are specified.

As a member of Parliament I am glad to be relieved of the responsibility of the Civil Service as embraced in my own riding. But there are some few points which, as a practical politician, I wish to fully understand. I am trying to be practical. In the first place the members of the Civil Service Commission are located in Ottawa. I have the pleasure of knowing several of them, and I believe they are very capable men. The Civil Service of Canada is paid by the people of all Canada, and not by the people of Ottawa, and I think every electoral district throughout the Dominion is entitled to a fair quota of men from that particular district. I lay that down as a principle. I

think the members of this House and the people of this country will have every reason to be dissatisfied if the appointment of the Civil Service Commission is going to mean that the members of the Civil Service in all the towns and cities from east to west and north to south are going to be sent from the city of Ottawa. I do not know whether that is the intention or not, but I want the minister to guard against that. I lay down as a principle that every riding is entitled to a certain number of its own people to administer its own business, subject to the rules and regulations laid down by the Civil Service Commission. That may be considered rather a narrow view, but I think it is a practical opinion. I think in all our communities we have men who are fit to discharge the various duties in all walks of life ,and I think the people of Ottawa, as fair-minded people, should not want to add to the eight or ten or fifteen thousand people they now have in Ottawa, and they are mostly Ottawa people, the appointments in every city and town and in every country district throughout the Dominion. I think every electoral district is entitled to have a certain representation in the public service of Canada, and I hope I have the backing of my fellow-members in making what I believe to be a very fair contention with regard to the Outside Service, as it is called.

I understand from a question that was asked in the House the other day by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) and answered by the Prime Minister, that members may or may not be consulted. Though I was in the House at the time, I must say that the answer did not appear to me to carry very strong conviction either one way or the other as to whether the member for a constituency was a proper man to be consulted as to who was fit to serve in any given position. If a member is not a fit man to be consulted in that matter, I think it is a reflection on his judgment and on his standing in his own community. If he is not a fit person I do not know who the fit man in that constituency would be to be consulted. I personally do not want to be charged with the making of appointments. It has got me into more trouble than it has ever done me good, because for every position to fill there are ten or twenty applications, but I say that if the members of this commission want the best testimony that can be got in the average constituency, they cannot go to a better man than the member elected for that constituency. I do not want to be considered as blowing my own trumpet; not at all. But the very fact that a member has the confidence of the majority of his constituents is a reason why he is entitled to be consulted. I do not say that his selection should be final by any means. I think the great trouble in the past has been that members in order to pay some political debt, or for some other reason of a more or less sordid character, have not used their best judgment in making nominations, owing to pressure perhaps or some other reason. But if the member will use his best judgment he can make a recommendation that will reflect credit on the position to be filled and credit on his judgment in the selection. But if this commission are not going to consult the member for a constituency, he should certainly be relieved from all responsibility for the administration of those offices. As it is now, if there is anything wrong in the post office, customs, inland revenue, or any other department, who hears about it first? The man who has a complaint to make runs direct to the member and says: "You are supporting the Government that is giving us this administration." The trouble comes home to roost with the member at once. The principle should be this: If members are not consulted, or, being consulted, their advice is not followed, the Civil Service Commission or the Government, who stand back of them, should relieve the member of the responsibility for seeing any particular office administered as it should be. I believe first, that members are fit and proper persons to be consulted, and that having been consulted, their advice should be followed, unless for some good reason. If a member is not consulted, he should be relieved from responsibility for any action taken by the commission or whoever may make the appointment.

A man who gets a position in the public service is required to pass an examination. It may be a fairly stiff one, and that is where the outlying districts are at a disadvantage again. Here in Ottawa a large number of young men and women will be passing examinations all the time, but in the country districts the people do not hear about the vacancy until the time in which to apply has expired. There is another point. A young man or a young woman may qualify for a position in the public service by passing an examination with high honours, and then find themselves without a job. How long are they to be kept waiting? That is a question

for consideration. There should be a reasonable time beyond which the young men or young women who have qualified themselves for the public service should not be kept waiting. At present they may be kept waiting months or years, and eventually get tired of waiting and take something else. I do not find in the Bill any guarantee that if a young man or woman qualifies he will necessarily get a job. It appears to me there should be in every community a certain number qualifying for the positions likely to become vacant in that district, and when they have qualified themselves their cases should receive first consideration when the vacancy occurs. No outsider should be sent in until all avenues have been tried for finding a man in the riding; that is the proposition I lay down, and I think it is a perfectly proper one.

The personnel of the commission is, I think, a good one. I have the honour of knowing the chairman. He was for many years a member of this House and a minister of the Crown. He is a fair-minded, reasonable man, and I think he will endeavour to give a good account of himself. I also know another member of the commission, and I think we are safe in their hands, so far as we can be safe under certain rules. But it must be remembered they are going to be guided by these rules, and while we all wish to have proper rules set up, they should be elastic enough to enable the commissioners to take a broad view of the matter, to recognize that it is not the money of the people of Ottawa that is being expended but the money of the people of all Canada. We are all interested in having our public servants fairly paid, and in trying to avoid a feeling of discontent and disquiet because their reasonable wants have not been met, and I do not think they have been met in the past. I think we would do well if we got the Civil Service on a basis similar to the Civil Service in England; that we should advance our public servants gradually step by step as their length of service and ability warrants, and then they would have something to look forward to. At the present time there are men who have been thirty and forty years in the service at the same old job, and have had practically no advance to speak of during that thirty or forty years, and now in their declining years they have very little to retire on. Some get a small pension and others nothing at all. The whole question should be taken up in a very comprehensive way. Full salaries should be paid for the present and the retiring allowance should be arranged for the man, or the woman, in this particular walk of life. We will have a much larger number of women in the public service in the immediate future than we have had in the past. A retiring allowance or a pension should be provided so that those people who have served the public long and faithfully may spend their declining years in comparative ease and comfort.

Mr. NESBITT: I confess that I am very pleased to see the Government introduce a Civil Service Bill that will take appointments out of party politics. I think they could not do anything better. I have not had an opportunity of reading the Bill through and I do not know what its provisions are in their entirety but I noticed one clause to which I should like to invite the attention of the committee. It provides that, where a civil servant is transferred from one department to the other, if, in the department to which he is transferred, the salary is lower, he must go in at the lower salary. I think that is absolutely unfair. There is another clause saying that he shall be entitled within a certain time to increases up to the salary that he received in the position which he formerly held but in the meantime, when transferred, he must accept the lower salary. I repeat, that is unfair. I do not think that clause should go through.

As to the Civil Service Commission, I do not know whether they are fairminded men or not, but if they are not fairminded men we are putting a lot of power in their hands because influence might be exerted underneath the surface that ordinary people would not know anything about. If they are subject to that sort of thing, we had better consider before putting so much power in their hands. However, I take it that the idea and intention of the Government is that these men shall be absolutely unbiased and fair. But, if there is some secret influence by some members of the Government, or by some people who may be known to the commissioners, the system will be nothing but a curse and a nuisance. If they exercise this power fairly I am absolutely in favour of the Bill. I am in favour anyway of giving it a trial. The laws that we make here are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, we can change them next year if the commission do not do what is right. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) says that we members are more or less responsible for the conditions as they exist at the present time, but if this Bill passes we will not be

responsible any more, and then we can tell those people who are clamouring for positions that we are not responsible and that they can go down to Ottawa and get after the Civil Service Commission with a gun, or club, or anything they like. That will be a relief to us, and as far as that is concerned I am not worrying about it. I am willing to give the thing a trial, but I would like to have some of these clauses amended. I am entirely in accord with the general principle of taking the Civil Service out of politics. It looks to me from such consideration as I have been able to give the Bill that there is too much power placed in the hands of the deputy ministers. Suppose that a man, or a girl, in the department offends the deputy in some way or other, he or she cannot get an increase of salary or a promotion without a recommendation from the deputy. I recently had something of that kind brought to my attention and I thought the young man in that case had been treated unfairly. I think we should give that clause our very serious consideration. Some of the deputies may be large-mined men and would not take a narrow view as to those who are in their department. On the other hand, there may be deputies who are not so liberal in their views, and we are putting a great deal of power in their hands when we say that a civil servant of any department can only get an increase of salary, or promotion, on the recommendation of the deputy. I think we should also consider the provision that a civil servant, upon being transferred from one department to the other, may be required to accept a lower salary. As I have already said, I am in full accord with the general principle of the Bill.

Mr. CRONYN: As this is a general discussion, I desire to draw the attention of the House, and particularly the attention of the Government, to one matter which has already partially been discussed during the session, and that is the position of those members of the Civil Service who are serving with His Majesty's forces. Under a late Order in Council, a copy of which I have not been able to obtain this afternoon, the civil pay of these men has been cut off and they are entitled now merely to their military pay and allowances. I have here what purports to be a copy of the Order in Council and, for the purpose of discussion and without at all guaranteeing its correctness, I propose to read it.

1. After the thirtieth day of June, 1918, the above mentioned Orders in Council shall be void and of no effect and no person in the civil employment of the Government absent upon service with the forces of His Majesty, or of any of His Majesty's Allies, shall receive any portion of the pay or salary which after that date would otherwise accrue in respect of such civil employment.

2. Any person in the civil employment of the Government absent upon service with the forces of His Majesty, or of any of His Majesty's Allies, shall be entitled upon the conclusion of the latter service, to be restored to his position in the civil employment of the Government if he remains qualified to discharge the duties appertaining to that position.

Now this question arose in a different manner during the Session of 1916 and I cannot do better, by way of explanation, than to quote the answer of the then Minister of Militia and Defence, the present hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) in answer to a question put to him:

Sir Sam Hughes: The rule in force is that members of the Civil Service who enlistel in the army prior to the 1st of November last draw their salaries as civil servants and also their pay and allowances as soldiers. Those who have joined the colours since the 1st of November, 1915, receive their military pay and an additional amount which brings it up to the amount of their Civil Service salaries, if their salaries in the service were larger than their military pay.

I think that succinctly covers the ground and shows what the position of these men was when they enlisted and went abroad. Earlier in the Session, when the matter came up, and it came up because of that difference being made, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), as reported at page 822, Hansard 1916, is quoted as follows:

An Order in Council was passed in the early weeks of the war providing that persons in the Civil Service of Canada who enlisted for overseas service would be paid their salaries during the time they were so serving their country at the front. At that time it was not anticipated that the war would last so long, and we had before us at that time the example of municipal corporations and railway and other corporations throughout Canada that were proposing to do exactly the same thing. The idea was impressed on the Government that the country could hardly afford to be less generous with regard to men who were prepared to make the supreme sacrifice than private corporations throughout the country.

Then he goes on to explain the reason why the Order in Council was changed and why the date of that change was fixed at the first of November, 1915 and adds the following:

Every civil servant who has enlisted on or since that date has enlisted under terms and conditions which were perfectly well known to him at the time.

and later on:

When the war did last for such a very considerable period, in view of the increased additional strain put on the public service by reason of the duration of the war and of the greatly increased number of men we are sending, we came to the conclusion that some change should be made, and it was made along that line.

That is to say, the civil servant, instead of getting his full civil pay in addition to his military pay, was given sufficient from the civil list to make up, with his military pay, the amount of salary he had formerly been receiving.

In the same discussion, Hon. Mr. Roche, the then Minister of the Interior, and now the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, spoke as follows:

I have explained the reason. Substitutes for civil servants who have gone to the front have to be paid out of the war appropriation, and we felt that there was too big a drain on it. That was one reason that led us to make the change. Hon. members who have spoken seem to think that the present system is the proper one, that is, only to pay these men the difference between their military and their civil pay, but they wish to go further and reduce the pay of those who enlisted prior to the first of November. I do not agree with that proposition, because it would be a breach of contract. All those men enlisted on certain conditions, and, as they did so enlist and went overseas, to reduce their pay would not be doing justice to them; but we are not doing any injustice to those who have enlisted since the first of November, because they know in advance what pay they are going to receive.

In the ensuing debate several of the members expressed their opinion on the subject. One hon. gentleman, the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who has just sat down, spoke as follows:

If these men joined under a certain understanding or promise, I do not see how the Government can honourably go back on that promise any more than an individual could. I am sorry I cannot advocate the cancellation of the first arrangement, because the men joined on the understanding that it would be carried out.

In other words, the member for North Oxford could not, and would not, agree that the men who first enlisted, prior to the first of November, 1915, should be cut down to the basis of those who enlisted after that date.

In the same debate the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) said:

I think the Government should give notice in the future of any change which they intend making. Any bargain you have made should be lived up to. If a man has gone under certain conditions, the Government cannot break the engagement.

[Mr. Cronyn.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will understand from the Order in Council which I have read, that not only those men who enlisted at the outbreak of the war, or prior to the first of November, 1915, but those who enlisted subsequent to that date, are to lose their civil pay and have to be content with their military pay and allowances. I think I need only state that proposition to the House to secure the disapprobation of the majority of the members to that course. I cannot conceive of any excuse for doing what a former minister of the Crown has stated would amount to a breach of contract. It does involve, of course, a considerable money outlay, and it may also be argued that it is a discrimination in favour of those men against any who have enlisted, or may enlist either under the Military Service Act, or otherwise, since the Order in Council of the 5th of April. I do not think either of those reasons should prevail, or, indeed, should have any effect whatever. I do not want to enlarge on it at this time, but I do urge the Government very seriously to reconsider their action in this respect, and acting on the suggestion of a minister in the former debate who asked for a concrete proposal, I am going to submit a recommendation, which I believe would be entirely workable. They tell me there are not very many of those original men still at the front, or abroad, that many of them have returned. I think the Government should say to those of them who do not come within the terms of the Military Service Act, those of them who are not liable to conscription: "We will withdraw you if you so desire, from the front, and return you to your post in the Civil Service. But if you remain, you must remain upon the terms of this new regulation, and receive only your military pay." That might take some little time, it would depend upon the numbers involved and the military positions held, but I think it would be dealing to some extent fairly with these men and with the country as well. Many of them are married men who would certainly come within the Act. Some are over the age, and others might, for some reason or other, be exempt from the provisions of the Act. All of these men, in my opinion, should be given the option of returning and resuming their places in the Civil Service.

This Order in Council also appears to affect, according to the information given to me, those members of the Civil Ser-

vice who have joined the various postal corps throughout Canada. A copy of the Order which I read was sent to such a man who was employed in the postal corps of Military District No. 1, and who, up to the date of that Order, had been receiving a certain amount of pay from the Civil Service. He is now cut off and his statement is that he loses about $50 a month. He is a married man and he and his family cannot possibly live on the military pay of $1.10 a day and whatever other field allowances there may be. That man certainly should be given the option to return to civil life. There may not be many cases of that kind, but there is one under my hand to which that applies.

There is one other point in connection with this matter. As I understand it, although I have no authority to quote on the subject, all those civil servants who enlisted did so upon the understanding that upon their return they should be reinstated (provided they were fit of course), in the situations they held, but at the salary which they would have normally received had they remained in the country. The civil servants, I should judge from the Bill before us, get certain yearly increases up to a maximum amount, and a man who went away receiving a salary of $1,000 and remained away three years would come back expecting to find his salary increased to $1,150 or $1,300. If his annual increase was $50 it would be the smaller sum, and if the yearly increase was $100 it would be the larger amount. Now, I am informed that in certain cases some of the men who have come back have been reinstated at the old salary which they received when they enlisted. That does not seem to be fair. Their brother clerks, who have stayed at home—I am not, of course, casting the least reflection on them,—have had their increases in the usual course. I think that is a point which the Government should take up, and, if I am right in my statement of fact, the wrong should be corrected.

I should also, before sitting down, like to say one other word in support of what the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said about the salaries generally of civil servants, and particularly of those in the post office, including the mail carriers. I understand the Government is considering that point, and I hope they will deal liberally with these men. There can be no doubt, with the tremendous increase in living expenses, when we are told officially that a dollar is not worth much more than fifty cents, that these men are having a hard time. Their case is made harder by the contrast to the man who is receiving a wage, and whose wage has largely increased. I know many institutions—some of them I have to do with myself,—have since the war, allowed a special war bonus, a high cost of living bonus. And while the Government, I understand, last year, did vote a special bonus of $100, that does not strike me as being sufficient to meet the needs of the men. I have had men come into my office, who were married, with large families, and lay down their family budget, and it is quite plain on the face of it, and with the knowledge I have of living expenses, that they could not get along on the salaries they receive.

Sir SAM HUGHES: With reference to section 9, concerning use of influence in getting appointments, I desire to ask the Acting Minister of Finance if there is any truth in the statement current around the city that the Auditor-General used undue influence upon the Government to have his son appointed Solicitor to the Commission, and then went personally and appeared before the Civil Service Commission, and as was stated, practically bulldozed the commission into appointing his son? The understanding is that the Government appointed him by Order in Council in the hope that the Civil Service Commission would not confirm the appointment. But the Civil Service Commission, having heard that the Government had anticipated such action, took what I take to be the proper course and refused to act in the premises until the Government would refuse to make the appointment. I ask the question, and if the minister has not the information now, I would ask him to let me have it at a later stage.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not in a position to answer the question just put by the hon. gentleman. But I do not think the Government has anything whatever to do with the matter. At any rate, I shall answer the question later.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Denis.

Bill No. 61, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 67, respecting the International Bridge and Terminal Company—Mr. Manion—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On the preamble:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not see the promoter of this Bill. It would seem that very wide powers are being conferred on this company. Where is the line to be built?

Mr. BUREAU: Who are the incorporators?

Mr. MORPHY: I would request that these Bills be distributed so that members can follow what is going on in the committee.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill has been distributed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the chairman of the Railway Committee can give us an explanation of this Bill, I shall be satisfied with any reasonable explanation.

Mr. CURRIE: This Bill, which was up before the Railway Committee, contained some contentious clauses. The railway company owning also the International Pulp Company at the International falls at Fort Frances, Ontario, have a railway bridge between the Canadian and American sides. This railway connects up their mills on the Canadian side. The railway crosses the bridge which the company own. This railway company and the pulp company desire to extend the railway line to a sawmill about four or five miles up or down the river—I do not know which, to provide cheap fuel for the pulp mill. They found that, under the Railway Act, they did not have the right to extend their line six miles on either side of their main line as provided in the Act. They had a charter of a bridge company which gave them a perfect right to build a railway track on the bridge and approaches, and they thought that, under that, they could come under the Railway Act and extend their branch lines six miles or so away from the main line on the bridge. The Board of Railway Commissioners decided that they did not possess that power because they were not a railway with a main line. There was also a dispute between the town of Fort Frances and this company. It appears that some time ago they had some trouble, and the town compelled them to build a revetment wall along the waterfront, and they wished to run this line of railway over that waterfront. Some clauses contained in the Bill give them the right to run over this embankment virtually without asking the permission of the municipality, and shutting the municipality from the waterfront. The municipality was represented before the Railway Board. The question was brought up there and amendments were agreed to which, I understand, were incorporated in the Bill by the clerk of the Railway Committee, and the Bill was then satisfactory to everybody in the committee, all interests being satisfied. Mr. Alexander Smith appeared for the town.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 75, respecting the Protective Association of Canada.—Mr. Demers.

Bill No. 73, for the relief of Frederick Ernest Zang.—Mr. Redman.

Bill No. 74, for the relief of Thomas Bailey Wainwright.—Mr. Fripp.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed in Committee on Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada—Mr. A. K. Maclean—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: This is an innovation from the way in which appointments to the Civil Service have been made in previous years. That is, instead of the members undertaking the responsibility and a certain amount of worry in connection with patronage in the filling of positions, that work is now assigned to the Civil Service Commission. If that commission will give the necessary attention to this very responsible work, a considerable advance will have been made. If, however, that commission, after it undertakes the work, becomes indifferent and allows a good deal of this work to drift into the hands of the deputy ministers in the various departments, or perhaps leaves a considerable quantity of this work for the secretary to do, I question whether it will be as satisfactory as we would like to see it. If the work drifts into the hands of the deputy ministers and the secretary, and if the commission does not give it the necessary attention, an inner circle or ring will be formed that will cause a great deal of dissatisfaction. I think, however, this is

a move in the right direction, and we should give the Bill a fair trial. If we find it is not working to the satisfaction of the members generally, some change may be made at a later date. As to beneficient action in regard to those who have voluntarily enlisted and gone overseas and those who have been drafted, I wish to compare the treatment accorded by the city of Toronto to its employees with that accorded by the Government to its employees. I do not think the Government has treated its employees as generously as the city of Toronto has.

At the outbreak of the war the city of Toronto continued to pay those of its employees who enlisted their full civil salaries, even in one case to the amount of $9,000 a year. These men drew their military pay as well, and some of them held pretty good positions in the army. During the second year of the war the city continued to pay them their full civil salary less the amount of their military pay, but reduced the amount of $9,000 which it was paying in one particular case, because they felt justified in making the reduction. The city of Toronto also insured for $1,000 all men enlisting in the city, and has paid out many hundreds of thousands of dollars in that way. This insurance is still kept up.

I have heard many complaints in connection with Government employees, and particularly in connection with the custom house. One young man that I know of in the Customs Department enlisted voluntarily and was granted both his civil and military pay, in accordance with the usual understanding that he would proceed overseas in a reasonable time. He was prepared to go overseas and so informed the department, but after some time had elapsed and he was not sent overseas, his civil pay was cancelled and he was allowed his military pay only. The same thing occurred with six or seven others in the Customs Department. This young man to whom I have referred was made an instructor, notwithstanding his desire to go overseas, and he still wishes to go. I got in touch with the department and suggested that he be allowed to go overseas or to revert to his civil position, but the answer was that he was to remain as instructor, and he is still carrying out that duty, receiving only military pay. It seems to me that is hardly fair treatment from the Government. It can certainly afford to be more generous than the city of Toronto, because of its large revenue and its power to tax, if necessary, the lands of the whole Dominion. The city of Toronto has been very generous, and in many cases has done what really should have been done by the Government.

Many employees of the Customs Department are receiving very small pay. They have made representations to the minister or deputy minister at various times that they should have an increase. I understand that many of them have not had an increase for several years. The minister may say that they were given a war bonus last year. It is true that a bonus of a hundred dollars was given, but not to the whole staff, for what reason I do not know. It has been represented to me that about forty members of the staff received no increase or bonus whatever, and that has created dissatisfaction. If the Government felt they could only afford to distribute a certain amount among the employees, they should have made an equal distribution of it amongst the whole staff, instead of giving a bonus to two-thirds and nothing to the rest. I think these employees have a real grievance and I trust that in the reclassification under this Bill they will get an increase and receive the treatment they should have received long before this. The same remark applies to the post office employees, in both the inside and the outside service, including the letter carriers. A deputation from Toronto made representations here for an increase a few weeks ago, but they received very little encouragement because the deputation was from Toronto. I understand the Government's answer was that representations had not been made generally throughout the Dominion, but from only a few employees representing the Toronto postal employees and letter carriers. I know some of these letter carriers in Toronto who have been in the service for from twenty-five to forty years and have not received an increase for many years. Their pay, considering the high cost of living, is very small. I trust that, when this Bill is finally passed the Government will see to it that these men are treated justly, even if they are residents of Toronto. I do not think the Government should require representations to be made generally throughout the whole Dominion. If no representations have been made by the West, it may be that conditions are better out there; perhaps they are getting better pay. I certainly think the cost of living is higher in the East than

in the West, and I therefore think there should be a greater increase in the East.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the West civil servants receive an increase of fifteen per cent per annum. This is due to the fact that the cost of living is higher.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I sincerely trust that something will be done after the representations that have been made. This is a very important Bill, and inaugurates a new policy. There is to be a re-classification of the service, and a system of competitive examinations. I think that is a step in the right direction, but it does not always follow that the person who comes out on top in the examination is best fitted for the position. I have seen in my time a young man who was extra bright and clever and who could pass the examination but who, when he was placed in a position, displayed no ability or aptitude for his work. Surely positions in any part of the country are not going to be given to people, whether they have ability or not, just because they have taken fairly high standing at an examination.

If a position should happen to be available in Ottawa, or Quebec, a young man living in Vancouver would be eligible to be examined for that position. He might be clever and pass the examination, and he might possibly be given that position. Why should you bring a man from Vancouver to fill a position in Ottawa or Quebec when you could get perhaps five hundred or a thousand people just as capable of filling that position right in the locality? You should give consideration to the claims of those who pass the examination and who reside in the locality where the vacancy occurs. Surely amongst them you will get some who possess the ability as well as the qualifications which the passing of the examination gives them. While you insist on an examination to test the qualifications of the candidate, you should assure yourself of his ability to carry on the work successfully. It should not be left entirely to deputies or to the secretary. I am inclined to fear that a great deal of the work of selection will be assigned to subordinate officers instead of being carried on under the immediate direction of the commissioners. However, I trust I may be disappointed, and that my opinion as to what is likely to occur will not be verified. It may be that my judgment as to what will take place is not good. If this Bill works out in a satisfactory way we will all be perfectly satisfied and glad of the change.

[Mr. T. Foster.]

Mr. COOPER: Although I have read this Bill through, I am not prepared as yet to pass on its merits or demerits. I think that probably a year's trial will disclose its weak and its strong points. There is a question that I would like to bring to the attention of the Government, and that is the position of the lower-paid public servants. I do consider, speaking more especially for the Far West, that some of our letter carriers and men in the employ of the Customs Department are quite inadequately paid. I would like to go on record as urging very strongly that they should receive a bonus or some other consideration to meet the increased cost of living. With regard to civil servants who are also soldiers, I have been very strongly opposed to those preferred soldiers. I felt that the Government had no right at any time to give a preference to any men that fought for the country, but as the Government made the contract with these men, that contract should be lived up to. If the Government's intention is to cancel all payments to those civil servants on the thirtieth of June, any men who did not fall within the operation of the Military Service Act should be allowed to break the contract on their side.

Mr. CURRIE: This Bill is possibly one of the most important measures that has come before this House at this session, and I only regret that it was not brought down earlier so that more consideration could be given to it. The Bill deals, we know, with both the inside and outside services. I have heard some of the discussion and I must confess that I do not think a case has been made out yet for a great many clauses of the Bill. It is argued that the Outside Services ought to be placed under a commission, and England is quoted as a great country that has its service under a commission. With all due regard to our desire to look up to England for everything, what do we find? We find that when war broke out the Civil Service of England was so cluttered up with incompetents that they had to break their regulations and call in outside practical men to take charge of various departments of the Government. I might point out, for instance, the case of Sir Frederick Geddes. It is only a few years since this gentleman, who is now in charge of one of the greatest and most important departments of the British Government, was a railway contractor. Other departments might also be mentioned in regard to which the Government had to break their regulations with reference to the Civil

Service, get the best men they could and put them into the service of the country. Those who know anything about the Civil Service under this Government, especially the inside service, know that possibly one-third of the service do all the work whilst the other two-thirds spend all their time in endeavouring to keep out of the way so that nobody will know whether they are earning their salaries or not. I knew cases in the old House before it was burned of men who had sinecures under the Government and who got away into a corner in a room and had the space occupied by them partitioned off so that nobody would be able to see what they were doing. I often wondered whether they did not crawl in and out of the window for fear that they might be seen going through the corridors. The difficulty is that there is no arrangement, such as there is in the United States, where there is a special inspection for supervising the work of different departments. When they adopted Civil Service reform in the United States they found it was necessary to supervise all the departments from time to time and under their law they appointed an Efficiency Board that goes through the departments from time to time, and if the head of that department or anybody else is incapable, the board will fire him. Here we have made no such provision. If a man once gets into the Service in some of these departments it will take a ton of dynamite to get him out, it does not make any difference whether he does any work or not. I know a good deal about it and that is exactly how the case stands. Every minister knows that he is encumbered with men in his department that he cannot get rid of. I repeat that one-third of the men are doing the work and the rest are doing nothing.

So much for the Inside Service. We come now to the Outside Service. We are going to put the Outside Service under a commission and have examinations. Can the minister tell me what kind of an examination you are going to have, for instance, for a man who shovels coal into a furnace? A lot of these men in the Outside Service are men employed to shovel coal, feed furnaces, sweep sidewalks and wash windows. What qualifications will you require of a man who is employed to wash windows? We go farther afield and come to the most important branch of all, the post office. Now in the case of a small post office in the country the postmaster or postmistress must pass a qualifying examination. Formerly they had to be examined by the post office inspector who had to find out whether the party nominated was fit for the place or not. But that is not going to be the case in future. As it is now a man who has a post office in his store sells out to another man who is duly qualified to take his place and run that post office. The man who is running that store then, instead of getting the appointment of postmaster, with a salary of $50 or $60 a year attached to it, has to pass the qualifying examination and when he does perhaps he has not got the job. Somebody will be sent to take that job, somebody perhaps from the Northwest or Three Rivers or some other section of Canada, to take the position.

A great many appointments will have to be made from time to time in the Outside Service. What will we have then under this Bill? A position perhaps may have to be filled in the outside service in Toronto. Well, one man will perhaps come from Vancouver, another fellow from Hull to fill it. Toronto will be ignored. With respect to the Inside Service when it was under investigation and fire a few years ago, it was discovered that eighty-five per cent of the appointments made to it were made from the city of Ottawa. Now, when all the appointments for the Outside Service are made in the city of Ottawa, how many appointments do you think will be made from the country to the Inside Service? When I had the good, or bad, fortune to take my seat on the Government side of the House in 1911, I made an investigation into the Inside Service here to find out how many men from my riding had positions in the Inside Service and how they had fared. I found that only one man from my riding had been appointed to the service and his appointment dated away back to 1887. So you see there is little or no chance whatever under this measure for anybody outside of Ottawa to get a job of any kind. As far as appointments outside are concerned there is a great deal of talk in the papers about the "uplift" and the terrible evils of patronage, and all that sort of thing. I have never experienced any trouble about patronage. I have had a little trouble when I appointed incompetents to office and had to deliberately fire them, and I have not hesitated, when men that I had recommended were found to be incompetent, to see that they were removed, and others who were competent put in their places. Somebody must be responsible for the management of the Outside Service all

over the country, and to whom do the people look? Do they look to the deputy minister? No, they look to the member and if anything goes wrong they blame him for it. Now, the members, to my knowledge, have always seen to it that the people they recommend for position in the Outside Service were invariably respectable people and well behaved, but what guarantee has the Government that all kinds of people will not get into the Outside Service now? There is no arrangement made that they shall be furnished with recommendations or anything of that kind. If a man seeks a position in the establishment of Sir John Eaton in Toronto what happens? The applicant has to give the names of two or three prominent citizens in the place from which he comes, and to each of these people will come a document from Eaton's saying, such a person has given your name as one who has personal knowledge of him, and accompanying it is a series of questions from the firm asking about that man, just the same as though he was recommended to a position in the Government. That is not patronage, that is purely and simply a guarantee that the man you recommend to Eaton's is a respectable person. You will not recommend a thief to go there. It should be the same with the Civil Service. A man, unless he is carefully recommended, may have a record that is not altogether too good, and the result will be appointments such as were made last year. Some appointments were made in certain departments of the Government without any reference to members, and to my positive knowledge—I do not want to name any party—two of the men that were appointed were more fit for the asylum than for a job in the Civil Service, or any other service. There are all kinds of people chasing Government jobs, and the great difficulty is to select the proper party. When you do so you must shed a tear over his career, because you know he is being put in some place where he is not going to get what he deserves. There are meritorious people who do not get what they deserve, and often those who are not meritorious get a good deal more than they deserve. I think some provision should be made in the present Bill to meet the difficulties I have pointed out. The old Act that we have been working under gave the Government power by Order in Council at any time to place the outside service under the Civil Service Commission. That was all right, but no case has been made out for the great change which is proposed here. Whilst there has been lots of talk and questions raised about appointments, the only cases where difficulties have occurred by reason of appointments in the ridings have been where members of Parliament have deliberately placed their own friends in office. We will have the same thing here; a deputy minister will place all his relations in jobs under the Government, and the people from other parts of the country will not have anything to say about it.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Auditor General?

Mr. CURRIE: I do not know anything about the Auditor General, who is a good old Scotchman, except that he is a very efficient officer. On several occasions in this House I have had to take his reports as proof where certain things had occurred that he would not let through. We have had him before committees on a number of occasions, and we invariably found the Auditor General was a straight and honest man. But there is a great tendency to nepotism in human nature, which extends away back to Biblical times. There is a great tendency to give jobs to your relations and I confess it is very difficult to get over at times. This tendency it will be very hard for the deputy ministers and the ministers to combat.

From my knowledge of what has taken place in this House, both when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, and when the Conservative Party were in power, I do not think that there were half a dozen cases brought before the House in which it could be said that wrong appointments were made through the instrumentality of the members. The member is responsible, and if he recommends an evil person to take a position everybody on the opposite side of politics in his own riding will be down on him for it. The result will be that he will have to have that appointment cancelled, or insist that whoever gets it shall walk in the straight and narrow path.

There is another thing to be considered. We are now having to deal with returned soldiers. The Government passed an Order in Council that no one should have a position who was of military age except a returned soldier. That was very much appreciated by the men who are fighting the battles of this country, whether they have returned from the front or not. Many men will return with empty sleeves and wooden legs. So far this Government has provided positions for those men, and I feel satisfied that after the clamour and excite-

ment of war have passed these men, without exception, will do their duty, because they have learnt the idea of discipline, which ninety per cent of Canadians who have not gone to the war know nothing about. Furthermore, the returned soldiers will know what efficiency is. We find that this Bill makes no provision for placing representatives of the men who are at the front on the Civil Service Commission. I have nothing to say against the present members of the commission, but I think that provision should be made for enlarging its membership whereby at least two, if not three, members should be men who have served at the front, men who have received wounds and served their country with honour and distinction. If we do not do that what is going to happen? There are going to be examinations and we hear it said that the soldiers are going to be put at the top of the lists, and all that sort of thing. Well, we have absolute confidence in the present members of the Civil Service Commission, but none of those gentlemen have a permanent lease of life. I would not like to see them disappear, but they are not going to live forever, and their places will be taken by others who may have no sympathy with the war or with the soldiers. The result will be that the soldier will be constantly cheated out of office by trick examinations. For that reason I would ask the minister to put representatives of the returned soldiers on the commission to see that there is no such thing as trick examinations imposed on the returned soldiers.

There are other departments of the Government in the Inside Service where examinations have to be passed. I do not wish to mention any names, but unless a man belongs to a union he gets a trick examination and has no chance to get an appointment. If he belongs to a certain union, he has every chance, and if he does not belong to that order he is out in the cold. So, in this case, if you are going to give a preference to a returned soldier, and you are honest about it, and the House is honest about it, then make provision that there shall be people on this commission who will fight for the returned soldier and see that he gets his proper due. I think these are sentiments which should touch the heart of gentlemen who are sitting within the sound of my voice, and I am not asking too much when I ask that this board be enlarged. I have no right to ask for the expenditure of a larger amount of money than the Government is providing for this measure; I would be called to order by the chairman if I did. But perhaps we could have some soldiers put on that commission who would serve for nothing and not ask for salaries.

I want to refer to another point in connection with the returned soldier. The matter has been referred to by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), who has placed his case very clearly before the House. I have spoken already this session on this matter, and perhaps it would not be right for me to say another word. I only desire to answer the suggestions that have been made that the men who went to the front in 1914 should be asked to return and revert to the Civil Service, give up all they fought for in France, or else give up their salaries. That would affect four generals at the front, who went over there as juniors and have received their crossed swords on the battlefield. They were men of the permanent corps holding Civil Service appointments. You ask these men, who are highly qualified officers, many of them the best officers we have, to return under this regulation, men who have been engineers in the service, qualified as artillerymen and observers. You say to them: We don't want you to serve your country any longer, you must give up what you have there and come back.

What would they get when they came back? I know one officer who went over as a permanent non.-com. in the service, a corporal of the permanent corps when he left. He went to Europe, distinguished himself, and rose to the rank of major. Through illness he was invalided to Canada. Whilst he was recovering an order went forth that no officers who were invalided to Canada were to be allowed to go to the front from here, and he had to remain at home. He was not willing to do so. But what were the conditions under which he returned to duty? Although he had won his commission and crowns on the other side, he had to go back in the permanent corps as a corporal. There is no guarantee, and there has been no guarantee, provided by this Government for any man who has left for the front from the permanent corps or militia and who obtains a promotion abroad. When he comes back he reverts exactly to the rank in the army or the militia he had before the war. This Parliament might very well have given consideration to amendments to the Militia Act in justice to officers who have gone overseas and won their promotion. But we are in a hurry to get away from here and important matters have been forgotten. If hon. gentlemen waver in the

right, and will not live up to its obligations, as a man who represents the soldiers in this House I insist on justice and that the contracts are carried out. Sir John Eaton is not asking, nor is any other of the great business houses of the country, to get out of the voluntary contracts they have made with the men who left their employ for the front, and they are paying the wives what was promised when the men left. Surely this House of Commons has not degenerated so much since the war began that it wants to do what is a rank injustice and a breach of contract so far as the men at the front are concerned.

There are one or two other matters in connection with this Bill which I think it would be well to consider seriously before proceeding to give it its final touches, and I hope the minister will take them home to-night, and bring in a few amendments, especially that there shall be representatives of the returned soldiers appointed on the commission. We all express so much sympathy for the returned soldiers here, but he gets so little of it when it comes to practice. It is time we did something more than talk about it. There is another clause in the Bill which deals with technical men. Technical men are the young fellows who come from the universities as draughtsmen, surveyors and designers, and enter the departments, nearly all of them with the Bachelor of Science degree. They are put in Class 2 according to this Bill. Why should the best brains which enter the service—chemists, draughtsmen and men of ability—be put into the Second Division? The Bill provides that architects and draughtsmen shall be put in that division, and the hardship of it is that these men, according to the Bill, can never be put into the First Division, can never become heads of departments. I hope the minister will reconsider that. I want to assure him right now, from my experience all over the country, and from my experience as to what the soldiers are saying, the men I suppose chiefly interested in the Bill, they do not think there is any great necessity for all this row about putting the Outside Civil Service under a commission. That is going to be a tremendous work. It should be undertaken after the war is over, when we would have plenty of time to pass a carefully considered Bill. It has not been proven that there is any merit whatever in what is known as Civil Service reform, because in England and in the United States they have had to put the best men in the country at the head of their departments. Charles M. Schwab was put the other day at the head of the ship construction.

9 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Schwab has not entered the Civil Service. He has entered the public service, just as Sir Auckland Geddes did in England.

Mr. CURRIE: He is the head of a department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And so is Geddes. Mr. Schwab has not become a member of the Civil Service.

Mr. CURRIE: Of course, these men would not think of becoming members of the Civil Service. Why should men like that want to enter the Civil Service? My observation is when it comes down to the point where we need real men we cannot get them from the Civil Service. Therefore, as far as this Bill is concerned, I do not think it has justified so much stupid talk about it. I heard the speech of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) this afternoon. And I thought if that was all that could be said on behalf of the Bill there was not very much to be said. If you pass this Bill you will get whole groups of men in office, and you make no provision to get rid of them if they are of no use. Neither the deputy head nor any other sub-head has any authority to dismiss a man or to establish discipline in the service, not even the minister. That is dealt with by the Governor General in Council. Suppose a man away out in the country will not do what he has been ordered to do: the superior refers the matter to the officer next higher up; that officer passes it on to the deputy minister, and the deputy to the minister; the minister puts it before the Cabinet and the Cabinet has to decide whether a postmaster drawing $25 a year shall be dismissed. The whole thing, to my mind, is absurd. The Bill should be better framed than it is. I do not think any argument has been advanced by either the minister or anybody in this House which has satisfied me that there is any crying desire for Civil Service reform of this kind. The cry for reform comes altogether from those people who have failed to get appointments.

Mr. HOCKEN: I was quite surprised to hear the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) say this afternoon that this Bill would be unpopular. As far as my observations go it is popular with pretty nearly every class in the community. I do not know any class of people with whom it should be so popular as the members of this House. I

congratulate the minister upon the Bill which he has brought down. It is not perfect, but I do not think we should look for perfection in legislation enacted by human beings. However, I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a few of the imperfections by which I have been impressed.

I heartily approve of the principle laid down in the Bill that the returned soldier should be taken care of. In many parts of the country institutions are training returned soldiers who intend to take up different occupations from those in which they were engaged before they went to the war. Many men who were not in the Civil Service before they went to the front may on their return prepare for and perform efficiently the duties of civil servants, and in this respect there is work for the Department of Soldiers' Re-Establishment. These men have risked their lives, endured all kinds of hardship and, in some cases, of misery, in order to protect our homes, and if there is any class of people to whom we should give special consideration it is the men who return from the war. This Bill provides that even if such men are not as well qualified on the competitive examination as some others may be, they are eligible for appointment. That is only fair, and I believe that such men will be most efficient. I hope that the Civil Service Commission will make that a particular feature of their work and that they will give the closest attention to it.

I was much impressed by the remarks made by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). It will not be satisfactory to send from Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton or other eastern centres, men to take up Government positions, say, in Calgary or Edmonton. Those in the locality concerned who are qualified should receive special consideration. I do not say this because I want to have anything to do with appointments in Toronto; I am delighted to be relieved of that responsibility. But the local feeling with regard to appointments of this kind should receive the consideration of the Government. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) emphasized the wide power that is conferred upon deputy ministers. I want to get away from patronage; I believe that that is the sentiment of the people. But if the people are forced to choose between the patronage system and a family-compact system, they will prefer the former. Nothing is more repugnant to public sentiment than the filling of public offices with men connected by blood relationship or by marriage with some particular group of officials. This Bill puts it in the power of deputy ministers practically to take care of every relative they have, and every relative their wives have, and every person he is connected with in any way.

An hon. MEMBER: How?

Mr. HOCKEN: These appointments are made on the recommendation of the deputy minister. The man getting the highest marks in the competitive examination is appointed on probation, and if at the end of six months or a year the deputy minister wants to give the appointment to the second man on the list, who happens to be a friend of his, the probationary period may be ended with the dismissal of the man who was highest in the examination.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The selection is made by the Civil Service Commission. The deputy minister may dismiss, but there is an appeal to the Civil Service Commission. The probation is for a period of six months or a year.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is as I understand it. Let us suppose the second man on the list is the man the deputy minister wants. I do not charge deputy ministers with being concerned in any corrupt act, but they are just as human as we are, and if the man who comes second is a relative or friend of the deputy minister the probationary period of the highest man may end in a report by the deputy minister to the Civil Service Commission that his services are unsatisfactory; and the commission sends along the next man. The best man to determine the qualification or fitness of an employee is the deputy minister; I do not see how we can get away from that. But I should like to see in this Bill a provision that the annual report of the Civil Service Commission shall state not only the name of the appointee, his salary, and so on, but also how many relatives he had by blood or by marriage in the service. In that way a check would be put on those who are disposed for one reason or another to create a family compact.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the deputy has the appointment, does that not mean that the minister will have something to say about it? because the minister has power to retire his deputy if the latter does not play the game. Moreover, is it not simply a left-handed way of letting the ministers have the patronage, instead of the members of Parliament?

Mr. HOCKEN: The appointment is made by the Civil Service Commission, but power

is vested in the deputy minister to eliminate one man after another who may be so appointed by the commission. The suggestion which I have made would put a check on the deputy minister in the matter of his appointing half a dozen men of one family to positions in the service. If an investigation were made of the service here in Ottawa, it would be found that in some cases half a dozen different members of the same family are in the service, sometimes in the same department. They may be qualified, but the principle is repugnant to the feelings of the people. It is the last thing we should encourage, or even permit, and if it cannot be absolutely prevented, it should at least be discouraged by such a plan as I have suggested. Then, take the appointments for which no examination is possible. I assume that professional and technical men would include carpenters, plumbers, printers and men of that kind. The appointment of such men rests with the deputy minister, who makes recommendation to the commission. The Deputy Minister of Public Works, for instance, would have the appointment of I do not know how many carpenters and plumbers all over the Dominion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Technical men are men of special or scientific knowledge—of mining, fisheries, and things of that kind. The expression "technical officers" would not include tradesmen.

Mr. HOCKEN: What examination can the Civil Service Commission set for carpenters? One carpenter is equal to another. How are you going to determine superiority of qualifications amongst men of that class? The same applies to printers and plumbers, large numbers of whom are employed. That responsibility all rests upon the deputy ministers, and that is altogether too much power to put into their hands, unless there is some additional check than that which is provided in the Bill as it stands at present.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Commission will find a method of appointing men of that class. The deputy minister has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not understand that from the Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I could not help feeling, while the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) was speaking about the influence that might be exercised by a deputy minister, that, as a rule, deputy ministers are not so unkind to their relatives as to wish to have them placed in the Civil Service. I have had some knowledge of the Civil Service for a few years, and, from my experience, my advice to my friends and acquaintances has been to keep clear of the Civil Service above anything else. If you have any ambition; if you ever expect to make any headway in the world; if you place any value on your initiative, your freedom, then, for Heaven's sake, steer clear of the Civil Service. If you want to become part of a machine by which you move along without exercising your initiative, then the Civil Service is the proper place for you. My sympathies have always been with those employed in the Civil Service. I want it distinctly understood that, if to-night I say anything that may, in some measure, reflect upon civil servants, I have no intention of casting any reflection on any one who is at present or who may in the future be in the Service. When the minister was pointing out the difference between the position occupied by Mr. Schwab and Mr. Geddes and the position of those in the Civil Service, it struck me that the difference was possibly an imaginary one. The minister told us that the former were in the public service, whereas the latter were in the Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What I meant was that Mr. Schwab was appointed head of the Shipbuilding Commission because he had some knowledge of that particular business. The civil servants of the United States Government have no opportunity of gaining a knowledge of building ships. That is not their business. It is, therefore, only natural that somebody should be taken from the outside. There is quite a distinction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I quite understand what the minister had in mind. In the positions in which Mr. Schwab and Mr. Geddes were placed, they were able to exercise their initiative, to do things and to control those placed under them. Some hon. members who spoke dealt with civil servants who enlisted voluntarily and went overseas with the first and second contingents, and with whom the Government entered into a contract to pay them their Civil Service salaries in addition to their military pay. I think that almost without exception those who spoke in reference to that matter said that it would be a breach of contract on the part of the Government with those men if that contract was not carried out to the very letter. I hardly

look at the matter in that light. We are, at the present time, passing through a condition of change. The war has revolutionized everything in the world. Conditions to-day are not what they were six months ago or a year ago. Changes are rapidly taking place. When these men entered the military service, we had the volunteer system. To-day we have compulsory military service in this country. While it would be advisable and obligating to carry out that contract with men not eligible under the Military Service Act, as regards any man who is to-day eligible for service under the Military Service Act, I do not consider that this Government or any other is justified in giving him preference over any one else. The same argument applies to the clamour that is being raised to-day throughout the country with regard to the cancellation of exemption of farmers. Some safeguards might be provided whereby, in certain instances, where a great hardship is going to ensue, exemptions might be made; but in so far as keeping faith with those men is concerned, changed war conditions have relieved the Government of any such responsibility. The very fact that we have to-day in Canada compulsory military service does not justify the Government in singling out civil servants and paying them salaries in addition to their military pay. Every one in this country ought to be on an equal footing with regard to this war. We ought to have, in so far as is possible, an equality of service and of sacrifice on the part of every one.

In my opinion, this is a most inopportune time for the introduction of a Bill respecting the Civil Service of Canada. There is no justification for taking any class of the people in this country or in any other country and cuddling them along and placing safeguards around them so that they are safeguarded from competition with other people. You give them privileges that other people do not enjoy, and you do a great deal of harm in that respect. It is true you kill, you strangle initiative in them, and in that way you do a great deal of injury to them. I should like to see, if it were only possible, some way of providing for promotion for merit in the Civil Service. I do not believe that has always been the custom, and I do not think it will be possible under this Bill.

By placing the Outside Service in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, we are departing from an established rule that has been in existence in the British Empire for many years; that is, responsible and representative government. I believe a government ought to be responsible to the people for the administration of the affairs of the country. I do not believe you can delegate those responsibilities to any commission and say: The commission have done so and so; the Government cannot interfere in the matter, and we are not responsible for the action of the commission. We have not had a great deal of experience in Canada with regard to commissions; but there is at the present time a feeling so intense burning in the veins of our people with regard to one commission that has been appointed in Canada, that it should cause us to hesitate, to reflect as to what the consequence may be of placing another commission in a position in which they will be able to exercise as much authority as that one is empowered to exercise, and I see that the powers are almost identical. You may rest assured that until some very serious misdemeanour is committed the Government will not call for the resignation of a member of any commission. As long as we have responsible and representative government in this country, responsibility rests upon the members who are elected to represent the people in Parliament, and a commission should not be beyond the reach of those so elected. I do not think it is right or fair that such power should be placed outside the control of the representatives of the people. A great deal has been said about the abuses that have crept in in connection with the distribution of patronage. While it may be true of certain constituencies where there is a great deal of patronage, in the inland counties, one of which I represent, there is little or no patronage, and I do not, as a result, hold the same views on this matter that some others do. I know that if the Civil Service Commission have the right to select some one to occupy a position in the county where I live, and some one was brought in from some outside place to fill a vacancy, the people of my constituency would be very indignant indeed, and justly so, and that is the very thing likely to occur under this Act. I received in my mail only the other morning a notice from the Civil Service Commission that applications would be received for the position of postmaster at Lethbridge, and I can imagine what the consequences would be if some one from Oxford was selected to fill that position. But this is likely to happen under present conditions. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has spoken of the influence that may be exerted on behalf of friends, and it may be that some would like to see a friend who was

not competent to fill any other place secure a position where he could be taken care of. I think there is greater danger of abuses under this Bill than under the old system. So far as the constituency I represent is concerned, I do not think I have secured the appointment of more than two from that constituency during the seven years I have been its representative, so I have no need to feel anxious about the number of appointments that would come to that constituency. In one case I recommended a very able and competent young man who had the qualifications for almost any position. He was taken on, and was later put on the permanent staff, and if ever a man was crucified that man was, and he will regret to his dying day that he ever entered the service, and I also regret ever recommending him for that position. Outside of the two I have mentioned, two others were appointed in the railway mail service, and that is the amount of the patronage that has come to the constituency of South Oxford during the last seven years, and I do not anticipate there would be much more come to it in the next six or seven years if conditions remained as they were under the old Act. So I do not speak of this measure with the feeling that it will affect me in any way if I should continue to represent that constituency.

I am speaking in this way because I feel this is an inopportune time to introduce a measure of this kind when we have coming back from overseas every day men who are maimed for life, and who will find it difficult to follow their old vocation. These men should surely be given the preference, but I cannot see within the four corners of the Bill anything to safeguard their rights in any degree. It is true that an Order in Council has been passed, but so far as the Bill itself is concerned—I have looked it over very carefully—no safeguards have been provided. On the contrary, the examinations that may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission will probably debar a great many of these men from entering the Civil Service, who under present conditions might be appointed. Why is it that to-day practically the only positions you can get for a returned soldier are caretakers of public buildings or some other menial employment of that kind? It may be that in other parts of the country returned soldiers are being given positions, but I am speaking of what is taking place in the rural districts and smaller towns and cities.

Reference has been made to the postmen of this country, who are not receiving salaries commensurate with the work they are doing. It is true an increase was granted last year, but what about the poor rural mail couriers in the country who have driven through the snowbanks all last winter and have had to pay $1.25 for oats and a similarly high price for hay for their horses? These men have to contend with a double increase in the cost of living; the cost of living both for themselves and also for their horses has gone up. In scarcely a single instance are these men being paid anything like what is being paid to the postmen in cities and towns, and there is nothing in the Bill providing for them. If this Bill should become law I trust the minister will consider the conditions under which the rural mail couriers are working and take care of them as others in the public service are being taken care of. In view of the increase in the cost of living and of everything these men have to provide, it is a disgrace that men who have taken contracts for four years, with a year or two still to run, should have to carry on at the same rate and at a loss under the abnormal conditions of to-day. The new contracts are being let for three, four and five hundred dollars more on twenty-mile routes than was granted under the old conditions, and the contracts in the cities and towns are being let for many thousands of dollare more than a few years ago. The only redress the rural mail courier has is to ask to be relieved of his contract. New tenders will then be called for, and someone else may be given the position he holds, and he may not be fit to do any other work. These men find it absolutely impossible to carry on under present conditions, and all the Government says to them is: You can resign if you can't carry on, and we will call for new tenders, and may, perhaps, appoint somebody else. But that is not the way they are looking after the people in the cities and towns; these are being taken care of and given an increase every year. Why not put the couriers on an equal footing with others in the Service who are receiving extra pay in view of the present conditions?

I say this is not the time to introduce a measure of this sort. It is not right that our returned soldiers should be prevented from occupying positions they are competent to fill simply, it may be, because they cannot spell "Bolsheviki" correctly. I say we could well afford to let this measure stand over until a more opportune time, and the same remark applies to a good deal of the legislation we have had before us this session.

The times we are living in are strenuous ones indeed, and let no one labour under the delusion that they are going to improve very soon. Let me warn the people of this country that we have not seen the worst yet. The day will come, and speedily come, I believe, when the people of this world are going to have great difficulties in getting food to maintain themselves and their families. That is the condition confronting us to-day, and it will continue to confront us until the people of this country realize that that condition cannot be improved by getting a comfortable position in the Civil Service or some other appointment at a substantial salary, but only by going out on the land and by hard labour produce something from the soil to feed the people of this country and of the world. It can only be accomplished in that way. It cannot be done by going out and telling people what they ought to do and how they ought to increase food production. We have hundreds of these people well paid going around the country doing that to-day. The people must realize that they have to go out and labour on the land in order to produce food. The present condition would have come about in any event in the course of a few years as a result of the world-wide movement from the country to the cities that existed before the war, but the war has hurried it on. A critical situation stares us in the face to-day. One side or the other of the contending forces will fail in this war as a result of the food situation. It is not going to be a victory by superior force of arms, but it is going to be a matter of laying down arms from starvation. There is no getting away from that. That sage of the West, the late J. J. Hill, some years ago made the prediction that the people of this world would be up against starvation inside of twenty years and it is unfortunate that it should arise at this critical time. I do not think this Bill ought to be put through this House at the present session. Let it remain until we see what the conditions will be at the end of another year. Let there be no obstacle placed in the way of the men who are coming back from the front being placed in the positions that are covered by this Bill.

Mr. NICKLE: Let me assure the House that it is my intention to take up only a very few minutes of its time but as this debate has become somewhat of a general experience meeting I should like to place on record one or two transactions that have recently taken place in the riding from which I come since the patronage was taken from the hands of the members and since we were advised by circular that we would no longer have a voice in the selection of those who were locally to occupy public office. These experiences will show that no matter how perfect a scheme may be in so far as its documentary form goes it will not amount to much unless the men who have to work it out are actuated by the purest of motives and are determined that the public interest shall not suffer from their administration. I do not know that there is a riding in Canada, in which in comparison to its size there are more public favours to be given, more patronage to be distributed, than in the compact little riding that I have the honour to represent. I think that probably the majority of my constituents would say that during the time of Mr. Harty, who preceded me, and in my administration of the riding, there has been a recognition at least in the great majority of the appointments, from men chosen from the political parties in power at the time, that the public service had not suffered by the appointments that were made. I do not want it inferred, however, that I am not in favour of the Bill. I favour the Bill and am prepared to give it a fair trial, because my political experience has taught me that from the point of view of a public man there is precious little to be obtained by him from what is commonly called the cohesive power of patronage. We all recognize that while the member was supposed to have the power of appointment, it was only the power of recommendation that was vested in him, because when you come to analyse the conditions that prevail, the member really only had the power of recommending. He had the power of recommending to the administrative officer of the Crown the name of a man who, in his judgment, would be a suitable person to fill a certain position. If a man was not able to do the work that was entrusted to him, the Government at all times had the right of dismissal. In connection with much of the patronage that was administered in my riding, recommendations were made to the executive officers there, they would take men on probation for a definite time, and if they were found unsatisfactory, the man responsible for the administration of the office would say: "Your selection is not suitable; the man lacks the essential qualities to win success, and I must ask him to give up the position and ask you to select and recommend another to take his place." Responsibility and power were united We had the power to make recom-

mendations, but the people held us responsible for the selection of proper men with an eye single to the public service. But, remember, all that is changed with this Bill, and we must consider it in the light of the instances to which I shall call the attention of the House. The members of this House are going to be placed in this position, that we are going to have the responsibility without the power. We, as members, are going to be held responsible for appointments made in our ridings of which we know nothing and about which we have not been consulted. It is idle to say that we have no responsibility. Under our form of government you cannot get away from responsibility. We have a responsible government. The men who occupy seats on the front benches are only a committee of this House. The positions which they occupy as members of the Cabinet they occupy only by virtue of the support that we give them. Let a substantial number, enough to command a majority in this House, transfer themselves to the other side of the House for one vote and the ministry who sit before us must resign from office and allow somebody else to take their places unless we should vote to retain them in power or they are sustained by the people. For the appointments that are going to be made the people are going to hold us responsible. I am not asking that we be consulted but what I am asking is that the ministry in carrying out this Bill shall see that a system shall not be established by which nepotism, favouritism and the power of deputy ministers be increased to such an extent as that the positions of members of Parliament shall become so dwarfed as to be a negligible quantity. The reason why I speak of deputy ministers will be apparent when I read certain correspondence that recently passed between a deputy minister and a government officer in my own riding. Less than a month ago a complaint came to me from Kingston that a certain position in the Kingston post office had been filled by the transfer from the Department of Public Works of a stenographer. A stenographer of the Public Works was transferred to the post office in Kingston. A woman who had had so far as I know, no experience whatever in post office work was sent from Ottawa to Kingston and given a position at $1,100 a year. The people said: "Why?," when the public service in Kingston did not demand any such position being filled and there was no need of an appointment being made. They held me responsible for the

economical administration of the service in the riding and they wanted me to learn why this appointment had been made. I am not very large and I got warm right straight through because you know little bodies heat up quickly and I was quite warm. I had heard nothing about the appointment when I left Kingston, but after coming here I found why and how it had been done. I hope hon. members will listen to this correspondence because it shows that dangers which I have pointed out are not imaginary but that they are real, and within a short time members will have nothing to do with appointments and a small group centralized in Ottawa will become all powerful while the members of this House will become helpless. That is why I want to read this correspondence to the House. I am going to read names and I am going to be perfectly frank in what I read. Some people are going to get hit. I am going to read the names into this debate because I want the House to realize that if we are going into Civil Service reform we must be careful lest we get instead centralized favouritism. The first letter I read stirred me up, it was a letter dated the 4th of March, 1918. It is a letter addressed to Mr. James Stewart, postmaster of Kingston, and reads thus:

Ottawa, 4th March, 1918.

James Stewart, Esq.,
Postmaster Kingston Post Office,
Kingston.

My dear Postmaster:

Up to a short time ago the Deputy Minister of Public Works, Mr. J. D. Hunter, has had serving him as secretary a gentleman of the name of Mr. Narraway. Mr. Narraway volunteered for active service and his wife, Mrs. M. B. Narraway, is employed in the Public Works Department also, and is desirous of getting a transfer to Kingston, in order that she may be near her husband who is stationed there. Mr. Hunter is very anxious to do what he can to help his secretary by obtaining a transfer to Kingston for his wife, and as a matter of courtesy to another official I would like the matter to be arranged if possible. My reason for writing is to ask when you could possibly make use of her services in the Kingston Post Office.

Mrs. Narraway is a competent stenographer and her chief gives her a most favorable report. I do not wish to overload your staff, but if you could possibly help me in this matter I should esteem it a great personal favour.

Yours very truly,

Robert Fowler,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will admit I am sympathetic to the returned soldier. I am sympathetic to the man who is anxious and willing to do something for his country, and before I decided to bring this matter before the House, I said to myself: I am

going to find out how much salary Mr. and Mrs. Narraway were getting before he undertook the responsibility of being a soldier; and I am going to see what work Mr. Narraway is doing as a soldier. I want to give the gentleman every credit. Mr. Narraway volunteered for active service. He joined the Signal Training Depot, Canadian Expeditionary Force, on the 12th of June, 1917, and when that unit left for overseas, he was transferred to No. 3 Special Service Company owing to his low category. That simply means, Sir, that Mr. Narraway was willing to undertake the responsibility of being a soldier but owing to the state of his health he could not go to the front. I will give the gentleman credit for his good intentions and will say that it was his misfortune and not his fault that he did not go overseas.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not catch the reason why you said he could not go overseas.

Mr. NICKLE: He was transferred to No. 3 Special Service Company owing to his low category. He reported for duty at Kingston, and transferred to No. 3 Special Service Company on the 28th of December last, and was detailed for office work at District Headquarters. He is now paid as a sergeant as follows: Pay per diem, $1.35; field allowance per diem, 15 cents; subsistence allowance per diem, 80 cents; making $2.30 in all per day. Mrs. Narraway is in receipt of a separation allowance of $25 per month. If you will compute those amounts, Mr. Chairman, you will observe that Mr. and Mrs. Narraway are receiving $1.139.50 per year from the Government of this country in respect of Mr. Narraway's military services. I find on inquiry from the Auditor General that prior to Mr. Narraway becoming a soldier he received $1,150 from the Public Works Department, with the result that he was short in his pay only $10.50 by virtue of the fact that he became a soldier. He is not getting his board for the reason that he was paid 80 cents subsistence allowance, but in all probability he was getting his uniform—as to that I cannot speak definitely because I do not know. On learning the fact that he was receiving $1,139.50, in lieu of $1,150, which he had previously received, I must say that my sympathies for Mr. Narraway and his peculiar financial embarrassments were not as acute as before I had made inquiry. Now if you will refer to the letter I have just read you will observe, the reason Mr. Hunter wanted the wife of Mr. Narraway transferred to Kingston was so that she could be there with her husband, but the Government would have to pay $1,050 to Mrs. Narraway for the convenience of her being near her husband when the Minister of Finance is telling us that we must have economy in the public service.

Now I want to be quite frank in my recital. I took the matter up with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who was Acting Postmaster General, and proved to my own perfect satisfaction that he knew nothing whatever about the transfer, and that it had been done behind his back. The moment he found out what had been done active steps were taken to recall Mrs. Narraway from Kingston, and within a few hours of my having put the facts before the Acting Postmaster General Mrs. Narraway was, I am glad to say, advised that Ottawa was a more congenial climate than Kingston for a woman of her temperament. Now how was the arrangement carried out? The assistant deputy minister, Mr. Fowler, told me that Mr. Narraway came to him with Mr. Hunter's card, and with a message that Mr. Hunter was anxious that Mrs. Narraway should be transferred to Kingston, and said that courtesy demanded that one deputy should pay respect to the request and recommendation of another deputy. We were not to consider the expenditure to the country that was involved, we were to consider the courtesy that one deputy owed to another. As a result Mr. Fowler wrote to the postmaster at Kingston, and let me again read the last clause of the letter:

> Mrs. Narraway is a competent stenographer, and her chief gives her a most favourable report. I do not wish to overload your staff, but if you could possibly help me in this matter I would esteem it a great personal favour.

"If you can possibly help me" from the assistant deputy minister to the postmaster at Kingston. In other words, "Do what I ask you to do, if you do not want me to remember that you did not do what I asked you to do." The Kingston postmaster is a man for whom I have regard, and upon receipt of Mr. Fowler's letter he wrote the following day this reply to that gentleman. It is dated Kingston post office, March 5, 1918:

> Robert Fowler,
>
> Assistant Deputy Minister,
>
> Dear Mr. Fowler:—
>
> I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your personal letter of the 4th instant.
>
> Some few weeks ago the department gave me two young girls, but as per my conversation with you this morning—

I will explain that in a moment or two.

Mr. George A. Macdonald has been appointed Inspector of Taxation, and he informs me that he requires a stenographer and has asked the military authorities if they can furnish him with one. I thought it better to telephone you and get the Finance Department to wire Mr. Macdonald not to engage any one until he heard from them.

Mr. Stewart knew that there was no vacancy in the Kingston post office. He knew there was a possibility that there was a stenographer required for Mr. Macdonald, who had recently been appointed Inspector of Taxation, and with an eye possibly to his own interest, and being desirous of pleasing his chief, he said to Mr. Fowler, "Get the Finance Department to get another deputy to get after Mr. Macdonald, and possibly the lady you are so anxious to please may be placed in the Finance Department if she cannot be placed in the post office." There was a danger to him, he did not want to exactly close the door in the face of a superior officer, so he closed his letter with this significant sentence:

If you do not get Mrs. Narraway placed I can find work for her here as two of my senior clerks—men of over 30 years' service—are away on sick leave, and it will be months before they return. I require two male clerks.

Very sincerely yours,

James Stewart,

Postmaster.

Now there is a little hiatus. I had a talk with Mr. Fowler; it was not altogether calm. I also had a talk with Mr. Stewart. Mr. Fowler says that Mr. Stewart called him up, about two weeks later and said, "There is a vacancy in my office, I can take Mrs. Narraway." Mr. Stewart says that no such conversation ever took place.

That was about the day she landed and a few days later I got busy. On April 16, 1918, Robert Fowler writes to James Stewart again, as follows:

James Stewart,
Postmaster,
Kingston.

Dear Mr. Stewart:

With reference to previous correspondence and previous conversation over the telephone I beg to give you the necessary authority to employ Mrs. C. A. Narraway in your office.

Mrs. Narraway is being transferred from the Public Works Department, Inside Service, to your office as a second class clerk, Grade "B", with salary at the rate of $1,100 which is her present salary. She may be paid at that rate as from the 16th instant. Please send the usual forms to this office.

Yours very truly,

Robert Fowler.

Now, I want the House to observe that while the temporary clerks in the Kingston post office are being paid at the rate of $600 a year, or thereabouts, and though I have married men working in Kingston on the temporary staff who cannot get the annual increase because they are on that staff—I have married men working there at $600, and the average highest wages paid to the most efficient stenographers in Kingston do not exceed $600 or $700 a year—here was a woman being transferred to Kingston as a stenographer, to undertake work for which she had no training, at a salary of $1,100. How are you going to have an efficient public service when men who are working for $600 find that somebody is transferred from the Inside Service to the Outside Service at a salary of $1,100, and without experience for the work at all? It is ridiculous to contend that such a thing should be done. Then I have a letter dated April 18, from Mr. Stewart to Mr. Northrup, which reads as follows:

B. M. Northrop, Esq.,
Superintendent Staff Branch,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

As per instructions received from Mr. R. Fowler, Assistant Deputy Minister, I beg to report that Mrs. M. B. Narraway, who has been transferred from the Public Works Department, Ottawa, to my office, reported for duty this morning. The usual forms have been forwarded under cover to Mr. Fowler.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

James Stewart,

Postmaster.

Then on April 25, which is the date I learned of this appointment and began my inquiry, the first man I tried to see was Mr. Clarence Jameson, a member of the Civil Service Commission, and I did not approach him in a very friendly frame of mind, because I thought he had made the appointment, and I was prepared to say some things more forcible than polite. He held up his hands and said, "I don't know anything about it; I have never heard of it; do not put the responsibility on me." Nobody could have been more kind than he. He came over to the Deputy Postmaster General with me, and I took it up with Dr. Coulter. I said: "This appointment has been made; there is no justification for it; I want to know who made it." Dr. Coulter told me that he did not know anything about it, and that he would try to find out. And being a man thoroughly zealous for the efficiency of the department, he asked for the correspondence file, which was brought in shortly, and we read it over.

What we found is what I have read. All the correspondence was there except one letter which was not on the file. Then I said to Dr. Coulter: "I want to clean this thing up.' "Very well," he said, "I am quite willing, what shall I do?" I said, "I want you to call up Mr. Stewart, the postmaster at Kingston, and ask him if he ever asked for assistance in Kingston; if Mrs. Narraway was appointed because he directed the matter to the attention of the authorities, and if he needs her there now." He called Mr. Stewart up on the long distance 'phone, and he told me that Mr. Stewart said, "I never asked for her; she was sent to me from Ottawa; I don't want her because there is nothing for her to do." Then Mr. Fowler came in, and there was an exchange of pleasantries, and they were pleasantries, but I think in the end I convinced him that Mrs. Narraway was not actually needed in Kingston. I wanted to be fair to everybody; so on April 25 I wrote to Mr. James Stewart as follows:

Re Appointment Mrs. M. B. Narraway Clerkship Kingston Post Office.

In reference to this appointment, I would appreciate certain information which perhaps can be best had by my directing your attention to certain conversation which I have had to-day.

In a talk I had with Mr. Fowler, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, he advised me that some time ago he telephoned you to know if there was a vacancy in the Kingston post office to which Mrs. Narraway could be appointed, and that he was interested in her going to Kingston as her husband was engaged in military work there. Mrs. Narraway had been engaged as a clerk in the Public Works Department. That you then advised him that you had no need of help, and that there was no vacancy; you suggested that a position might be had for her under the Inspector of the Finance Department of Income Tax. Mr. Fowler states that about a week later you communicated with him and advised him that if he had not been able to secure a position for Mrs. Narraway, that you could accommodate her in the Kingston post office,

10 a.m. as you were in need of help. On this representation from you Mrs. Narraway was sent to Kingston.

This afternoon I was in Dr. Coulter's office when he called you by long distance telephone, and he told me that in reply to his enquiries you told him—

Remember, I did not hear the conversation; I only heard it as it was repeated to me, and I made that abundantly clear to Mr. Stewart in my letter. This is what I said Dr. Coulter had told me that Mr. Stewart said:

—that you had not asked for Mrs. Narraway's appointment; that you had not made representations that you were in need of assistance; that Mrs. Narraway's appointment was made on instructions from Ottawa, and that her services were not required in Kingston.

I would appreciate an immediate reply as to the correctness of the statements that I have made, and any explanation you may have to offer as to the apparently conflicting declaration alleged to have been made by you. Immediate attention will be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

That letter was signed by me. Under date April 26, Mr. Stewart writes me as follows:

W. F. Nickle, Esq., K.C., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—

Referring to yours of the 25th instant re Mrs. M. B. Narraway—allow me to say that on the 4th March Mr. Fowler wrote to me and said that he would like to have Mrs. Narraway transferred from Ottawa to Kingston where her husband was employed. I advised him to try and secure employment for her with the Taxation Inspector. This could not be arranged. On the 13th March Miss Allen, one of the young ladies in the Reg. office, did not report for duty, and I informed Mr. Narraway when he called here that she was absent from the office and two other clerks—Mr. Wells and Mr. Darcy were also absent.

I want you to observe that although Mr. Stewart told Mr. Fowler that there was no vacancy for a woman in the office, Mr. Fowler had told Mr. Stewart that he wanted Mrs. Narraway sent to Kingston, and Mr. Narraway, so Mr. Stewart says, who was in Kingston, kept dinning it into Mr. Stewart's ears. It was obvious that Mr. Stewart was to understand that his superior officer wanted Mrs. Narraway sent to Kingston. I might say of the two employees referred to that Mr. Darcy was dead and Mr. Wells was ill. The letter goes on:

He [Mr. Narraway] must have reported this to Mr. Fowler. I had no further communication with him until this letter of the 16th reached me stating that she had been transferred to my office. The enclosed copy of the correspondence will give you all the information.

I have read this correspondence to the House.

I might add that Miss Allen's return to duty made Mrs. Narraway's services unnecessary. Mr. Fowler instructed me by a wire to have Mrs. Narraway return to Ottawa and she left on the noon train to-day.

Sincerely yours,
James Stewart,
Postmaster.

So much for the correspondence. Let me read a section of the Civil Service Act. Section 50 reads:

An exchange of positions between two officers serving in different departments, or in different divisions of the same department, and the filling of a vacancy in one department by a transfer from another division of the same department, may be authorized by the Governor in

Council to be made without examination of either officer.

2. Such exchange or transfer shall be made without increase of salary of either of the persons exchanging or transferred.

That section lays down the principle that no transfer can take place without the consent of the Governor in Council, and yet Mrs. Narraway was transferred to Kingston by the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General without any Order in Council being passed, and nobody apparently knew anything about it until I unearthed it, because nothing was said in regard to the change in her pay. And this is proved by an inquiry I made of the Auditor General. I wanted to find out in respect to what department Mrs. Narraway was drawing pay, whether the Public Works Department was paying her, or whether the thing was being done as a fraud on that department or the Post Office Department. I wrote the Auditor General in the latter part of April or early in May. Here is what Mr. Sutherland, the Assistant Auditor General, says in reply, under date of May 2:

Mrs. Narraway was paid as a clerk in the same department—

That is the Public Works Department.

—up to April 15th last. Her salary since last July was $1,050 per annum.

The Public Works Department paid the salary up to April 15, 1918, the day she left that department, but there was no record so far as the Assistant Auditor General's letter shows, in the Auditor General's Department to show that she had been transferred to Kingston. It was not until I began to stir the matter up that the attention of the Government was directed to the fact that this change had been made behind the back of the minister and practically behind the back of everybody else, because I knew nothing about it until the change had been made. Any Civil Service reform proposed by this Government should be carried out in an honest and straightforward manner. As an independent Unionist, I will stand behind them if they play the game fairly, but if they do not play the game fairly; if deputies are not restrained, I shall be quite as candid in my criticism of ministers as I am in my criticism of their deputies. I believe that the ministers are thoroughly sincere in their desire to carry out the Act, and what I say to-night is not in the nature of a threat. I know that they will appreciate the spirit in which I make these remarks. If these deputies want to advance the interests of their friends, it is not fair to the Unionist party that they should do it at the expense of the political prestige of members of this House. When I raise the point that this is an irregularity; when I say that the public service is losing $1,050 or $1,100 a year that might be saved, I am told that it is none of my business, and, in the language of a Chesterfield, I am committed to a region more celebrated for its heat than for its frigidity. I go to a minister or to a deputy, and say that I object. I am told, in all politeness: "What do you know about these things? The efficiency of the service must be maintained, and we propose to maintain it in such a way as we think best." Well, the efficiency of the service is to be maintained by transferring to the post office a woman who has been a stenographer, and who, so far as I know, has had absolutely no experience in post office work. The efficiency of the service is to be maintained by sending a woman to Kingston at a salary of $1,100 a year, a salary larger by hundreds of dollars than that of men who have worked conscientiously and well in that department for years. The efficiency of the service is to be maintained and the public cheerfulness is to be kept up by the payment of $1,100, through the intrigue of a deputy minister, in order that an officer doing clerical work in Kingston might have the privilege of having his wife by his side. I tell members of the Government that the country will not stand for this; now is the time when things of this kind should be crushed in their inception.

Examinations to determine efficiency may be all right, but I went through school and through college and I have known many men who, though standing high in examinations because of their facile pen and retentive memory, were not worth much when it came to administration. I do not think I am going beyond the mark or reflecting on the brilliant students with whom I was associated in my university days when I say that the men who have gone furthest have not been the men who got 85 and 95 per cent in their university examinations, but those who had a broad knowledge of human nature, who understood the commonplaces of life, who learned how to do things and had courage, pluck and initiative. If the Civil Service Commission gets down to the simple basis of examination and personality is forgotten, the public service will be as dead as the fungus that attaches itself to a rapidly decaying tree.

The Government served on me several months ago an Order in Council which I welcomed as I had welcomed but few documents, because it met with a principle that I desired to put into effect. This document said that in the matter of appointments preference should be given to returned soldiers, to the men who had fought for their country. Every recommendation that I made after that Order in Council came to me, and many recommendations that I made before, I gave to returned soldiers; but since I have lost the power of recommending and my control of appointments, returned soldiers have been and are being neglected, because the men who have the power have not the sympathy; efficiency counts more to them than respect for the obligation that we owe to the men who went overseas. When we stood on platforms throughout Ontario and appealed to the men to undertake the country's cause, we said to them: "Don the uniform and go to the front; if you are disabled we will pay you a pension, and whether you are injured or not we will endeavour to secure employement for you if the position that you filled before you went is gone." The ministers of this Government, in the organization of their departments, should not let efficiency blind them to the duty that they owe to the returned men. I do not say that efficiency should be overlooked. We must have efficiency; we cannot put men in positions to do work that they have not the ability to do. But before you appoint an official, before you make a temporary man permanent or before you readjust your staff—there are ministers sitting in the House who know to what I allude; I am not going further—it is fair that you should make careful inquiries to see whether returned men, particularly if disabled, are available, and to see to it, if they are available, that they are given preference over everybody else. I do not say this in any jingoistic spirit, or with any desire to make myself solid, so to speak, with the returned soldiers. I am appealing on what I think are sound national grounds; I am trying to enunciate what I believe to be the sentiments of the great masses of the people.

I wish to take up the question of Civil Service pay to the men who went overseas and to say a word or two with regard to that Order in Council to which the attention of the House was so forcibly directed to-night by the member for London (Mr. Cronyn). When the German troops went through Belgium, a certain German chancellor said of the treaty guaranteeing Belgium's rights: "It is only a scrap of paper; it is something that is not to be respected." That statement of international morals shocked the world and was the foundation of the dislike—shall I say, the hate?—that has arisen in the hearts of neutral nations against Germany. What is this Government doing if it cancels the Order in Council under which agreement was made with the men who went overseas that their Civil Service salaries should be continued? This Government should consider carefully the entire question of the position of members of the Civil Service who have gone overseas. If a man who formerly was a member of the Service has gone overseas and would fall within the class of men who would be called out under the present Orders in Council—that is unmarried men within the ages specified—it does not seem unreasonable that his pay should stop, because the Government would have the right to recall him to Canada and he would automatically then become liable to military service and would have to take the military pay that goes to his rank. But when married men, or men not within the classes now called, voluntarily enlisted for overseas service, many of them laying aside substantial salaries and taking positions of great inferiority in the army, it is a great injustice to them—particularly to the married men—that the Government should cut off their pay and make their wives and children do work which they never did before. The other evening I had a talk with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in regard to this matter, and I want to do myself the honour of believing he was very favourably impressed with what I had to say. Speaking as I do to-night, I want to raise this point, hoping the members of this House will express sentiments similar to those which I have expressed, and will make the Prime Minister understand that we, the representatives of the people, believe that the national compact must be carried out, and that if anything is done with reference to a reduction of pay it will be only with regard to those men who come within the classes called out and that the others should get the pay we agreed to give them. Anything else would be radically unfair and unjust; it would be a blot on the national escutcheon, and I do not believe the Canadian people want it said that they have broken faith with the men who have gone to the front on representations made by the late Government.

The points I want to emphasize are these, and I want to say them very quickly: I

believe, if the Civil Service Act is going to be made a success, in the first place the principle must be recognized that local appointments must be first given to those in the locality, provided they have the ability to do the work. My second principle is this, that preference must be given to the returned soldier particularly if he is disabled, and that before appointments are made careful, honest inquiry must be had to see if returned soldiers are available. My third principle is this, that too much attention must not be paid to mere academic qualifications, but that the question of personality, of individuality, of administrative force, must be considered; because I say it to-night, in all seriousness to the Government, in all kindness to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who has many appointments to make in Kingston, that if he appoints as guards or instructors or keepers in the Kingston penitentiary men who have only academic qualifications as a merit, without regard to their physical qualities and without regard to their high sense of truth and honesty, he will soon find a system of trafficking has entered his institution which will destroy it. I do not know how the Civil Service Commission intend to work out this legislation. I do not know from what source they are going to get their information. I am not anxious that they should consult me. I say frankly that, if they consult me and if the people know the responsiblity is on me for recommendations and an expression of opinion, then the Civil Service Commission should act on the representations I make to them; and if they are not prepared to act on my representations, then I do not want them to ask me for recommendations. If the responsibility for the recommendations is going to be given to me, then they must give me the privilege of having it known amongst my people that if I have the responsibility the recommendations that I make are followed, and that I am not going to be held responsible for positions which are filled, in regard to which I have nothing whatever to say.

As I began in saying that the administrative officers of the Crown in Ottawa will, without doubt, be influenced in making appointments to make selections from those with whom they have a sympathy, I sincerely trust that what I have put on record to-night in this House will be seriously considered by the Government. I put it on record because I want some specific instance to show that the dread expressed by the gentlemen who sit around me is not a mere chimerical fear, but an actual one at this particular time, that the system that we on the outside dread is beginning to get established, and if something is not done soon, Civil Service improvement will, in my judgment, become disrupted; the people will become disgusted with the Civil Service Act, and those of us who would like to see the public service elevated and improved, are going to see the whole thing brought into public indifference, if not into contempt.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I shall speak for just a minute, because the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has taken up fifty per cent of the time that I intended to occupy on this question. From what I have listened to this evening, it is clear to me that hon. members are feeling somewhat sorry that the patronage system is passing out of existence. We are absolutely losing the point of view of the Bill which is now before the House. The principle underlying the Bill is this: In the past we have had so many people seeking to get something in a manner other than the rightful manner; instead of making efficiency the qualification for a position the erroneous principle of party adherence has been a dominant qualification, and as you had more party adherents than you had positions, the cries of those who had been denied the spoils became much louder than the shouts of exultation on the part of those who had secured positions.

The Bill which is to-day presented for our consideration is one which commends itself to every right-thinking person who wants to get away from the principle of dispensing patronage on account of the fact that you are elected a member of Parliament. All hon. members will remember the statement made in the House by Sir Clifford Sifton, whose speech on the need of Civil Service reform swept away the last vestige of Liberal opposition to the principle. Amongst other things he said this:

> The present system is a source of great trouble to all, involving, as it does, the constant harassing of members by their supporters for something which it was impossible to make go round all.

Many cases similar to that which has been cited this evening by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) could be cited by hon. members. You are very lucky to have a Minister of Justice this evening, for something took place in his department that I did not like. But for a solitary case which may not be to the advantage of the constituency that I represent I do not pro-

pose to condemn the whole Bill. If the cases multiply themselves to the extent that I see that there is not honesty nor sincerity in the Government in its endeavour to remove the evils that patronage brings, I hope I shall not lose my voice, but, like the hon. member for Kingston, let me tell you, Sir, some Scotchmen can rise to a pitch of heat. It is in the power of the members of this House to take this Bill and to make of it what they like by refusing to pass clause after clause. There is in the Bill a provision dealing with returned soldiers. If it is not in accordance with the wish of the members of this House, it is within our power to say that we will not pass it as it stands, and that we will have it passed in a certain form. I do not see why we should not pass from clause to clause and make this Bill applicable as soon as possible. There is on the part of some hon. members a desire to maintain in their control the patronage which they had in the past. I am opposed to that principle, and I shall be pleased to support the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Government introduced this Bill in response to what I thought was an almost unanimous request of the country, and when they find such criticism as has been indulged in to-night, not by the two previous speakers, but by others, they must think of the old couplet:

> You shall and you shan't, you will and you won't;
> You'll be damned if you do, you'll be damned if you don't.

We give the Government credit for endeavouring honestly and effectively to deal with this patronage question. It is perfectly true that almost any hon. member could pick the Bill to pieces if he chose, but what we want is something along constructive lines. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) referred to the deliverances of Sir Clifford Sifton on the question of patronage. He was undoubtedly a man with very great political experience and in a position to speak with authority. Sir Clifford told the country in a public address that the patronage system was a curse, and I think every hon. member, if talked to some months ago, would have agreed that it was a curse, and there went up a shout of approval throughout the country when ministers of the Union Government announced that an end was to be put to the patronage system. Now the minister has brought down a Bill. It is true that almost anybody could pick holes in it, but let him who is disposed to pull the Bill to pieces tell the Government what he would do under the circumstances. I have not observed any hon. member who has risen in his place to denounce the Bill offer a valuable suggestion. We all agree that patronage has been a great curse in the past. The Government is making an honest endeavour to meet the question and deal with it fairly and effectively. We have had public deliverances of the able Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) on this question. Pledges have been made to the country that patronage would be abolished, and the Government is endeavouring to do it. Let us join then with the Government in at least making the experiment. No matter what we do, I do not think we could possibly have a worse system than has prevailed in the past years, and I would appeal to hon. members at least to give the Government credit for the earnest efforts it is making, and let us deal with the Bill clause by clause and pass it. Let us make the experiment, and then I believe we shall all find that a great reform has been accomplished. I am not afraid to take the responsibility. I do not believe that all these deputy ministers are fiends incarnate. I do not believe they are going to conspire in order to "do" the people. I am sure when we listened to the petty intrigue that was displayed in the case of the deputy minister cited by the hon. member for Kingston, there must have come to the mind of every hon. member the conviction that that man at least should be dismissed from office. Public opinion is such that no deputy minister and no set of deputy ministers will dare defy it; they are amenable to public opinion. I do not fear the results of the administration of patronage by the Civil Service Commission. We have at its head Hon. Dr. Roche, a man whom I have known personally for thirty-five years, a man of the highest probity, of the finest integrity, and of spotless public reputation. I believe that as head of the Civil Service Commission he will endeavour to administer this Act in the interest of the people. Let us trust him. As a representative of a constituency, I am not afraid of having the inspector of the district in which my riding is located come out and find the best man for any particular office. He may make a mistake. Perhaps I might make a mistake if I exercised the patronage. I shall be glad to assist him if he asks my advice in any matter. I believe if we give this commission our hearty support and our confidence we shall find we have accomplished a very much greater reform in the country than we have ever dreamed of.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): I have been surprised at the diverse views expressed on this measure in committee to-day. I thought hon. members were unanimously in favour of appointments of the Civil Service being taken out of their hands and put in the hands of an independent commission. I have had very little experience with patronage, but the knowledge I have had leads me to say that I do not want anything to do with it. Another thing I should like to see in our Government service in every department inside and outside is business administration. Under the patronage system we do not get business administration. Why should we not have the same principles adopted in our departments of Government that the Canadian Pacific adopts in its departments, or that the banks adopt throughout the length and breadth of Canada? When we have such a system in vogue we shall have efficient administration, and men who go into the Government service will realize that efficiency will win recognition and promotion. Under the patronage system that certainly does not exist, for a man may be in the service for twenty or twenty-five years and give the best of satisfaction to the community where he is serving the Government, and some person may come along at that period and chop off his head because he does not like him. You cannot have efficiency in any department of government under a system of that kind. This Bill may be full of faults; the patronage system is certainly full of more faults. I am prepared to trust this Bill for the present, and when we find the faults we can remedy them, until we get a measure that will provide for efficient service in the departments of Government throughout this Dominion.

There is another point I should like to emphasize. I am an advocate of economy in the public service. At the same time I do not believe that we treat the efficient officials in the service of the country as we should treat them. I know of two instances in my own city where young women who had been in the post office some years and had gained good experience, so that they were probably the best clerks in the office, have recently taken positions in banks in Lethbridge at a considerable increase in salary. If these young women were valuable to a bank they were equally valuable to the Post Office Department, and they should have been treated as valuable clerks in the service.

Mention has been made of the payment of certain grades of the service, particularly the letter carriers. I agree that those men should be given better treatment than they have received in the past. The cost of living is advancing all the time, but the salaries of these men and of other men in different departments of the public service are not advancing proportionately, and as a result the Government is losing the services of some of its best men, because they are attracted to other positions that offer better salaries. I should like to see the Government service put on a business basis, and men paid a salary and promoted according to their merits, and if this Bill will provide such a system I believe the people of Canada will strongly favour this Government for having introduced it and, I hope, for having passed it at this session.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON: After the prolonged discussion we have had on the principle of this Bill one almost hesitates to interject another remark. But I feel I should be unfair to myself and to my constituents were I to remain silent in the face of the criticism that has been levelled against the principle of the measure. As I listened to the expressions of opinion from a number of hon. gentlemen who took part in the early discussion of this Bill, the thought came to me what a study in psychology hon. gentlemen presented. I have taken some little interest in politics during the whole of my life and I do not think I have yet heard a member of Parliament on the public platform, particularly if he was berating the party in power, who did not curse the patronage system. That has been the theme ever since I first knew anything about politics. How are we going to get rid of the patronage system unless we make an honest effort? If the details are not right, as the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) and preceding speakers have said, we should go through it clause by clause and make them right. If we find when we come back here after a year that there are some things which we should amend we can then make the changes which are necessary. The whole argument of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) as to what took place in the Kingston post office seems to be a justification of this Bill. If the hon. member for Kingston had been a little more human, if he had had those weaknesses that are applicable to most of us, if he had had the disposal of the patronage in Kingston and if the deputy postmaster general had presented the case to him as he did to the postmaster in Kingston, in all probability the same action would have been taken and we would not

have had the hon. member for Kingston to check up what had been done. Every member of this House will have in his own hands not only the right but the power to see what is being done. If the deputy minister of any department makes an appointment in my constituency I shall consider it my duty to find out all about it. If the members of this House are doing their duty as the representatives of their constituencies they will see to it that the appointments are as they should be and that an efficient service is given. One word with regard to the suggestion offered by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan). I agree heartily with what he says that if we are going to get an efficient civil service reform we must put it on a business basis and get it nearer to what is being done by private companies. Instead of saying that deputy ministers are as we have had them represented to-night I would say: Place the deputy minister in charge of the department, hold him responsible for the efficiency of the organization of the department and leave the whole thing in his hands. If the Canadian Pacific railway appoints a general superintendent they will not say to him that he cannot dismiss a man if he is inefficient.

Mr. BEST: Would you ask the Government to dismiss a deputy minister if it is proven that he has done wrong?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I have not the slightest doubt that the Government will deal with the deputy ministers if they have done wrong. If they do not the members of the House can deal with them. I am not going to put any question to the Government with regard to what they may do about the case raised by the hon. member for Kingston, that is a matter between the Government and the hon. member. Both of the political parties have been clamouring for years for Civil Service reform and the abolition of patronage. Patronage has been recognized as the curse of the Civil Service, and when we are asked to take one step in the direction of getting rid of it let us respond by passing this Bill.

Mr. SHEARD: I want to say a word in support of this Bill. Representing a city where we have been administering patronage for a long while, I want to say that if there is anything in my judgment that contributes to a lack of efficiency in the public service it is the administration of patronage as in the past. Hon. members have spoken in this House about their influence in reference to patronage. I have had to do in an indirect way with, or have seen administered, the patronage system of Toronto pretty well in all the ridings, and I do not believe there is a single member from the city of Toronto who has had the slightest voice in the distribution of the patronage there. It is left to the various ward associations, and the member of Parliament is almost invariably constrained to support their recommendations. Sometimes he experiences considerable difficulty because there are men pulling one way and the other and he has to do the best he can in the dilemma. I heartily commend the Bill to the House. We should be glad to get rid of the patronage question, which I contend this proposed Bill will do most effectively if it is thoroughly and properly lived up to. It is just like anything else in that proper methods must be adopted in carrying it out. You can talk about the administration of the Canadian Pacific railway or any other business organization, but to have efficiency you must have good men and hold them responsible. You must have first class men in charge of the various branches of the Government and hold these men responsible for the administration if the proper results are to be forthcoming. If you have inefficient men administering the Act, I do not care what its provisions may be, the whole thing will fall down. It is up to the Government to see to it that the deputies are thoroughly qualified to administer their departments, and if this is done we will get the service that the country demands and expects. I realize quite fully, as has been illustrated upon the floor of this House to-night by the case cited by the hon. member for Kingston, that there is danger. If this matter does not receive the close scrutiny of the various members of the Government there may be developed in the city of Ottawa a bureaucratic officialdom which will be twenty times worse than the patronage system, bad as it is. We have had an illustration in the question asked by the hon. ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), in reference to the Auditor-General, in reply to which there is on record on the Hansard of this House the statement that six or seven members of the Auditor General's own family have been provided for at comparatively lucrative salaries. An hon. gentleman stated that he was a Scotchman. I do not want to reflect on some of my hon. friends opposite, but somebody has defined the Scotchman as a man who kept the Sabbath and everything else he could lay his hands on. This

gentleman, being a Scotchman, and true to his principles, seems to be tenaciously holding on to everything he can, and he seems to have a sort of family compact under his own roof. I have no hesitation in saying, irrespective of what his nationality may be, that he is utterly unfitted for the public service if that is his idea of the proper administration and enforcement of the law in any department of the Government.

With reference to the question raised by the hon. member for Kingston, if the facts are as stated, I unhesitatingly say that it is the duty of the Government to dispense with that man's services without any further delay. We want the ministers to understand that they must instruct their departments to carry on the public service in such a way as to produce efficiency, and if they do they will be supported by the country and by the members of this House.

While I say that I want to add that there are some branches of the public service that are suffering. Reference has been made to the services of the postmen. The postmen are scandalously underpaid in the city of Toronto. You have postmen who have been working in the city of Toronto for ten or fifteen years receiving $700 a year and trying to live and pay the high rents of that city, something which is an absolute impossibility; you cannot do it in the large centres. The postmen should be well paid—every one working for the Government ought to be well paid. If a man is efficient he ought to be promoted and he should know that from the time he enters the public service, and as long as he discharges the duties of his office faithfully, the country will appreciate and promote him and he will eventually receive the highest position available in the work in which he is engaged.

If you are going to put over his head people coming from outside, you will be doing something that will not contribute to the efficiency of the service, and I think that in this Bill the Civil Service Commission should be instructed to consider the appointment of local men to local positions as far as possible. There are cases where that is not possible, but if it is at all possible regard should be paid to that policy.

Now, with reference to the question of examinations. I have been conducting examinations of students for over thirty years, and I desire to say in reference to examinations in medicine, as illustrated in the colleges of this country, that if I wanted a man who was most impractical, the most inefficient, as a rule, for practical work, I would take a student who had confined himself to preparing to pass an examination, and I would probably get the most impractical man I could possibly get for a practical job. I would twenty times rather have a man who had good common horse sense, integrity and alertness, and an eye which was pretty keen and cunning, and give that man charge of a department. In scholastic attainments—in reading, writing and arithmetic—he might be lacking and might probably not be able to do a single sum in quadratic equations or algebra, but he would make a mighty efficient, good public servant, and I think every corporation in the Dominion will bear me out when I give such testimony on the floor of this House.

Mr. CROTHERS: What kind of an examination would you subject him to?

Mr. SHEARD: I would first take into consideration what work he had been engaged in. If a shorthand writer who had been in that work for five or six years as an ordinary stenographer wanted to take charge of the post office in the city of Toronto I would undertake to say the chances are that she would be an entire and utter failure. I would govern myself by all the circumstances, I would form my opinion to some extent on the past history of the applicant, his or her experience, and the work that he or she had done, and the efficiency displayed in the particular branch in which the party had been engaged. If I were to undertake to give an opinion on a lawsuit, for instance, as to the grounds for submitting a case to the Court of Appeal, I would probably make a fool of myself, and I have not the slightest doubt that if a lawyer who undertook to give an opinion upon a complex medical case the same thing might be said. We must have regard for the work, vocation, and life experience of the applicant, unless we are going to start them in the public service from the lowest position up, and if you want an experienced and efficient man in that way surely you have got to give him some guarantee of continuity of service, to support him in his promotions, and to vouchsafe that recognition which ought to always follow efficient service.

A word now in reference to the returned soldier. I hope the country will not go back upon its pledges to our men who have gone overseas. I am not at all concerned with any fear that the boys who have

fought and sacrificed in France and Flanders are going to be unloaded on the country on their return to the Dominion. To the extent of the country's ability and power I hope these men will be recognized, and I hope that the Civil Service Commission, who will be charged specifically with the duty, will see that every returned man, whether his sleeve be empty or full, will receive any available position he is qualified to fill, and that no examinations will be allowed to stand in the way of his receiving it. That is what the people of this country, if I understand their wishes, desire. They mean to keep faith with the returned soldiers, and they ought to keep faith with them. I venture the prediction that no Government could long stand that dares to break a single pledge which it has made with the boys who have gone overseas to fight for liberty and the preservation of our homes. For that reason I submit that the first claim upon the Government, the first claim for consideration upon the members of this House, the first claim upon any commission, over and above every other test and every other consideration, is the claim of the returned soldier, and if his qualifications are in any degree commensurate with the requirements of the place for which a man is needed, the returned soldier should have the job.

I want to close with a word of commendation with respect to the Bill in general, and to congratulate the Government for bringing down even a tentative measure which will, in a sense, do away with this farce of patronage. For it is a farce, the placing of men in the public service who are utterly disqualified for any such duties. In the past we have got about the worst class of men for the job, speaking generally, and if this Bill will work the slightest improvement, if it will improve the service in the slightest degree, I say let us give the Bill a trial; let us give it our hearty support; let us give the Government an opportunity to carry out its pledge in this regard. For my part, I will be very glad to assist the Government to the utmost of my ability in strengthening the hand of the departments, in establishing the principle that the minister at the head of a department shall run it absolutely and entirely, and that the deputy under him shall be responsible to him. If we do this I say, in all confidence, that we shall then get a degree of efficiency in the public service that up to now this country has never known.

Mr. PARDEE: Much has been already said, and practically very little remains to be said on the subject of this Bill. Doubtless, as we consider the measure clause by clause, we shall find many provisions that are not workable. But there can be no doubt about the fact that there has been a demand throughout the country for many years that patronage should be abolished and some measure of Civil Service reform brought about. That was a pledge that was given to the country, and something to which I personally pledged myself. I have always been desirous of Civil Service reform, and am equally strongly in its favour to-day. The Bill may not be perfect, there are undoubtedly some provisions that are imperfect; but we owe it to the country, whether this Bill be perfect or imperfect, that a start shall be made in the way of abolishing patronage and introducing Civil Service reform.

We have heard from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) to-night the statement that he could look through the window of a departmental office and see from twenty to thirty clerks, not one-third of whom would be working. To my mind that is one of the principal objections to the present system of patronage, which simply means this: That the member, and the Government through the member, is very often overwhelmed with applications to appoint this man or that man to office because his financial position is not such that he can continue to keep himself. As a consequence what happens? From goodness of heart, from motives of humanity—and very often, and very largely, through political considerations—men are put into departments of the service who are no more needed than the fifth wheel of a coach. I venture to make the prediction that if a proper Civil Service Bill is finally enacted by the House—not perhaps this session, but with amendments next session, and amendments the session after that, if necessary—a saving can be effected in the civil list of this country of from thirty to forty per cent. If you take the cost of the whole Civil Service of the country as it stands to-day, and our overhead charges generally, they run into figures that are absolutely astonishing. Hon. members owe it to the country to aid in curtailing expenditure in every way they possibly can in order to meet the great needs of Canada both now and in the time to come.

Therefore, I say again that although there are some provisions in this Bill that I do not agree with at all, we will have an op-

portunity to discuss these when the Bill is taken up clause by clause. Too much power is placed in the hands of the deputy minister, because although it is said that the commission finally has the appointment, yet, mark you, Sir, the appointment is made through the recommendation of the deputy minister, which leaves in the deputy's hands very great power. I do not believe, so far as I can see at the present time, that the method of taking a person from Toronto and transferring him to Windsor or Sarnia or somewhere else is practicable. It appears to me there are just as good brains in Toronto as in Ottawa, and vice versa—just as good brains in one part of Canada as in another part. Under the proposed system of competitive examinations there will be a waiting list, and the Bill should empower the commission to see to it that appointments to local offices shall be made from successful candidates in the locality where the office is to be filled. To my mind, that is the only way to work it out. I shall not discuss the sections farther until the Bill is taken up clause by clause. I heartily agree with all that has been said regarding the returned soldier. I want to refer to the circular mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston. We were all told that the department sent out a notice, very properly to my mind, that the returned soldier when competent should be appointed to any vacancy occurring in the Civil Service. In some way, Sir, that has yet to be worked out. We have no right, nor should we have a right, to break in any way the implied contract made with these men who are deserving of it. These remarks, I know, do not touch the very essence of the Bill, but to my mind that is something that the Government ought, and must make an effort, to do, and in doing which it will be commended by the members of this House and by the country generally.

Mr. MORPHY: I support the principle of the Bill. Personally, I have not been troubled with patronage in my riding, and I cannot fall in line with the gentlemen who have spoken of the tribulations coming through it. I want to make a plea that may come before the members of the commission and the Government to deal with the under dog in the matter of salaries. Take the letter carriers in the cities, the rural mail delivery men, and the collectors of letters, and all the inferior services, where men are working for 312 days in all kinds of weather throughout the country at the munificient salary of about

[Mr. Pardee.]

$700 a year, many of them with a wife and four or five children. It is about time that the country awakened to the great disparity in pay and salaries between the officials I see about Ottawa, who are ensconced in their lovely offices supplied with all modern conveniences, and the men in the country who have to plod wearily through wet and snow and heat and cold doing the drudgery work of the country on a mere pittance of $700 or $800 a year. I hope the Civil Service Commission which, to my mind, is composed of a splendid body of men—men of careful habits, kindly disposition coupled with, I think the necessary firmness to do a splendid duty—will

11 p.m.

take note of the remarks that have been made by many members not only as to the returned soldier but as to those other branches of the service which are so badly underpaid. I would like the minister to take note of the branch I have referred to and go over the whole range of it and see if a better scale cannot be brought forward so that the country will not be held up to opprobrium and shame for the way they are treating what may be called the "inferior" service though their service is extremely valuable. I agree with the remarks made and the points raised by the hon. member for Kingston, which seem to show the necessity for this Bill. Such grave irregularities could not have happened under the Civil Service Commission's administration; no deputy would have dared to do what was done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He would not have the power to do so under the proposed law.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like to ask the minister if the system is going somewhat to pieces because the Postmaster General, Mr. Blondin, is not at home. If he had been at home, does the minister believe that any deputy would have dared to do what was done? "When the cat's away the mice will play." Why is the Postmaster General not here? Why is his position not filled? There are plenty of Liberal-Unionist members on this side of the House; there is lots of room for them in that place. I think it is a public scandal that the position is not filled to-day. Who is it being kept open for? I think that is a matter that had better be attended to, so that the Government shall be complete. I also wish to argue the same point with regard to the deputies. It is all right to say that the Civil Service Commission have the power; they have not the power. Humanly speaking they cannot have the power to override the deputy. The Civil Service Com-

mission is a tribunal with mixed powers. There is a quality of power. When the clause comes up, I propose, if I can, to shift the responsibilities and the privileges that are being given to and imposed upon the deputies to the ministers themselves. I think the ministers should take the responsibility of recommendations to the Civil Service Commission. You may tell me: "Oh, the minister doesn't know." Well, he has to know, and, to my mind, he has his deputy, and the deputy will know, and he will tell the minister. If we are going to have an up-to-date, efficient reform in the Civil Service there must be ministerial responsibility and not deputy-ministerial responsibility, and I propose to argue as strongly as I can that the minister, not the deputy, shall take the power and bear the responsibility. As to the commission itself, I heartily approve of it. It is about time that efficient administration in the public servce is brought about, and I believe the Government are on the right track. They have a good personnel in the commission. There is no mention in the Bill as to what the secretary of the commission shall be paid. There is provision for the salaries of the commissioners—

Sir SAM HUGHES: It should be increased.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member says it should be increased. As a corollary to my argument about the under dog, I would like to put on record what I find to be the salaries paid to some of the deputies. The Paymaster General, Militia, gets $6,000, and the Accountant General, $6,000. Other salaries are as follows:

Commissioner of Commerce, $6,000.
Railways: General Consulting Engineer, $6,000.
Chief Engineer, Western Division, $6,000.
Military Hospitals Commission, Director General, $6,000; Under Secretary, $5,000.

I have never heard who the Under-secretary of the Military Hospitals Commission is, but he gets a pretty fair salary.

Deputy Fuel Controller, $6,000
Chief Commissioner, Railway Commission, $12,500; Assistant Chief Commissioner, $9,000; Deputy Commissioner, $8,000; two Commissioners, each $8,000.
International Waterways Commissioners, each $7,500.

What have these commissioners been doing for the last two or three years? Have they had sittings? Have they made a report? This commission, I understand is in idleness, and the country is paying them this money. This list proceeds:

Secretary, War Board, $6,000.
Cost of Living Commissioner, $7,000.
Chairman, Scientific and Industrial Research Commission, $10,000.
Assistant to Minister of Railways, $5,000.
Chief Engineer, $5,000.
Law Clerk, $5,000.
Chief Architect, Public Works, $5,000.

No building is going on; everything is tied down in the Public Works Department, but the salaries are kept going.

Chairman of Food Board, $7,000.

A very important position; the Department of Food Control is one of the biggest departments we have.

Pension Commissioners, each $5,000.

Several others are also paid $5,000 a year. Meanwhile rural mail carriers get $450 a year for travelling twenty miles a day, winter and summer, wet or dry, in heat or in cold. Postmen who trudge through the streets of cities, most of them married men with large families, get $2.75 or $3 a day. These are the under dogs. I have given only the fringe of the long list which I have before me. It is a public scandal and a shame if the Civil Service Commission and the Government cannot get together and do something to give these men better remuneration, allowing those who receive the larger salaries which I have mentioned a reasonable competence to live upon. With regard to the returned soldier, I agree that the examinations should not be too hard. I have confidence in the personnel of the Civil Service Commission; I believe that they will do the fair thing for the returned soldier. It is unfair to say in advance that they will set trick questions; I have too high a regard for the men who constitute the Commission at present to believe that. They are men of methodical habits and kindliness of disposition; they have the best interests of the country at heart. The returned soldier will find in the Civil Service Commission a friend at court who will give them a fair show and do all they can for them consistent with their fitness for any positions for which they are applicants. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill and in commending the principle of it and I hope that we shall be able to get its various clauses in such shape that the country's interests may be served and the Service benefited.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This afternoon I requested one of the members of the Civil Service Commission to prepare a statement showing, as far as was possible in the short time given him, what work had been done

by the Commission since the passage of the Order in Council on the 13th of February, and the manner in which that work was done. I have that statement under my hand, but before reading certain portions of it I want to say a word or two with reference to the principle of the Bill. I believe strongly in the principle of this Bill and trust that the House will accept it practically as it has been presented. Members of Parliament should, I think, more than any other class of the people, support any legislation which has in view the elimination of patronage. It is not fair to members of Parliament or to the country that the representatives of the people should waste their time over matters of patronage as they have in years gone by. Public servants are selected to perform a service to the State, therefore the State should select them in the manner which seems best and which will produce the greatest efficiency. The member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) expresses the view that this is an inopportune time to introduce a reform of this character. On the contrary, I believe that this Bill is introduced at an opportune moment. It is the first time in the history of our country that such legislation has been possible, and when this Parliament expires, having passed this Bill, it will have rendered a greater service to Canada than any Parliament that has existed since Confederation. Not only is it desirable politically that this Bill should be enacted; it is an economic necessity at this period in our history. Greater efficiency in the public service will result, and the public business will be disposed of much more economically than it has been in the past. The case to which the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) referred is a very regrettable one indeed, but under the patronage system that same thing has happened every week of the year. Under the present Bill that could not possibly happen. The section of the present Civil Service Act to which the member for Kingston referred was not applicable to the case at all; nothing in the present Civil Service Act would prevent the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General from doing what he did—at least, that is my reading of the Act. Nevertheless, I thank the member for Kingston for bringing the facts of this case to the notice of the committee; he has simply performed his duty in doing so, and his action cannot fail to have a salutary effect.

There is a misapprehension, I fear, in the minds of some hon. gentlemen as to the scope of this measure. It is not intended that all appointments to the service shall be by competitive examination. Section 41 says:

> Except as herein otherwise provided, and except in the case of deputy heads, appointments to positions in the public service shall be by competitive examination which shall be of such a nature as will determine the qualifications of candidates for the particular positions to which they are to be appointed, and shall be held by the Commission in accordance with regulations to be made by the Commission and approved by the Governor in Council.
>
> Provided, however, that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to positions in connection with the Government railways or any railway owned or controlled by His Majesty, or to any position on any ship of His Majesty until the Governor in Council otherwise directs, and the Governor in Council shall have power to make this Act apply in whole or in part to any of the said positions. Provided, also, that in any case where the Commission decides that it is not practicable to apply this Act to any position or positions, the Commission, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may make such regulations as are deemed advisable, prescribing how such position or positions are to be dealt with.

There must inevitably be a great number of appointments made to the Civil Service under the regulations provided for by this section, particularly as regards the class of employment which was referred to by an hon. gentleman a short time ago.

Mr. BUREAU: Who has the appointing power under this Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Under what section is that provided for?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Subsection 3 of section 42. The hon. member (Mr. Morphy) seemed to be under the impression that deputy ministers recommended all appointments to the commission. That is not correct. Any department requiring the appointment of an officer makes a request to the commission for an appointment, and the commission proceeds to make the selection and appointment.

Mr. BUREAU: Subsection 3 of section 42 reads:

> From the list of successful competitors the Commission, on the application of the deputy head, shall supply the required officers, clerks and employees.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is on the application of the deputy head.

Mr. BUREAU: The deputy heads do not appoint them?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That means that the deputy head informs the commission

that there is a vacancy to be filled or that a new office is to be created. The commission makes the appointment. The deputy head does not even make a recommendation. There is, however, one exception to that general statement. Section 16 provides that:

> In any case where, in the opinion of the Commission, the knowledge and ability requisite for any position in the public service are wholly or in part professional or technical, the Commission, on the recommendation of the deputy head, may appoint a person to such position without reference to the age limit.

It is only, therefore, when persons having professional or technical knowledge are to be appointed that the deputy head is permitted to make a recommendation. In all other cases the appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission, and the deputy heads have no power of recommendation whatever.

The statement which I desire to read to the committee will indicate the policy now pursued by the commission in carrying out the Order in Council.

No permanent appointments have yet been made in the Outside Service by the Civil Service Commission, except in the case of rural postmasters. Temporary appointments only have been made by the Civil Service Commission since the Order in Council of the 13th of February, 1918. Altogether, since the passage of the Order in Council, 465 permanent appointments and 2,409 temporary appointments have been made. The document from which I am reading will explain why so many temporary appointments have been made. It may be of interest to the committee for me to read the names of the departments in which permanent appointments have been made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: How long will a temporary appointment last?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It will last only until there is available a list of qualified persons, and that list should be available very shortly, because examinations will soon be held at many points in Canada.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: There is no specified time limit for a temporary appointment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, and the temporary appointments have all been made on the express understanding that they are but temporary, and the incumbents of the office so understand it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Supposing there are no applicants, as will be the case in some instances, what will happen?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot understand that ever happening.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have known instances of that kind where it was necessary to go after someone to take the position.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Commission will have to meet that difficulty when it arises. This is a statement of the permanent and temporary appointments made by the Civil Cervice Commission since February 13, 1918:

Departments.	Permanent employment.	Temporary employment.
Agriculture	3	81
Auditor General	1	—
Canada Food Board	—	49
Canada Registration Board	—	11
Civil Service Commission	3	7
Customs	1	10
External Affairs	—	2
Finance	—	390
House of Commons	1	—
Indian Affairs	1	5
Inland Revenue	1	1
Interior	4	282
Justice	1	1
Labour	1	2
Library of Parliament	1	4
Marine	—	15
Militia and Defence	1	161
Mines	4	5
Naval Service	—	76
Post Office	439	938
Privy Council	2	13
Public Works	—	125
Railways and Canals	—	18
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	—	93
Soldiers' Settlement Board	—	8
Trade and Commerce	1	42
War Purchasing Commission	—	21
War Trade Board	—	49
	465	2,409

Mr. DEVLIN: Who made all the other appointments under the Canada Food Board?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They were made before the passage of the Order in Council, and I think they were probably made under Orders in Council on the recommendation of the Canada Food Board.

Mr. DEVLIN: After the passage of this Bill, by whom will such appointments be made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will they be brought into the inside service by this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, they do not become a part of the Civil Service, but all appointments to the war commissions are to be made hereafter by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DEVLIN: The outside service is not brought into the inside service by this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The distinction between the outside service and the inside service still remains, but appointment by competitive examination and promotion by merit are now being made applicable to the outside service whereas they are now applicable only to the inside service.

Mr. DEVLIN: Under this legislation?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: What about section 55?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall refer to that later.

Mr. FIELDING: Have these appointments been made after examination?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The persons appointed permanently must have been qualified. The temporary appointments are made because there is not available a list of persons qualified for permanent appointments. Hereafter, examinations will be made at any point in Canada upon request of five candidates.

Mr. BUREAU: What was the test in these examinations?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I really cannot say. Probably a number of these who were appointed, took the examination some time ago. The following statement explains the procedure in making appointments:

The method of selection of such temporary employees has been,—

(a) From the application on file with the Civil Service Commisson in the order of seniority of aplications where necessary qualifications were met;

(b) Recommendation from the Deputy Head of a department of a suitable person;

(c) Selection on the ground by the responsible officer of the department when thereto authorized by the Deputy Head of the Commission; he being held to strict accountability for the selection being made without regard to personal or political considerations and being the most suitable of those applying or available therefor.

In all cases returned soldiers are given the preference.

The reason temporary appointments only are being made is that there are as yet no eligible lists throughout the country from which to make assignments for permanent appointments. These will be built up as a result of Civil Service examinations.

Heretofore examinations have been held semi-annually in the months of May and November,

[Mr. Devlin.]

but in future they will be held more frequently if found to be necessary in order to keep the lists in a healthy condition.

Where possible and expedient in the public interest, the principle of promotion will be observed in the Outside as well as in the Inside Service. Where this is impossible the lesser positions will be filled by assignment from the eligible lists and the more important ones thrown open to competition and advertised.

Heretofore permanent appointment in the Inside Service was based solely on the result of an educational test (the candidate being otherwise suitable, of course, as to age, health, character and habits). This gave to the candidate fresh from the class room, and yet lacking in experience, a great advantage over the educated and altogether more suitable person who possessed business experience but might be a trifle rusty in some of the subjects written at the examination.

In future it is proposed in appointments to both the Inside and Outside Services to give a rating for business experience, and thus, while not lowering the standard of the educational test, enable the public service to be recruited from the really most efficient of those who successfully compete at the examinations.

As already outlined, where a vacancy arises in a Postmastership, a Collector of Customs or the like, in an important centre, the same will where possible be filled by promotion. If the public interest would not be served thereby the position will be thrown open to competition and applications invited from persons possessing the necessary qualifications and who have been residents of the city or vicinity for a stated period.

There is naturally a very strong feeling throughout the country that positions should, wherever possible, be filled by the appointment of local persons and that except in the case of transfers, which might occasionally become necessary, "outsiders" as they are regarded should not receive preferment.

The United States Federal Civil Service system recognizes this principle, and in advertising the higher positions, such as Postmasters, etc., limits the eligibility of applicants to the vicinity of the particular town or city concerned, a year's previous residence being required.

Our Civil Service Commission purpose following quite closely the rule adopted in the United States.

In rating applications for such positions the business experience of the applicants would be considered, together with their educational standing as evidenced by school or collegiate record, while satisfactory information as to character and habits would also be required.

The method of passing upon the representative qualifications of applicants for such positions would be along the following lines:

The Civil Service Commission would appoint a Board of three suitable persons to whom the applications would be submitted for examination and report. The members composing such a Board would be selected with due regard to their fitness to judge of the necessary qualifications in a candidate to properly fill the vacant position. If the position required a certain degree of technical knowledge and skill the Board would be composed in part at least of technical men. If the duties were chiefly of an administrative nature the Board would

probably have as a member one or more administrative officers of the department together with a business man or men of experience and outstanding ability. All required information would be afforded them upon which to base their opinion and where a position required administrative ability a requisite of the applicant's experience would be a certain number of years in the administrative capacity.

As an illustration of how such a Board would act, two cases recently dealt with may be cited. The first was that of three skilled Accountants required in the Public Service. The positions were advertised, a large number of applications were received, experience and reference being fully given. These were referred to a Board consisting of two Chartered Accountants in general practice and the Head of the Accountant's Branch in the department concerned. These gentlemen reported the names of three applicants who in their judgment were best qualified and the Civil Service Commission approved the report.

Another case was that of Assistant to the Board of Historical Publications, Public Archives. A Board consisting of Dr. Doughty, Dominion Archivist, Professor Wrong of Toronto University and Profesor Colby of McGill was appointed. The applications were submitted to each member of the Board and were rated by him. They were then returned to the Commission and in summarizing the Reports it was found that the three members of the Board agreed upon one candidate as being the best qualified, but differed with regard to the rating of the other applicants. It happened, however, that the candidate obtaining the highest rating accepted the position therefore no necessity for a meeting of the Board to arrange the order of merit of the remaining candidates.

Appointments to the clerical grades of the Outside Service would be made from the eligible list—those who had successfully competed at the regular examinations—regard being had so far as possible to the desirability of the appointee being a resident of the district or community concerned.

The employment of temporary labourers who in some centres at least have heretofore been assigned from the lists kept by the political managers of the party for the time being in power will in future be based upon the necessities of the public service and the fitness for employment of those appliying therefor.

Vacancies in positions on the Canals have this year largely been left with the respective Superintending Engineers to fill, as there was no time after the passing of the Order in Council of the 12th of February last for the Commission to invite applications and create an eligible list. The appointment in the main to the Canals are for the period of navigation and recur yearly; those who prove satisfactory in the opinion of the Superintending Engineer being re-engaged each season. This policy it seems desirable to pursue in future.

In a few instances applications were made direct to the Civil Service Commission for specific positions on the Canals which had become vacant owing to death, resignation or removal. In such cases returned soldiers were assigned in the order in which their applications were received, conditional upon their possessing the necessary qualifications to satisfactorily fill the position in the opinion of the Superintending Engineer.

It is proposed at the close of navigation, in future to request the Department of Railways and Canals to supply the Civil Service Commission with a list of positions to which new appointments will require to be made the following spring and to give notice thereof in the districts concerned.

This method will extend also to certain classes of officials in other departments, as for instance Fire Rangers in the Department of the Interior, Light Keepers and Life Saving Crews acting only during the season of Navigation. Such officers when they have proved satisfactory to the department, having gained experience, should, if available, be re-engaged in the public interest.

I have read that statement in order to indicate the procedure adopted in carrying out the terms of the Order in Council of February 13. I think this statement will remove some of the objections to the Bill which were stated this evening by some hon. members.

Mr. FIELDING: Does it touch rural postmasters?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When the Order in Council was passed the Civil Service Commission requisitioned the assistance of the post office inspectors in the several provinces. I think the Civil Service Commission make requests for recommendations from the post office inspectors of the several provinces. This form of letter is sent out to the post office inspectors and possibly to other people:

Ottawa,.....

Dear Sir,—

The Postmastership at..... having become vacant through..... the Civil Service Commission has been asked to make a new appointment. I am directed by the Commissioners to ask that you will be good enough, by inquiry in the district, to secure the name of a suitable candidate for office, and that you will submit such name or names for their consideration with the least possible delay. The essential requirements are (a) that the candidate should possess the ability and education to efficiently perform the duties of the office, (b) that his character and habits should be vouched for by three reputable citizens of the community. It is, of course, understood that where a returned soldier is available and qualified, he should be given the preference, that no personal or political favouritism is to be exercised, and that your recommendation of any candidate should include substantial reasons for his selection.

Yours truly,

Secretary.

Mr. BUREAU: To whom is that letter addressed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To the post office inspectors of the several provinces. It is hardly wortth while discussing the full scope of the Bill. I do not purpose referring to any of the sections of the Bill at the present time but we will discuss them clause by clause as we proceed. Sub-

stantially the Bill is the same as the present Civil Service Act. There are very few changes. The Order in Council is being given statutory effect, and to accomplish that end it was necessary to insert in the Act new sections. The Civil Service Commission is substituted for the Governor in Council in every case where the latter approved of any appointment, or made any appointment. Outside of that the changes are not very substantial and I think the Committee should deal very expeditiously with the Bill when we come to consider it clause by clause.

Mr. CAHILL: Were the appointments of registrars for taking the man power of the country made by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know, but I think not. I would hardly suppose that the registrars would become part of the Civil Service.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: How were they made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know how they were made, but they were not made by the Government.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I would like to know how they were made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They were appointed by the Registration Board, of which Senator Robertson is Chairman. I did not know who were appointed even in my own county.

Mr. BUREAU: The same here.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Before the appointments were made I received a communication asking if in the previous enumeration the returning officer had been satisfactory. I answered that he was not quite so, and I named for the place a returned soldier who had been in the trenches for eighteen months, and who was one of six brothers who had gone overseas, one missing, one killed, one in hospital, one on his way over and one returned.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think my hon. friend is mistaken in saying he had that request from the Civil Service Commission. It was from the secretary of the Registration Board.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: It was from the secretary, Mr. Foran.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Foran is the secretary of the Civil Service Commission.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Well, that is the man who signed the letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. BOYCE: The person who signed the letter I got was Mr. Hoey. I recommended the appointment of our returning officer and he got the appointment.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I recommended the returned soldier of whom I have spoken a man who was quite qualified to occupy the position. The doctrine has been preached, and the departments have concurred in it, that where he had the qualifications, the returned soldier should be given the preference. Notwithstanding the fact that I named a returned soldier whose family had made such a sacrifice, he did not get the position, but one whom I did not recommend did get it. I do not know who made the appointment. If I am asked to give information again in view of this experience, I do not know that I shall comply with the request.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should be surprised if the hon. gentleman received a request for a nomination from the Civil Service Commission, but I should like him to advise me to-morrow about the matter. The requisition, in all likelihood, was from the secretary of some office of the Registration Board. However, I am very sorry that the nomination made by my hon. friend was not acted upon.

Mr. D D. McKENZIE: I might say that I had a somewhat similar experience to that of the hon. member who has just spoken.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: As coming from Saskatchewan, I wish to voice the view which is held by the people of our province in regard to the proposed legislation. Not only on the platform, but throughout the press of our province during the last election, the view was expressed that the abolition of patronage would be one of the greatest and most needed reforms that could be brought about. There is no well-informed person but has realized that under the old patronage system the country was not getting that efficient service from its employees that it should get. Merit was not taken into consideration when appointments were made, but if regard was paid to anything it was the faithful services that had been rendered to the party. Only from a government constituted like the present could we expect such a needed reform, and, as the present seems to be an opportune time, I am glad that the Gov-

ernment has taken advantage of it to introduce this legislation.

I was very much surprised to hear certain hon. gentlemen this evening endeavour to throw cold water on the Bill. If a measure of Civil Service reform is not passed by the present Union Government, when may we expect to see it enacted? In connection with the matter of salaries I would urge upon the Government that they should not deal in a penurious way with the Civil Service. At present there are a number of federal employees who are giving good service to the country, but who are unfortunately underpaid. We hear of many business concerns who have had to increase the salaries of competent men in order to retain their services, but that policy has not been followed in the Civil Service. According to the statistics furnished by the Labour Department, the cost of living in 1914 for a family of five was estimated at something over $14. In 1917, the cost for a family for food, including rent, but excluding clothing and other necessaries, had advanced to $19.33, an additional cost per week of about $5.05. Now, there are a number of employees under the Post Office Department who deserve consideration, and notably the letter carriers. The letter carriers, I understand, receive about $2.50 a day. A war bonus has been granted of about $100 a year, or $8.33 per month, making their total earnings $73 and some odd cents per month. According to the cost of living figures, not reckoning the expense of clothing, doctor's bills, and other incidentals which are bound to occur in any family, no matter what care is exercised, the outlay per week is greater than the amount that is allowed by the Post Office Department to the letter carriers. These men are performing important duties and they have to turn out in all kinds of weather, and they should certainly be given a living wage. They should be given more than that: The stipend which they receive should be such as to permit them to lay by a little for a rainy day. The same thing might be said with respect to the clerks who occupy positions of importance and responsibility in the post office itself.

I think the case of the country postmasters should not be ignored. They have to turn their residences into what might be termed "public buildings." They have to be on duty all hours of the day to hand out mail for the public, and to discharge the duties required of them, and in return they receive the munificent sum of $50 per annum. In some few instances the remuneration is $75; I know of one man who is getting that much per annum. I do not think a department such as the Post Office, which is able to exhibit a substantial surplus every year, should remunerate the worthy people who render such important service to the public by paying them such a comparatively insignificant sum.

Reference has been made to the appointment of registrars in connection with the registration of man-power. I wish to say that if the appointments made are as satisfactory as in the city which I represent, namely, the city of Saskatoon—although I had nothing to do with it—every person will be perfectly happy. I notice from a newspaper received to-day that a returned soldier was appointed in the city of Saskatoon. In my opinion that appointment is a very worthy one and will undoubtedly prove satisfactory.

There seems to be a great deal of fear as to the appointments to be made by the Civil Service Commission. My experience as a member only dates from the 17th of December last, and if other hon. gentlemen have had the same experience as myself—even although I have not had numerous applicants for positions—they will feel very pleased to be rid of the responsibility of having to recommend men for positions in the service. Viewed from any angle, the change which is proposed ought to afford members great relief. Judging from the experience of the past, for every friend a member makes when he recommends an appointment, there will be forty or fifty disgruntled constituents. Therefore, I do not think any member should feel that he is being deprived of a privilege but rather of a burden to be relieved of patronage. We want to see the public service run on business principles, and in that way obtain the best results. In my opinion the method proposed by the Bill tends to bring that about, and we may therefore look for a great improvement in the public service.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was reminded of my own position by the observations of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) that he was consulted about a certain appointment, and after he had given his views they were not followed. I was not looking for or expecting any patronage; but the returning officer appointed in my county last year, appointed, of course, without consulting me, was a very good respectable Tory. They appointed sixty enumerators also, every one of them Tories of the highest orthodoxy. We were told that everything was to be "fifty-fifty," but that is the kind of "fifty-fifty" we got. I

did not complain; I was not disappointed; I was looking for that kind of thing. After appointing this returning officer—and I hold the acting minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean) responsible for it, he is the only minister we have in the province except the Prime Minister, who has other things to look after; patronage of this kind, I believe, is handled by the Acting Minister of Finance.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What kind of patronage?

Mr. McKENZIE: Later I was asked to say if the man appointed returning officer would be satisfactory to me. I wrote back: Certainly. When I was going to get Tory anyhow, I preferred a decent Tory; so I said, yes, the old man was good enough for me. But was he appointed? No, he was too good, too decent. They went to the poorest kind of a Tory they could get and appointed him over the head of the other man. So I sympathize with my good friend who is disappointed, for I am in exactly the same position.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Not exactly. In my case the man is a returned soldier who should have been appointed.

Mr. BLAKE: There has been a lot of talk about patronage to-night directed at this Bill, but it has not hit at the mark at all. The patronage which is objected to is not the few appointments made by the member. I have been in control of the patronage in my constituency for four or five years, and I don't think I secured appointments for more than one person each year to post offices and so on, and there never has been a complaint against one of them, although I turned down dozens and dozens of men. That is not what the people are kicking so much about to-day, but rather at the matter of letting contracts to friends at exorbitant prices with the object of having some of the money turned back to the party funds. I do not see anything in this Bill to remedy that state of affairs. That is the big thing the people mean by "patronage," and not the few appointments made here and there by members. When there is an appointment to be made of a postmaster in some rural constituency, who knows better than the member where that post office should be situated if a new post office is to be opened up? I think that members, with the majority they have behind them this year, and the independence which characterizes members in this House, would feel that they could defy their constituency, or one or two people here and there, and be big enough to locate the offices where they would best serve the community. There is an injustice done here, and under this so-called reform havoc will be wrought in the Civil Service and a great deal of displeasure and more harm caused. I think that, where there is more than one application for a postmaster, at least the opinion of the member should be taken. It is not only a matter of shifting a man into this department or into that. The Bill as constituted is an excellent thing. But where there are more than two applications for a post office, or where there is a vacancy for a postmaster caused by the opening of a new office or by death, I think the member could be consulted first and no harm result. If this Bill is to fulfil the promises of the Government, something should be put in it to provide that every tender for dredging or any other work or for any supplies should be sealed and left in a designated place until the time comes to open it, and it should be opened in public. In that way we will get away from patronage in the big sense of the word.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is provided for in other legislation, by Order in Council. It has nothing to do with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BLAKE: That is a form of patronage that may well be embodied in this Bill instead of in an Order in Council. I am not taking up the cudgels about Orders in Council; I have endorsed some of them. But this is going out as a Civil Service Bill, and is not a complete reform of patronage. I have no doubt that the intention of the Government, as enacted by Order in Council, will be followed out faithfully and to the letter, and that the lowest tenderer will receive the contract in each case. That would accomplish the strict abolition of patronage.

Mr. MURPHY: As many members began work in committees at ten o'clock this morning, and it is now midnight, and I assume we will be adjourning before long, I do not wish to take up very much time. With the general principle of the Bill I am in hearty agreement, as I said when it was first introduced. Anybody who was born in Ottawa and has lived here all his life, and who has had anything to do with politics must assuredly welcome any measure to put an end to patronage. The very fact that a man has been born in Ottawa and lived here all

12 m,

his life and has had something to do with politics makes him look at a measure of this kind even with a more critical eye than that of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), who has just spoken. I agree with him that what the public understand in the talk about patronage is the wider meaning covering every kind of distribution of party or Government favours such as my hon. friend indicated.

Mr. BUREAU: The prevention of graft.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. minister who is in charge of this Bill read to the committee a statement from the Civil Service Commission purporting to detail what they have done since February 13 last, when the management of the Civil Service was practically turned over to them—and as my hon. friend said just now this Bill proposes to give statutory authority for the power that was then vested in the Civil Service Commission. I presume that, owing to a rush of work, the Civil Service Commission overlooked an important part of their work with which I think I should acquaint the committee, because I think it has an important bearing on the Bill. It has this bearing on the Bill, that unless something is done to give the House and the public some assurance that different methods will prevail, the Civil Service Commission is not likely to meet the views and the wishes of the people who desire that patronage should be abolished. The Order in Council transferring the management of Civil Service affairs to the commission was passed on February 13 last, I understood my hon. friend to say. On February 18, five days after the commission was put in sole charge, they issued a circular and blank form, which I hold in my hand, and on which applicants for positions were expected to give their name, address, age, position desired, experience, and two classes of references, one as to ability and one as to character and habits. In the city of Ottawa, I am informed, hundreds of these forms were sent out, and each person who received one received at the same time a circular from the Civil Service Commission in these terms:

> The enclosed form of application for temporary employment is sent you at the instance of Mr. A. E. Fripp, M.P.

Mr. PROULX: No!

Mr. MURPHY: Yes.

> It should be filled in and returned to the Office of the Civil Service Commission.

Patronage was supposed to have been abolished by this Order in Council on February 13 last.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Who issued that letter?

Mr. MURPHY: The Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CALDER: It is an application form?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, and a covering letter is sent with it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It does not sound like anything that would come from the Civil Service Commission. I do not doubt that the letter is authentic, but I hardly imagine that it was issued by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Unhappily these things are judged not by sounds but by words.

Mr. MURPHY: I am assured that that is where it came from and that the forms, as this circular states, were to be filled in and sent to the commission.

Mr. CALDER: Is that the original document?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; I will send it to my hon. friend. Even assuming that this circular was not sent out by the Civil Service Commission, it requests that the forms shall be filled in and sent to that body. The Civil Service Commission, therefore, cannot be absolved of all connection with the transaction.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It may not have been very objectionable, anyway. Perhaps the Civil Service Commission desired to establish a list of those who would be available for temporary employment in Ottawa. Quite likely they have lists in some of the departments, but the commission may have required further information. I will make inquiries and say something about the matter to-morrow.

Mr. MURPHY: The reason suggested by my hon. friend is a most extraordinary one. What necessity was there for the Civil Service Commission sending out a circular saying "the enclosed form of application for temporary employment is sent to you at the instance of Mr. A. E. Fripp, M.P.." If this was done because of the reason suggested by my hon. friend, that the commission desired to establish a list of those desiring temporary employment—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say the Civil Service Commission sent it out.

Mr. MURPHY: Why the mention in this circular that it was sent out at the instance

of Mr. Fripp? These forms, when signed, were returned to the Civil Service Commission, which, on the date on which this letter was issued, February 18, were in complete control of the situation. The Civil Service Commission will be no more in control of the situation after the passing of this Act, than they were on the date mentioned. What guarantee have we in the Act that practices such as this will not be continued after the Act shall have been put in force? I do not cite this occurrence for the purpose of objecting to the Act or of putting any obstacle in the way of bringing about the reform that we all desire. I am simply pointing out that even after this reform was supposed to have been instituted, we had an occurrence such as the one that I have acquainted the committee with. I am told that these forms were sent to hundreds of people in Ottawa. I draw this to my hon. friend's attention so that the matter may be considered during the discussion of the Bill and so that some provision or provisions may be inserted in the Bill whereby the public will have a guarantee that neither the Civil Service Commission, nor a member of Parliament, nor any individual can do anything of this kind in the future. The acting minister will agree with that most heartily, because I am sure that he is seriously desirous of effecting the reforms which this Bill aims at. Like some other hon. gentlemen, I have been disappointed that those on the other side who have criticised the Bill—because the discussion has been carried on chiefly by supporters of the Government—did not offer some suggestions to take the place of the sections to which they have objected. Possibly that may be done in future; in any event I hope it will.

The CHAIRMAN: If all hon. members who omitted to speak on the second reading have now spoken, I am sure I shall be pardoned if, before taking up the Bill clause by clause, I read paragraph 5 of rule 13. It is as follows:

Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

On section 2—definitions:

Mr. BUREAU: There will be some discussion on this clause. We meet at 11 in the morning, and many hon. gentlemen were called to committees at 10. I think that we ought to adjourn.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to pass section 2. It is a short one.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. BUREAU: There will be some discussion on it; it deals with definition of Inside and Outside Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If hon. gentlemen insist, I agree.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Mr. A. K. Maclean, the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Saturday.

Saturday, May 11, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. P. A. CHEVASSU.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the table of the House the report of the Clerk and my recommendation in the matter of the appointment of Mr. J. P. A. Chevassu to the Hansard Division of the Translation Staff of the House of Commons.

REPORT.

Details of remuneration paid in connection with the Victory Loan.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

SUSPENSION OF RULES RELATING TO PRIVATE BILLS.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That owing to the advanced period of the session, the following rules relating to Private Bills be suspended for the remainder of the Session, viz.: Rules 28, 28a, 52, 103, and paragraph (a), subsection 3 of rule 89, and that Private Bills reported on Private Bills days by any Select Standing Committee be placed on the Orders of the Day of the same day for consideration in Committee of the Whole amongst Private Bills, or if reported on days other than Private Bills days, then immediately after routine proceedings.

He said: This motion is recommended by the Clerk of the Private Bills Committee, and it has been submitted to me by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who has gone over the rules that are mentioned in the motion, and who is of the opinion that those rules should be suspended in order that Private Bill legislation may be properly advanced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I should like to have this motion stand until Monday, so that I may have an opportunity of looking into the matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

Motion stands.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 89, respecting The Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 90, respecting The Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 91, for the relief of Francis Newman.—Mr. Lalor.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Henry Ernest Saxby.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 93, respecting a patent of Jacob David Wolf.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 94, to incorporate L'ordre des Dominicans ou frères prêcheurs au Canada.—Mr. Chabot.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

NOTICE OF MOTION RE CENSORING WITHDRAWN.

On the notice of motion:

Resolved, That the Rules of the House be amended by inserting the following rules immediately after Rule 24:

Censoring the Official Report of the Debates.

24A. The Speaker of the House of Commons, of his own motion, or upon the report of the Chief Censor, may order that any adverse statement, report or opinion, concerning the causes of the present war, or the motives or purposes for which Canada or the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or any of the allied nations, entered upon or prosecutes the same, which may tend to arouse hostile feeling, create unrest, or unsettle or inflame public opinion, or any unfavourable statement, report or opinion concerning the action of Canada, the said United Kingdom, or any allied nation, in prosecuting the war, or any statement, report or opinion, which may tend to weaken or in any way detract from the united effort of the people of Canada of the prosecution of the war, made by any Member or Members of the House of Commons, shall not be included in or shall be deleted from the official report of the Debates of the House of Commons.

24B. The Speaker of the House of Commons may, in cases where he deems it necessary, order that the printing of the official report of the Debates in the House of Commons be suspended for such time as he may fix in order to afford opportunity for the making by the Chief Censor of a report as provided for in the last-mentioned section, and the determination by the said Speaker as to whether any portion of such report should be excluded or deleted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In view of the advanced stage of the session, it is not the intention to proceed with this motion during the present session. It was intended as a corollary to the Order in Council with regard to censorship which has been laid on the table of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the Prime Minister the reason why he is dropping this motion? Is it only in view of the advanced stage of the session, or is it because he now thinks that there is no reason for having given such a notice?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I explained that it was on account of the advanced stage of the session. It may or may not be necessary to take it up at the next session. I also said that it was a corollary to the Order in Council with regard to the censorship which was passed a few weeks ago and which was laid upon the table of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: That is very unsatisfactory, as I look upon this motion as an attempt to introduce " club " rule.

Notice of motion dropped.

LIBRARIAN OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): May I ask the Prime Minister if the report published in this morning's Citizen is true, namely, that Mr. A. D. DeCelles, C.M.G., Librarian of Parliament, is going to be superannuated? Has he been consulted in regard to his superannuation, and is it true that the Hon. Mr. Sévigny is going to succeed him? Perhaps I might qualify my question by stating that everyone who knows Mr. DeCelles knows that he is in perfect health and is a most excellent official. Further than that, he is an ornament to the Library, because he is one of the great students of Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have heard nothing of the matter, except what is contained in the observations of my hon. friend.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 69, to amend the Criminal Code, was read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

BILL FOR TEMPORARY CONTROL OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS DROPPED.

On the Order being called for the second reading of Bill No. 16, to amend the Customs Act and to provide for the temporary control of exports and imports:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: On account of the advanced stage of the session, and in

view of the fact that the War Measures Act gives for the time being authority for doing what was sought to be done by this Bill, I beg to move that this Order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS. —SUSPENSE ACCOUNT.

RESOLUTION DROPPED.

On the Order being called:

House again in Committee on a proposed Resolution to provide that the working expenses of the Canadian Government railways and of any railway under the charge and management or direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be paid out of the receipts and revenues of the said railways, etc. —Hon. Mr. Reid.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not the intention to proceed with this resolution, and I beg to move that the Order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

BILL TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TO BRING THE OUTSIDE SERVICE UNDER ITS PROVISIONS.

The House again in committee on Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair (from May 10).

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee adjourned last night we had completed the general discussion of the Bill and had begun its consideration clause by clause. Section 1 has been adopted.

On section 2—Definitions:

Mr. BEST: I hold in my hand a circular I received this morning from the Civil Service Federation of the Dominion of Canada, which reads in part as follows:

It would appear from recent items in the press that some influential agency is endeavouring to dissuade the Union Government from proceeding wtih the Bill for Civil Service reform by the abolition of patronage in appointments and promotions to the public service. This great measure of reform was one of the principal planks in the platform of the Union Government, held a similarly prominent place in the speech from the Throne, and was enthusiastically acclaimed by the public and press of the country.

I do not know an hon. member of this House who has been approached by any agency with a view to influencing him against Civil Service reform. Certainly I have not been approached, but I hold in my hand this circular from the most influential agency there is to-day in the Dominion of Canada trying to influence the members of this House to pass this Bill. As far as I can see the public servants of the Dominion are just as honest as anybody else, but I believe hon. members of this House are just as straightforward and honest as the civil servants. We had an example only last night, which was amply proved by the correspondence produced, that hon. members of this House are at least just as straight as deputy ministers. I believe that if power is taken out of the hands of the peoples' representatives and handed over to deputy ministers or to the Civil Service Commission, ten mistakes will be made in the future for every one that was made in the past. I do not pretend that mistakes have not been made in the past; there have been mistakes of course. But for the life of me I cannot comprehend how two or three men sitting in Ottawa or Toronto can possibly know what is the best thing to be done in the counties of Dufferin or Simcoe. I agree with a great deal of what was said last night in reference to postmasters not receiving sufficient salary.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is entirely out of order. By the unanimous consent of the House last night we decided to observe the rules, after having, by unanimous consent, violated the rules all afternoon and the particular rule we decided to observe was that hon. members should make their speeches relative to the clause under consideration.

Mr. BEST: This is a very important Bill, and I think it should not be pressed through the House in the dying hours of the session. I believe it would be in the public interest if the Bill was left over and a committee were appointed to examine it carefully and report at the next session of the House. I firmly believe that something should be done in the way of Civil Service reform, but in my opinion this Bill is altogether too drastic.

Mr. CURRIE: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Best) was perfectly in order in discussing the action of the Civil Service Federation in reference to this Bill. I say that if the man who wrote this insulting circular to the members of this House got his just deserts he would be brought to the bar of this House. The circular is an insult to every hon. member. Talk about influence! Why, that organization is the influence that is at the bottom of the whole thing. It is a countrywide organization, and is endeavouring to force this Bill through. I think it is time the members of

this House took cognizance of its actions. What an insult to insinuate that members of this House are influenced by some mysterious agency behind the scenes! The mysterious agency behind the scenes is the influences these civil servants are trying to exert, and the men who wrote that circular are after promotion for themselves; everybody knows that. I think it is high time these men were called to time. The Government should find out whether or not these men have a right to send such an insulting circular to members of this House. I think it was perfectly in order for my hon. friend to read the circular.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend read the whole circular?

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman has received a copy as has everyone else.

Mr. COOPER: Honi soit qui mal y pense.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Read it in full.

Mr. CURRIE: It is a circular of the Civil Service Federation of Canada. As I have your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read the circular.

The CHAIRMAN: I resent the remarks of the hon. member as to my having called the former speaker to order. I did not call the hon. member to order because he was discussing the circular. I called him to order because he was discussing the salaries of postmasters in Canada, which is altogether different.

Mr. CURRIE: I suppose that comes under another clause and we can take it up when that clause is under discussion. At the top of this circular is "The Civil Service Federation of Canada." And at the side I find the names of the officers and a list of affiliated organizations, as follows:

President—Walter Todd, House of Commons, Ottawa; Vice-Presidents: Maritime Provinces—S. W. Wilkins, St. John, N. B.; Quebec—H. McLaughlin, Montreal; Manitoba—C. A. Hives, Winnipeg; Saskatchewan—Charles Gardiner, Regina; Alberta—A. Venables, Calgary; British Columbia—J. E. Fagan, Vancouver; Secretary-Treasurer—F. Grierson, Finance, Ottawa, (P. O. Box 484); Assistant Secretary-Treasurer—L. D. Burling, Mines, Ottawa; Organizing Secretary—T. T. Hawkins, P. O. Inspector, Ottawa.

Composed of the Following Affiliated Organizations of Civil Servants.

Dominion Postal Clerk's Association (35 branches); Dominion Customs Association, (20 branches); Railway Mail Clerk's Federation, (15 branches).

Local Organizations.

Charlottetown, Quebec, Ottawa, Perth, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, Vancouver, Victoria.

Class Organizations.

Excise: Sherbrooke, Stratford, London, Hamilton; Immigration: Niagara Falls, Winnipeg; Marine: Halifax; Meat Inspectors: Toronto, (2); Militia: Halifax; Naval: Halifax, Esquimalt; Public Works: Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg.

Then the circular goes on to say:

Dear Sir,

The Public Service, performing alike in peace and war the national business, is surely one of Canada's greatest assets. We are addressing you because you are one of the directors in Canada's business enterprises and so responsible for the results. We are addressing you at a time when events afford you the opportunity to co-operate in an Act that will remove a serious handicap to national efficiency and so contribute to the one great aspiration of all Canada's public men,—the winning of the war.

Every one who wants a little salary always thinks that it must be granted to him in order to win the war.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: My right hon. friend knows that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do.

Mr. CURRIE: The circular continues:

It would appear from recent items in the press that some influential agency is endeavouring to dissuade the Union Government from proceeding with the bill for Civil Service Reform by the abolition of patronage in appointments and promotions to the public service. This great measure of reform was one of the principal planks in the platform of the Union Government, held a similarly prominent place in the speech from the Throne and was enthusiastically acclaimed by the public and the press of the country.

That is by the public service, I guess.

In view of the foregoing facts, the good people of Canada look with alarm upon any attempt to defer the passage of this much needed measure and the undersigned on behalf of the organized Civil Service—

Bear that in mind.

—plead the privilege of pointing out to you the ill effect upon Canada's part in the war that will ensue in the event of failure to place this measure upon our statute books.

I suppose they are all field marshals in their own minds.

Patronage as a means of winning the war has little chance of success in competition with the business like methods of the enemies of the Allies.

May we therefore appeal to you to support this great measure of reform, so that we may offer to the world one more indication in the national history of our country of a rennaissance born of the sorrows and chastisements of a universal calamity.

On behalf of the Civil Service Federation of Canada.

Walter Todd,
President.

F. Grierson,
Secretary.

The minister in charge of the Bill is here and he can stand up and tell the House whether there ever was any elaborate organization endeavouring to put a stop to this great measure or whether this letter is all bunkum and an attempt to coerce the members of this House into the passing of a measure without due consideration. As one member of the House I do not object to real Civil Service reform but when we have a measure of such vast consequence to the whole country and one by which we will tie ourselves down to a lot of bureaucrats, it should be placed before a committee of this House and threshed out for a whole session so that we would know what we were doing. Nobody really seems to understand what the measure means. I have read this circular and I say unhesitatingly that if I were a minister of the Crown and a man in the Civil Service with whom I had anything to do wrote an insulting letter like that to me and to members of the House I would suspend him immediately. What right has a man who is a servant of this House to address this House in such a contemptuous way?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would like to say a word in reply to that sweeping condemnation of the Civil Service for presuming to represent their position to their employers the members of this House and the representatives of the people. I have in my experience heard similar statements made in regard to other large bodies of employers when their employees would presume to represent their case to their employers as the Civil Service have done here. I do not see that it is inconsistent with the good of the public service that civil servants should be organized if they wish to be just the same as the servants of any other large employing body. It matters not whether they are in the employ of a large corporation or of the people of Canada. I question very much whether the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) would object if some one came along with a proposition that involved a large organization of capital and that was going to be the employer of a large body of men. Any one who stands up and indulges in a sweeping condemnation of any group of men for presuming to organize and present their case to their employers is taking just the same position that a great many of the autocratic employers took a generation ago but who have been compelled to get down from that lofty pedestal. The observations made by the hon. gentleman have no reference whatever to the merit or genius of this Bill. The Bill is either good or bad according to its details. The object is to take the Civil Service out of politics and to get rid of the curse of the patronage system, a principle which ought to commend it to every one. There is nothing inconsistent with the good of the public service that the men who are engaged in that service should have an honest desire for promotion. Why should not a man entering the Civil Service have the same right to want to get to the top as the man in the service of a railway company or of any other employer?

Mr. CURRIE: Why should he not get to the top—the Bill provides that a man in the second class can never get to the top.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Simply because some member of Parliament with sufficient pull, whenever a position is open in the Civil Service that is worth anything, railroads some of his friends into it. That is why they cannot get to the top. The opportunity for promotion does not exist in the Civil Service as it does in any other line of business simply on account of the patronage system. If this Bill is not complete in its details this House can improve it. If we find when we have gone through it that there are some things that are incomplete, we can take it up another year and make the necessary improvements. But, the principle is the right one. The public service ought to be put upon the same ground as any other class of service.

Mr. CURRIE: Just a moment. I desire to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. G. B. Nicholson), and I shall do so in a very few words. The gentleman who has sent the circular, Mr. Grierson, sits in the gallery constantly watching the proceedings of the House. He is the secretary, or occupies other official position in the Civil Service Association, and publishes the Civil Service paper, The Civilian. It is a shame—I would not for one moment stand it if I were a minister of the Crown—the abuse that ministers are handed out in every issue of that paper. When a minister tries to exercise any discipline over any official in his department he is subjected to a torrent of abuse from the paper published by this man, Mr. Grierson, one of the signatories to this circular. The hon. member (Mr. Nicholson) comes down here full of enthusiasm and thinks he is going to regenerate the whole world through the medium of this Bill. I do not object to a man who is selling his labour belonging to any organization, but I say that it is a danger—a danger to the country—that the officials

of Canada should be allowed to set themselves up in an organization of this kind and make these raids on the treasury. I speak as a public man, not as one who is going around looking for votes, and this organization—the very thing that has destroyed Russia— is alarming. It is a thing that is going to create all sorts of factions in this service whereby it will be nothing more than a series of disjointed units and broken links. I say that the ministers henceforth should put their foot down on these men who have the audacity to insult the House of Commons with a circular of this kind. This organization has nothing to do with the Federation of Labour, or any of the trades unions that are trying to render a service to the country in these troublesome times. It is only a short time ago since the greatest labour man on the whole of this continent stood upon the floor of this chamber and called upon everybody to perform public service. Can anybody tell me that public service is linked up in the organization which has expressed its sentiments in this circular? The members of this organization are united for the purpose of raiding the treasury and bringing pressure to bear upon members of this House and the ministers—especially the ministers—and it has been done to the extent that a minister, as far as I can see, is only a cipher to register in his department the acts of an organization which is not responsible either to the House or the people of the country. For that reason I think the Acting Minister of Finance should make a statement and say whether there has been any organized movement to try and stop this Bill, or whether these men are only indulging in further misrepresentations.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not catch the wording of the circular. Does it give practical reasons why this Bill should be supported, or does it insinuate that the members are not doing their duty?

Mr. CURRIE: The circular consists of a string of insinuations from start to finish.

Mr. BUREAU: They say that to win the war you have got to have such a Bill.

Mr. STEVENS: Paragraph (a) of clause 2 of the Bill defines "Civil Service" as meaning and including:

All classes of officers, clerks and employees—

and so forth—

—appointed by the Governor in Council or other competent authority before the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two or thereafter appointed or employed in a manner provided by the Civil Service Act for the time being, in force.

Is there not a better way in which that definition could be stated? I understand that the Civil Service includes practically all the employees of the Government of Canada. In that case why limit the definition to those employed "in the manner provided by the Civil Service Act for the time being enforced" which I presume is the old Civil Service Act? Why not say that all the employees of the Government come under this Act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: And all the officials.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to distinguish between the Civil Service and the Public Service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the difference?

Mr. STEVENS: That is the point I want to make. Why make such a distinction when you are going to abolish patronage and bring all the employees under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are a great number of war commissions operating today in the city of Ottawa whose employees are but temporary, and on the cessation of war these commissions will cease to exist. While the Civil Service Commission should have the right to appoint hereafter all persons employed by these war commissions, it was not deemed desirable to consider such persons as part of the Civil Service.

Mr. MORPHY: Are the Dominion police part of the Civil Service, and if not, why?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Mounted Police are not part of the Civil Service.

Mr. MORPHY: I said Dominion Police, not North West Mounted Police.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The press gangs going round the city and country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Dominion Police, I think, are part of the Civil Service.

Mr. MORPHY: Is the minister sure? I am told they are not, and why is it so?

Mr. CURRIE: I asked the minister a very important question whether any organization had approached the Government with a view to stopping the passage of this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am very sorry, but I did not have the opportunity of

answering the question put by my hon. friend from Simcoe. I quite agree with the principle enunciated by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), but I am inclined to agree with the views expressed by the members for Dufferin and Simcoe as to the impropriety of the Civil Service bombarding members of Parliament in respect to the passage of this Bill. I have been flooded during the past week with telegrams from every part of Canada, and I have taken pains to let the officers of the organized Civil Service know that I resent the manner in which they have approached members of Parliament during the past few days by circular and by telegram. So far as I know there has been no organized effort on the part of anybody to defeat the passage of this Bill. I should like to say in connection with clause 2 that subsections a and b are substantially as they now appear in the present Civil Service Act. The only difference in c is that there is an addition to the officers named as Deputy Heads, such as the Controller of the Mounted Police, the Superintendent of Insurance, the Dominion Archivist and the assistant to the chairman and secretary to the Commission of Conservation. The purpose of making these officers deputy heads within the Act is that they control their staffs, and therefore it is necessary for the proper working of the Act to define them as deputy heads.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the exact meaning of clause 2? Subsection (a) defines "Civil Service" as including all classes of officers, clerks and employees. Subsection (c) defines what is meant by "deputy" or "deputy head" and so on. I want to know whether the deputy is comprised in the Civil Service or not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The deputy ministers are part of the Civil Service but they are appointed by the Governor in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The deputy heads should be part of the Civil Service and they seem to come within the meaning of subsection (a). They are employees of the Government and they are in the Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A deputy minister is an officer—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He is an officer and therefore part of the Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He is part of the Civil Service but he is appointed by the Governor in Council.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that and I do not disapprove of the appointment of deputy ministers by the Government but he is also a member of the Civil Service, and you make a special provision for him.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 41 of the Bill provides:

> Except as herein otherwise provided, and except in the case of deputy heads, appointments to positions in the public service shall be by competitive examination.

Mr. BUREAU: That excludes deputy ministers from the examination, but not from membership in the Civil Service.

Mr. STEVENS: In the large or small post offices, customs offices, and inland revenue offices throughout the country we have some very excellent officers in technical, clerical or official positions. Why should they not have the dignity, if there be any dignity attached to it, of being in the Civil Service instead of being classified as the Outside Service. I understand the object of this Bill is to change present conditions. The Civil Service is practically limited to Ottawa and to a few technical positions outside of Ottawa; the rest of the public servants are called the Outside Service. If we are to have real Civil Service reform, men of an equal standing outside of Ottawa should be in the Civil Service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I refer especially to men on the permanent staff, not those on the temporary staff, employed for a few weeks under rush conditions. My reference is to the permanent officers of the Customs, Post Office, Inland Revenue and such other departments as have permanent officers throughout the country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Very strong representations were made to me by representatives of the Outside Service that the distinction be abolished between what is known as the Inside and the Outside Services, and that all be known as the Civil Service. My reply to these representatives was that at the present time we could not very well give favourable consideration to their request for the reason that it is necessary to have some reorganization and re-classification of the Outside Service before the distinction could be abolished. For instance, if the distinction were abolished to-day, the Outside Service would come under the classification found in section 45 of the Bill; there would be a first, second and third

divisions, and various grades within the divisions. Clearly that would not apply to the various branches of the outside public service. Take the customs service, for instance, it would hardly do to classify the outside customs service as the inside customs service is classified to-day. In many cases, salaries of $100, $200 and $300 a year are paid, and that is all the recipients expect, and all they deserve for the service performed, which frequently only requires one or two hours work a day. This Bill provides that after its passage the Civil Service Commission shall report to the Government and to Parliament some scheme of reorganization of the inside and outside services, and as soon as that report is made the Government shall take into consideration the matter of the abolition of the outside service.

Mr. STEVENS: This is practically a temporary Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: Would it not be better to leave this Bill over until the commission report what they propose by way of amalgamating the outside and inside services? I think it would be a good thing to have that done, and to have the whole service taken out of politics as far as possible and to do away with patronage. It seems to me that the Committee of the Whole is not a good body to deal with this Bill clause by clause. We have not the time now at the end of the session to discuss it fully. If the Bill is now dealt with I venture to say there is not one member in ten—and I will be one of them—who will understand what the Bill means when we get through. A committee should be appointed to deal with it, such as the committee dealing with pensions, which would investigate the matter fully and report during the next session, by which time we will have the report of the Civil Service Commission. The House would then be in a position to deal with it to the satisfaction of both the Civil Service and the country. There is something in the circular sent to members—though I do not blame the service very much—that I do not like, that is the suggestion that the winning of the war depends on the passing of this Bill to suit the Civil Service. The Civil Service have no complaint to make in my judgment in connection with the war. Many of those who went to the front have been getting two salaries, and it does not become them to come before Parliament and say that the passage of this Bill is necessary to the winning of the war. That is only a bit of buncombe. I move that this matter be left over until next session, and that a committee be appointed to study the matter before we deal with the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There has been lots of buncombe about the winning of the war—

Mr. CURRIE: I rose when the hon. gentleman did to second the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there a motion?

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please repeat the motion?

Mr. TURRIFF: I would move that a committee be appointed to consider this Bill and make a report at the next session.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to rule the motion out of order, as not being competent to be moved in Committee of the Whole. The only motion that could be made by the hon. member at this stage would be that the committee rise and report progress, so that the House may deal with the question.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before my hon. friend proceeds, I would like to have an explanation from him. When my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) concluded his remarks by asking if the Bill was presented as a temporary measure only, I understood the acting minister to nod assent. I desire to know if this is a permanent measure or only a temporary. If it is a temporary measure, I shall have something to say about it later on.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When the member for Vancouver used the word "temporary," I assumed that he did not mean that this Bill when enacted would be but temporary; I assumed he meant it was not to be considered as a complete Bill, and that it would be subject to amendment later.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What amendment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It will be subject to amendment later as any other Act. It is not a temporary Bill. We must have a Civil Service Act as we have always had. I admit that the Bill may contain defects which we hope to remedy later. In answer to the member for Assiniboia I want to say that substantially there are but eight or nine new clauses in this Bill; the whole Bill is substantially as it has been for the last ten years, and there is no reason why the House should delay many hours in its passage.

Mr. MORPHY: To win the war.

Mr. CHABOT: Reference has been made by an hon. member to the effect that the Outside Service was to be dealt with in this Bill, and I would ask whether in the reorganization and reclassification of the Outside Service it is the intention through this Bill to place that service on the same footing as the Inside Service as regards appointments, promotion, salaries, and superannuation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of the Bill is to apply to the Outside Service the principle carried out in the Inside Service in the matter of appointments. Otherwise the Bill is not applicable to the Outside Service, nor is it possible to make it so until we have the report on the reorganization and classification of the Outside Service which the Civil Service Commission purposes making during the recess.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am in favour of Civil Service reform, that is, a real reform. If the object of this legislation is to carry out what was contained in the Act of 1908, it is not a great reform, because under that Act the Government could at any moment, by Order in Council, bring the Outside Service under the Civil Service Commission. I am sure that my hon. friend knows how to handle Orders in Council; there has been a literal manufacture of them by the Government. Why this legislation in the last days of the session, when the Government could, by Order in Council, bring the Outside Service under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is true that there was such a section in the old Act, but it was not workable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Civil Service Act now in force was designed to apply solely to the Inside Service. It is true that the Act gives the power to put the Outside Service under its operation, but it is not practicable that this be done. For instance, if an Order in Council was passed putting the Outside Service under the operation of the Civil Service Act, the salaries of the Inside Service would automatically apply to the Outside Service. The section to which my hon. friend refers was carelessly drafted; it had not sufficient consideration at the time it was passed, and it could not possibly be put into operation.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Is it not a fact that the Outside Service has been brought under the Civil Service Act by Order in Council? I received notice from the Government that appointments were to be made by the Civil Service Commission, and that I should have nothing to do with them. Appointments have already been made in my riding in that way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This legislation gives statutory effect to the Order in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: An Order in Council has no statutory effect, then?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It may have the effect of a statute, but there is some doubt about it. In a case of this kind it is better to give statutory effect to the Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: This is an Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada. Clause 2, paragraph (a), defines "Civil Service" as follows:

> "Civil Service" means and includes all classes of officers, clerks and employees in or under the several departments of the Executive Government of Canada and in the office of the Auditor General, etc.

Who is to control the various commissions that have been appointed? I do not see why members of such commissions should not come under the same Act as that which applies to the ordinary civil servant who works in a particular department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: So far as appointments are concerned, they will be under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not see anything in this Bill that says so. Even if these commissions are only temporary, they should, unless otherwise enacted by the statute creating the commission, come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. This would prevent the substitution of an Order in Council for Parliament, and would give members of Parliament at least a dim realization that they have a little say in the administration of the country's affairs. In the old Civil Service Act, as found in the Revised Statutes, the definition of "Civil Service" is practically the same as the one given here, except that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Northwest and Yukon Territories were then excluded from its provisions. Later, in 1908, the definition was enlarged to include employees in Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory. Between the two another Act was passed concerning the superannuation and retirement of persons employed in the Civil Service, and in that Act "Civil Service" was

defined as including all officers, clerks and employees under the several departments of executive government who were paid a yearly salary and to whom the Civil Service Act applied. Included also were all such officers, clerks and employees of the second or outside division as the Governor in Council might from time to time designate; the permanent officers and servants of the Senate, the House of Commons, and the Library of Parliament; and so on. The definition given in that Superannuation Act is a great deal broader than that given here. I do not see anything in this Bill which says that the permanent employees of the House of Commons are included in that definition. As to the Commission, let us set out in the statute appointing them what regulations the members and employees of them shall be subject to. If the Governor in Council appoints a commission let the officers of that commission come under the operation of the Civil Service Act. I am in favour of the principle of this Bill; I think it is right. Since we have been in opposition we have not been overburdened with the distribution of patronage. That is a great relief, and I thank God for it. Another cloud that I want to disperse, another glory that I want to put into its proper place is the statement that this is a new thing, and that this legislation is being enacted to redeem the pledges made during the elections by Union candidates. We heard it said last night in this House that if the Union Government did nothing but enact this particular legislation, a monument should be erected to perpetuate the great good they have done to this country. The acting minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has just declared that this is the very Act that was placed in the statute books in 1906, and that was revised and amended in 1908. Just a few sections, he says, are different.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are new.

Mr. BUREAU: I suppose those sections that are new are the ones that are to bring the Outside Service into the Inside Service. We shall have an opportunity of discussing that question later on. This is not new legislation; this is old legislation; and, instead of investing money in a monument, we should invest it for the purpose of paying the salaries of those poor soldiers whose salaries are to be cut off, although they enlisted on the understanding that they were to get their Civil Service salary in addition to their military pay. Let us have no more camouflage. With the exception of the heads, let all the other officials and employees of commissions appointed by the Governor in Council come under this Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They do.

Mr. BUREAU: I fail to see where that is provided for. If that be the case, let us put into the Bill a definition that will include them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member should look at the definition of "Public Service," clause (g), of section 2.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not see much that relates to Public Service. Why make a difference between "Public Service" and "Civil Service?" If I were to make any such definition, my definition would be this: I would clasify, under the head of "Public Service," all men not employed by the Government, but employed by a commission created by virtue of an Act of Parliament, the duties and the scope of jurisdiction of which commission is defined by this Act of Parliament, and which commission is not subject to the Civil Service Act. That is what I would call the Public Service. But all commissions appointed by the Governor in Council and paid by this country should be under the Civil Service Act. No exception should be made in any case. In the Estimates of 1918-19, I find at page 92, item 287, an amount of $600,000 that we are asked to vote for salaries. The item reads:

> To provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and the Income War Tax Act, 1917: Appointments for the purpose may be made without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, $600.000.

It is things of that sort that we want to guard against. It was said last night by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) that this did not exactly meet the evils that the people wanted to cure by doing away with patronage. He was absolutely right in his statement, and, for once, I must say I am with him heart and soul on this particular question. What the people want this Parliament to protect them against is what is commonly called graft. The word may not be parliamentary, but I am going to use it to express my idea. Graft is not caused by the appointment of a clerk at $1,000 or $2,000 a year, but graft is found, in the various contracts that are handed out, in the changes that are made and the extras that are paid on those contracts after they have been signed. The other day I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a case of this

kind which happened in my own riding where, to favour a particular friend, a contract was given at a price lower than that of the lowest tenderer, and then the contractor, expecting to make up the difference by extras, received shamefully large amounts for shamefully small jobs, such as receiving $400 for turning a stone around in a wall. I am, however, getting away from the question. Why should we pass a Civil Service Act, if any minister of the Crown can come into the House with an appropriation to provide for the administration of certain things, and then attach this rider which seems very inoffensive per se, but in the tail of which is the old venom:

> Appointments for the purpose may be made without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

The Government have changed the phraseology so that the old members will not understand it. The former phraseology was "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act contained." It is things of that sort that we want to take precautions against. If we are going to make the appointments, one thing that the people are complaining about and from which they want to be protected is, not so much the matter of overpaid civil servants, as the matter of over-crowded offices. If the minister will accept my suggestion, I shall draft a little amendment for the purpose of putting into the definition of "Civil Service," all commissions or officers employed by commissions appointed by the Governor in Council, and into the definition of "Public Service," all commissions whose duties and jurisdiction are established by Parliament. When we create such commissions by Act of Parliament, we can say what officers shall be appointed and how they shall be appointed.

Mr. CHABOT: My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has referred to pre-election promises and also to the erection of a monument in commemoration of the passage of this Bill. If I properly understand the tenor of this Bill, its chief purpose is to abolish political patronage, which has been a curse to this country and a bane to some of the representatives of the people and to myself in particular.

Mr. BUREAU: You have always had my sincere sympathy.

Mr. CHABOT: I think at all times patronage has been opposed to the best interests of the Civil Service and has to a large extent, contributed to the defeats of many Governments in this country. After 1911, political patronage in this city was thrust upon me with a vengeance, and my life in Ottawa from 1911 to 1917 was a regular political hell on earth. If this Bill abolishes political patronage, which I consider at all times, an unsatisfactory and unfair method of making appointments, it will remove a grievance and the people of this country will be thankful and satisfied. Since the passage of the Order in Council abolishing political patronage, my peace of mind has been greatly enhanced; a huge load has been taken off my shoulders, and I feel that my life has become worth living. If this legislation abolishes patronage, it will render the Civil Service more effective and efficient, and it will render to the people of this country a very valuable service.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am sure every member of this House who is acquainted with my hon. friend (Mr. Chabot), would like to relieve him of the difficult position in which he has been placed since 1911. A political hell is about as bad a hell as one could expect. I do not, however, think that many of the members of this House from the various parts of Canada are persecuted in the same way as the hon. member is. As this is the seat of government, one can readily understand how conditions here would be different from what they would be in other parts of the country. I want to point out that the abolition of political patronage is not going to be accomplished by this legislation.

Patronage, as the people understand it, is not affected by this Bill at all. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Winnipeg and the hon. member for Three Rivers that it is the expenditure of public money on public works in this country that is the kind of patronage the people of this country are desirous of abolishing. Patronage in appointments is comparatively a trifling matter, so insignificant, in fact, that in the part of the country from which I come the people do not try for Government positions at all. We expect to have very little patronage of that kind in the inland counties of Canada. Does the Pension Commission come under this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, as to its employees.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: And the Pensions Commissioners?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I presume that the powers of the Civil Service Commission are very similar to those exercised by the Pensions Commission, and if that is the case I must record my opposition to having the Bill gone on with until we have a little more light on the subject. I have always felt that commissions can perform a very useful service in this country provided they have a good man at the head, but if proper jurisdiction is not exercised over them they can be guilty of great abuses. The definition of the powers of the commission does not, in my opinion, go as far as it should. I do not think the Government should delegate to a commission matters for which they themselves ought to be held responsible.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is a matter of policy, and has nothing whatever to do with the Civil Service Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: As the section defines the scope of the commission, I think my remarks are pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will look at section 4 he will see that the duties and powers of the commission are set forth therein.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In reply to my hon. friend from Three Rivers—"Public Service," as used throughout this Bill means and includes all officers, clerks or employees in the service of the Crown or of Parliament; so no person is omitted. Section 41 provides that all appointments to positions in the public service shall be by competitive examination. There are certain other provisions empowering the commission to provide regulations for appointments to the Outside Service where it is not practicable to apply this Act.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the hon. member for South Oxford was quite in order in discussing on this section, which defines "Commission," the question whether the other commissions that are governing half this country should not be included under this Bill. We are here defining "Civil Service" and the hon. member for South Oxford wants to know whether these various commissions are included in that definition.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In all countries there has been more or less difficulty in managing the Civil Service. Alexander Pope long ago referred to the matter in these lines:

> For forms of government let fools contest,
> Whate'er is best administered, is best.

Some departments of the Civil Service are administered splendidly. Again, one branch of a department will be administered splendidly, while another branch will be badly administered; it depends upon the administrator in each case. The Civil Service in Ottawa is very fine in many respects. I deeply sympathize with the two members for Ottawa. I have had considerable experience with them. I can well remember getting a letter from one of these distinguished gentlemen requesting that such and such a person be forthwith appointed. I passed the letter on without comment, and about a month later received another letter from the member demanding to know by what authority this particular person had been appointed. It seems that a certain fellow wanted to get in the service, and when he went to see the head of a department he was told to get a letter from my good friend the junior member for Ottawa. He wrote a letter of introduction, knowing no more about the fellow, I suppose, than about a stranger in the street, and the fellow got the job. Later on the other letter came wanting to know how he got appointed. It is true that sort of thing does not occur very often, but it is an instance of the routine that is gone through. After all, it is the heads of departments who engineer the appointments nine times out of ten, but the member of Parliament gets the blame; the member is simply the cat's-paw in the game. With regard to this circular, I know the two gentlemen who signed it. I was a little annoyed at receiving it. They are good fellows, but they have been in the service so long that, like a good many others, they think the period of leisure has arrived for them. Their talk about winning the war and what the people of Canada want, is piffle. I think these gentlemen should not interfere with members of Parliament. If these gentlemen had furnished us with some good reason why we should support the Bill, I would have been delighted to do it. But a sloppy thing like that circular is merely annoying.

Mr. BUREAU: Let us forget it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. Is this Bill going to control the appointment of senators? In the last election, a minister of the Crown is supposed to have bought off a candidate by offering him a senatorship. This minister was an old hand at the business, as he had done a similar thing before. In another

case, a new hand at the business was concerned. I should like to know if cases of that kind come under this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman will have to renew that question at another time.

Mr. J. READ: I notice in the editorial column of the Citizen, which, I presume, is a Government organ, the following:

> The Government has every reason to be displeased with the report, sent broadcast across the country, that the Civil Service Bill would be postponed till another session. The parties responsible for giving out such misleading information are apparently not anxious to see the Civil Service reformed by the abolition of patronage. Such reports tend to undermine the position of Union government; especially now that the government is undertaking the responsibility of railway ownership on a national scale, with the Canadian Northern added to the government railway system, it is essential that political patronage should be eliminated.

Paragraph (f) says:

> "Outside Service" means and includes the other officers, clerks and employees included in the public service, not being part of the Inside Service.

Then paragraph (g):

> "Public Service" means and includes all officers, clerks or employees in the service of the Crown or of Parliament.

That seeems all right, but at page 13 of the Bill you exclude the railway service. Some hon. gentlemen, like my hon friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) fortunately have not been in contact with the Government railway system of the Dominion. They do not have any Government railways running through their parts of the country. But eventually this Government is going to take over the railway systems of Canada, including the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific, so that we will have extensive Government ownership. If Government ownership is going to be thus extended, it is absolutely essential, if this Bill is going to be any benefit in eliminating patronage, that it be applied to the railway service as well as to any other part of the public service. If you were in my province, where we have one mile of Government railway to every 300 inhabitants and observed the position in regard to patronage, you would appreciate the importance of what I am trying to tell the committee. In the name of common sense, why should the railway service be eliminated from this Bill? It looks to me very suspicious. If the Government are really in earnest in their desire to give us this reform I am in favour of it.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

The reason for my attitude with regard to this measure is that I have seen the system worked out in England. In the Old Country they have almost entirely done away with the curse of patronage as administered by politicians. The system has done more than that. It has enabled a man, upon entering the public service, to know that his salary and his job are going to remain with him as long as he behaves himself and that he is not subject to being fired with a change of Government. The result is that men can afford to take a less wage, and millions and millions of pounds have been saved to the people of Great Britain from the very fact that they have adopted this principle of Civil Service reform. That is what is going to happen here. A great deal of the legislation that is passed now-a-days has particular reference to war times but this measure should be framed to meet the conditions which will exist when the war is over. An hon. gentleman on the other side pointed out that this was a good time for the Union Government to do something. In the name of common sense, let it do something under this Bill because up to the present it has done nothing beyond putting the country in a state of turmoil. I would strongly urge placing the Government railway system employees under the operation of this Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: I would like to call the attention of the minister to the definition of "Public Service."

> "Public Service" means and includes all officers, clerks or employees in the service of the Crown or of Parliament.

Are not all classes of officers, clerks or employees "employed in or under the several departments of the executive government of Canada" employees in the service of the Crown?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Well then "Public Service" includes the whole service of the Dominion?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It includes everybody who is in the employ of the Government, or the Parliament of Canada and only excepts railway and steamship employees and lighthouse keepers, I think.

Mr. BUREAU: "Public Service" includes the Civil Service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It does not include soldiers?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. BUREAU: But it includes every person in the employ of the Crown. I fail to see any difference.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Subsection (a) defining "Civil Service" might be struck out for all practical purposes. It does no good there, but it has been in the Civil Service Act for a great many years and I did not think it desirable to strike it out. It can do no harm and I wanted to follow the old Act as far as possible. The term "Public Service" is in the present Civil Service Act, but without any definition.

Mr. BUREAU: Let us take that section. You use "Civil Service" and "Public Service," and they mean the same thing?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The words "Public Service" are used throughout the Act. It is the better term and it includes everybody in the service.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there an accepted definition for the term public service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not other than this.

Mr. BUREAU: In the old Act there was a schedule to determine who were civil servants, and in the Superannuation Act they extended the definition to cover all, whether in the Inside or Outside Service.

Mr. MORPHY: Have the Civil Service Federation of Canada, on whose letter paper this circular was written, had this Bill before them and have they approved of it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot say whether they have approved of it or not. I know they had it before them and that the association made representations to the Government about certain clauses in the Bill.

Mr. MORPHY: What do the Government think of the federation, through their secretary and president, writing a circular to the members containing these words:

> We are addressing you because you are one of the directors in Canada's business enterprises and so responsible for the results.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is addressed to members of Parliament.

Mr. MORPHY: Yes.

> It would appear from recent items in the press that some influential agency is endeavouring to dissuade the Union Government from proceeding with the Bill for Civil Service Reform by the abolition of patronage in appointments and promotion to the Public Service.

Apparently the Civil Service have no confidence in the Union Government. Does the minister share the view that the Government should be under suspicion by Mr.. Grierson that the Government has been influenced in some way in regard to the passage of the Bill? Why should not members of Parliament have the same right and opportunity of seeing a Bill of this kind in advance, that is offered to the Civil Service? The Bill is sprung here one morning, and a day is given for general discussion, before the members of the House have even been able to read the measure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill has been on the file of the hon. gentlemen for at least two weeks, and probably three or four weeks.

Mr. MORPHY: Quite true, the Bill has been on the members' files and the fact of the minister saying that it is on the files would indicate he thinks that every member should have read it. There is another Bill on the files, the Bill to amend and consolidate the Railway Act, and I presume the minister would say because it is on the files that it should be read, digested and understood by the members of the House who, by their multifarious duties morning, afternoon and night, with committee work and correspondence, have no time to read either Civil Service Bills or Railway Bills of voluminous nature and fulfil their ordinary duties. I am beginning to feel that there is a nigger in the fence with regard to this Bill when the secretary of the Civil Service association, or the federated union, can dare to use language warning the members of the House that they are directors of the country's business and that they are responsible. If that responsibility is to be attached to me I am going to side with those who have already requested either that a committee be formed to look into this subject and bring forward a Bill next session, or that we take all the time necessary to go into every clause of this Bill so that we may know when its consideration is concluded what "Civil Service" means.

I have an item which I think I should bring up here with regard to appointments. I am entirely in favour of the principle of this Bill, and I am anxious to get rid of every vestige of patronage. When I was first elected to Parliament I went to the local committees and asked them to take the patronage away from me, because I did not want it. The cry was then raised, "You will be responsible, you will have to take it yourself." Well I have had no trouble, and the matter has not bothered me. The only trouble I have had has arisen since I came here lately, concerning a certain ap-

pointment. A deputy undertook to recommend to a minister the appointment of a man in my county to a responsible position upon an international cheese board. The Government appointed a man who had the capacity all right, but whose son was married to a girl who had four brothers at the front. That man was out against Union Government in the riding that I represent, in South Perth, and in West Huron or North Huron.

Mr. BUREAU: He was a wise man.

An hon. MEMBER: He's all right.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member for Three Rivers says this man was wise, and another hon. gentleman says he is all right. I am not complaining, the party in question is a free man. The young woman to whom I have referred was married to this man's son, had four brothers at the front: one had been just killed, another has since been killed, the third has been wounded, and the fourth is still on active service. The husband's father and the husband both declared that the woman would never be allowed to poll her vote. They prevented her from polling her vote as a soldier's sister, and she did not poll it. Now the appointment of that man to the position in question seared and shocked the conscience of the loyal people in the county which I represent. It seared and shocked the conscience of those who had not voted. I think it seared and shocked the conscience of a few pro-Germans, the thing was so heinous in its character. I spoke to the minister about the appointment, and he said that for his information he had depended upon his deputy.

I do not blame him, he was new in the position, but I want to tell hon. gentlemen that deputies assume powers that usurp the ordinary functions of members of parliament who ought to know about these appointments. The deputy in question might have inquired from somebody. I do not want to be consulted in such matters, but as member for the riding I do not want to be insulted, and I shall not stand for that sort of carelessness in the future, either from the Civil Service or anybody else. I think there should be some decorum displayed in connection with these matters, and some courtesy, and reasonable attention paid to the position of the member by ministers and deputies, so that a man will not be held in contumely and contempt by things being done in his riding for which people hold him responsible, although he has had nothing to say in regard to them.

I hope the Civil Service will remember that there are duties devolving on them towards the public men of this country, and if members are not to be consulted as to who is to be appointed to positions, at least they should be consulted as to whether any reason exists for not selecting such men as I have described.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Will the minister be kind enough to tell us why the employees of the Government railways do not come under this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An exception was made of the employees of the Government Railway System because it was found difficult to apply the Act to that service. When the resolution was before the House some four or five weeks ago, I stated that during the recess the Civil Service Commission were to make an investigation into that class of employees and endeavour if possible to arrive at some method of putting them under the Act, and if the Commission are able to make any practical suggestion, next session it will be considered.

Mr. DEVLIN: May I ask the minister if the Civil Service Commissioners themselves come under the operation of this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Commissioners are deputy heads.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understood the minister to say that deputy heads come under the operation of the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They do. They are under the Civil Service Act, of course, except as to appointment.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the deputy ministers hereafter be appointed by the Commission, or by the Crown?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By the Crown.

Mr. DEVLIN: And the Civil Service commissioners will be appointed by the Crown?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: A few minutes ago the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) spoke of other commissions such as the Hospitals Commission and the Food Control Commission. What about the members of those bodies?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will be appointed by the Crown.

Mr. DEVLIN: And will the members of the War Purchasing Commission, and these other commissions, also be appointed by the Crown?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, but not their staffs.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood the minister to say in the early part of his remarks that public service covered all the temporary employees at present employed under any of these commissions or war boards?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Later on, the minister in answer to some other gentleman, gave another explanation that seemed to enlarge the scope of his first statement. I refer to his statement that the expression "public service" extends all through the Act. Will my hon. friend explain what he meant by that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The words "public service" occur in the present Civil Service Act but they had no definition. I really do not know why they were put in. The definition of Civil Service, my hon. friend will see by reference to subsection (a) of section 2, includes officers, clerks and employees in all of the several departments of the executive Government of Canada. We thought that the definition of public service was somewhat wider and would include everybody in the employ of the Crown, or of Parliament, and particularly it was designed to cover the employees of commissions, such as the Canada Food Board and the War Purchasing Commission, so that hereafter the employees of these commissions would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MURPHY: Then the Bill covers more than a temporary purpose?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Are the heads of these commissions to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. PROULX: Why?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think it would be desirable or practicable that heads of commissions should be appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. PROULX: I understand that under this Bill only deputy ministers will be appointed by the Governor in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: That refers, then, to the members of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is true.

Mr. PROULX: Why should not the heads of other commissions be appointed by the members of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The heads of commissions are but temporary employees, and they are selected for a special purpose. I do not think it would be fair or practicable that they should be appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DEVLIN: I would like to follow up the questions I asked a few minutes ago respecting these outside commissions. They are classed, I understand, as in the Outside Service. Am I right?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think they are classified at all either as Outside or Inside. They are temporary employees.

Mr. DEVLIN: Well, then, they are not classified by this Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They come within the definition of public servants. They do not belong to the Civil Service properly, either Inside or Outside, but they are in the public service.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understand that, but the moment this Act passes it will apply only to what is known as the present Inside Service, not to what is known as the Outside Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not correct. I have stated more than once that all appointments to the Outside Service will fall within the Bill, subject to some exceptions. I wish the hon. gentleman would leave the consideration of that matter until we reach the section.

Mr. DEVLIN: It has reference to this very section. If I left it I could not come back to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have explained that matter several times and have called the attention of the Committee to the exact clause, section 41. I think it is hardly fair we should be discussing it again.

Mr. DEVLIN: I don't want to be unfair to the minister; I don't think I have been—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I want to make progress, that is all.

Mr. DEVLIN: I did not have section 41 in mind at all, but rather section 55 dealing with the Outside Service:

> 55. The Commission shall, as soon as practicable after the passing of this Act, after consultation with the several deputy heads and other principal officers and employees, prepare schedules containing lists of the positions and the duties and salaries attached thereto.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That clause has reference to the organization of the outside Service and also of the Inside Service.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not satisfied as to the definition of "public service." If the term "public service" includes everything, we can leave out the definition "Civil Service," and I still stand by my proposition that it should be defined as follows: "Public service" means and includes all officers, clerks and employees in the service of any commission constituted by virtue of an Act of Parliament, whereby the mode of appointment, dismissal, and so on, are therein determined. That would bring the employees of the Senate and the House of Commons under the definition of Civil Service. As the definitive clause is now drawn we do not know what it means. It says:

"Civil Service" means and includes all classes of officers, clerks and employees in or under the several departments of the Executive Government of Canada and in the office of the Auditor General and in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, appointed by the Governor in Council or other competent authority before the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two—

I suppose these men might request superannuation or take advantage of any law passed by this Parliament to protect Civil servants for performing faithful duty to the country. Men employed since 1882 have worked for thirty-six years for the Government, and I suppose they are entitled to some recompense. The clause goes on:——

—or thereafter appointed or employed in the manner provided in the Civil Service Act for the time being, in force.

We do not know what employees these are, or anything about them. I would substitute for that definition the following:

"Civil Service" means and includes all officers, clerks and employees in the service of the Crown or of Parliament.

I want to protest against anything which will take away from the Act, if we are going to pass it—and I am in favour of it, and think we should pass it,—the power to appoint the personnel of commissions such as the Bureau of Public Information headed by Mr. Nicholls, and other commissions which are the result of the very prolific Orders in Council we have to-day.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is why the definition of "public service" was put in the Bill, to cover just such cases as my hon. friend suggests.

[Mr. Devlin.]

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask why the term "Civil Service" has been defined, if it covers everything?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That word rather denotes the purpose of the Bill. It is an old section, and it was not considered desirable to revise entirely every section of the Act. We might very well drop the definition "Civil Service" altogether, but I do not think it would be well to do that.

Mr. MORPHY: Why not say that the "Civil Service" means all officers, clerks and employees in the service of the Crown or in the public service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Except that the word "public service" is used in another sense throughout the Bill.

Mr. MORPHY: Why not leave "Civil Service" out and say that the "public service" means all that the former term includes?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In speaking on this matter yesterday, I expressed my inability to distinguish between "Civil Service" and "public service," and that may account for my inability to see where this section covered the Pensions Commission. I understand from the explanation that has been given that that commission would come under the term "public service."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The Bill says:

"Public Service" means and includes all officers, clerks or employees in the service of the Crown or of Parliament.

I would assume from the wording of that section that it would include the men who are in the public service across the sea at the present time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is military service, not Civil Service.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would imagine surely that that is public service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is public service in a sense, but strictly speaking it is military service, and there is a separate statute covering matters of that kind.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: May I ask if the public service has been administered in this sense since the passing of the Order in Council on February 13? In listening to the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) relate what had taken place in his constituency, I felt that as the representative for the constituency from which I come I possibly ought to know something about conditions in that riding.

An appointment has recently been made there which, I assume, would not come under the Civil Service Act. In this appointment is suggested one of the reasons to which I attribute the breaking down of the Military Service Act. The official to whom I have reference was appointed representative of the Department of Agriculture on the Leave of Absence Board for military district No. 1, although he had stumped the constituency during the election campaign in opposition to Union Government and to the Military Service Act.

Mr. BUREAU: It would appear from a return respecting the staff of the Food Controller's office that the chairman of the Food Board reserves to himself the power to say anything he pleases, notwithstanding the Civil Service Commission or anything in the Civil Service Act. In an Order in Council respecting staff and salaries of the Food Board I find the following:

> The minister observes that the Food Controller states that the above method of using item numbers to denote the maximum salaries that different members of the staff may be paid enables him to discharge incompetent persons and engage others without the necessity of having an Order in Council in each instance, and that this method has received the endorsation of the Auditor General.

Instead of saying: I want one clerk to copy letters, another to stamp envelopes, and so on, he says: I want so many men at from $1,000 to $2,000 a year each. This means that we are substituting a commissioner for the Governor in Council. The chairman of the board, who is not under the control of the Civil Service Commission, may say, as is sometimes done in the Estimates, that notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or any other law, $600,000 shall be paid out under the patronage system to the staff of the commission. I insist that this Act should cover every commission, and that no exception should be made unless set out in the statute creating the commission. Let us have a real Civil Service Act, not a mere camouflage which will make the people believe that something has been done and for which those who have promoted the Bill may take credit.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BUREAU: I submit that in what I have said the very basis of the whole Act is involved. If we do not define what really constitutes Inside Service or Outside Service, the Act is useless.

At one o'clock the committee rose.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Paragraphs (f) and (g) of section 2 read:

> (f) "Outside Service" means and includes the other officers, clerks and employees included in the public service, not being part of the Inside Service.
>
> (g) "Public Service" means and includes all officers, clerks or employees in the service of the Crown or of Parliament.

By reading that, we really have very little knowledge of what may be included in the Outside Service. On the canals and in many other places in Canada we have men employed, some for eight months, others for shorter terms. Some of them are called permanent employees and others temporary. I should like to know under what heading they will come. Will they come under this Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I do not want to be understood as opposing this measure. I have said that I agree with the principle of it, but I think we have, perhaps, gone a little far afield. The clamour throughout the country in the past has been, not so much in regard to the appointing of men to swing a bridge or run a post office, as against the patronage slate for all purchases in the various departments at Ottawa, as well as throughout Canada. In the past we have had to comply with that patronage slate, and I quite agree with the Government in their endeavour to abolish it. We have, however, very little information in regard to this Bill, and the acting minister has acknowledged that it is, to a large extent, a temporary Bill. If we read the clauses respecting the Outside Service, we see that the commission, immediately after the passage of this legislation, is to get together and formulate rules and regulations in connection with the Outside Service. I entirely agree with the sentiments expressed this morning by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), that such an important Bill as this, involving as much as it does, should not be brought up in the dying days of Parliament in the endeavour to have it rushed through. The members of this House are entitled to all possible information before the Bill is permitted to become law, and I would seriously recom-

mend to the acting minister to take into consideration the advice given this morning by the hon. member for Assiniboia, to withdraw this measure for the present and refer the matter to a committee of this House who may confer with the Civil Service Commission and with the heads of the different departments and have the regulations and rules all consolidated and brought down at the next session, as will evidently have to be done. We can then deal intelligently with the situation. Since the Order in Council was passed a few months ago we have been making appointments to the Outside Service in all parts of Canada. Why not let us go on during the recess under this Order in Council as we have been doing? Then perhaps by the next session of Parliament we shall have a better knowledge of how this legislation will work out, especially if the committee sees fit to appoint a committee of this House to consult with the Civil Service and the heads of the different departments.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I am absolutely opposed to the withdrawal of this Bill. It is the duty of the present session of Parliament to pass this Civil Service Bill, because of the solemn agreement entered into with the people of Canada. I do not see that there is anything to be gained by standing this Bill over until the next session. As was suggested by the Acting Minister of Finance, there may be some defects in the Bill, but I have never yet seen any Bill, except perhaps Bills relating to private legislation, in which there have not been some defects, and which have not, from time to time, required amendment. The suggestion of the hon. member is that this Bill be reintroduced into this House at the next session, and that a committee of members be appointed to work out a measure in the interests of the country. If there are defects in this Bill, I know of no method by which those defects can be made more apparent to the Government and the public than by enacting the Bill and putting it into force. I know of no body of men more competent to observe the defects in the operation of the Act than the members of the Government themselves, and more particularly the members of the Civil Service Commission, who will have charge of the administration of the Act. If we find that the time between now and the prorogation or adjournment of Parliament is not sufficient for us to discuss and pass this Bill, then it is our duty to come back here in August, as was suggested by the Prime Minister, in order to give the Bill full consideration. But it is the duty of this Government to the country and to the Civil Service at large that this Bill be placed upon the statute books this year and put into operation as speedily as possible.

[Mr. Sexsmith.]

Mr. COWAN: Like the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie), I desire to see this Bill passed, because I am anxious to get back to Regina, and should not like to return to that city if this Bill is not passed, because I know the attitude of my constituents in regard to this matter. After the explanation of the Acting Minister of Finance as regards section 2, I find it quite easy for me to support it. As I understand his explanation, this Bill brings within its operation all the employees of the Dominion of Canada, with the exception of the deputy ministers, the Civil Service Commissioners, the Militia of Canada, and the railway employees, and, as the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) has said, the senators of the Dominion. The deputy ministers should be left out of the operation of this law, because, as a firm believer in what is termed the pyramid system of organization, I feel that this Parliament should hold right under its control a certain body that will be directly responsible to it. As I take it, these deputy ministers will, hereafter be responsible to the ministers, the ministers being undoubtedly responsible to this Parliament, so that we shall have direct control over those deputy ministers. If at any time a deputy does something that he should not do, as we were told yesterday, by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) that one of them did, it would not take this Parliament very long to get rid of such a deputy minister, and in that way we would have the necesary efficiency in that particular department. The militia, of course, should be exempted from the operation of this legislation. The Civil Service Commisioners should also be exempted, because the commission should be directly responsible to this Parliament. I may be wrong, but I do not think we should ever attempt to bring the employees of the Government railways under the operations of this Act. Those railway employees should in my opinion, be under a separate commission, just as independent as this one will be, and just as subject to Parliament, but absolutely free from political control or interference. Where we have such a large body of men technically trained as railway men are, we should not attempt to bring

them under the control of a commission such as this, which could not attend to the work as efficiently as a commission of technically trained men, specially delegated for the purpose, could do. I think, therefore, everybody that should be reached by this legislation, is being reached. We should bring all of the Inside and Outside Services under the operation of such a Bill as this. The Bill may not be perfect, but I do not think that any law that could be regarded as absolutely perfect was ever passed by this or any other Parliament.

If they were all perfect, there would be no need for us to come here year after year to improve them. We must therefore treat this Bill as we would any other Bill. It must be considered in relation to present conditions and we can make any amendments in the future that are deemed desirable. I have no doubt we shall find defects in the Act, but we can deal with them next year just as we are dealing with the Bill to-day. The people in the section from which I come are very anxious to have this Bill passed, because they have seen some of the evils of patronage. I do not know whether this Bill touches the question of patronage in the matter of buying supplies, but that is a different matter altogether. Let us clean up patronage in the matter of appointments, and we can deal with the other matter later. I unhesitatingly support this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE: I suppose the public hangman comes under this clause. I think it is very important that we should include some one empowered to act as Civil Service executioner, for we know that many departments are over-manned. In the Printing Department, for instance, I am informed there are two hundred surplus men floating about doing nothing, and when I brought that fact to the notice of a responsible member of this Government he told me it would be political suicide to clean that department up. In the Statistics Branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce there are a hundred and thirty men doing what it takes only seventy-four men to do in the United States, and there would be between seven and eight hundred men in this branch in the United States if they engaged men on the scale we do in proportion to the amount of work to be done. I do not see in the Bill any provision for remedying these conditions. The hon. member for Lambton has said that the Bill will reduce our expenditure on the Civil Service by thirty or forty per cent. I have no doubt it should be reduced to that extent, but I do not see any means provided in the Bill for doing so. Section 10 of Part 2 provides that the present status of employees shall be preserved. Section 25 deals with the employment of extra assistance. It may be necessary to have extra help in certain departments at certain times on account of the growing business of the country, but I think the main business of the commission should be first to deal with the overmanning of departments. I think they could set a fine example to all municipal governments in this country, because I think I am safe in saying that there is hardly a municipality where three men are not employed to do the work of two. I think this matter should be considered, while we are dealing with the definitions under this clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I listened attentively this morning to the criticisms of this Bill. Most of the critics were in favour of the principle of the Bill, they said. I do not wish to question their sincerity, but it seems to me they took a very strange way of showing their love for the Bill. As the discussion proceeds, it seems plain either that we shall be here all summer or that the Bill will be talked out. I think in these strenuous times, when the news from the front is so serious, members of this House could be better engaged than in wrangling over this or any other Bill. I am an enthusiastic supporter of the principle of this Bill and of the abolition of the patronage system. It would seem from the discussion that some have a lingering love for the old system. We have heard about the benefits of having appointments made on the recommendation of the member for the constituency. That sounds very well, but as a matter of fact it has not been the practise in the past. In the constituency I represent the recommendations have not been made by the member for the last thirteen or fourteen years. When I was rejected by the people of that constituency, it was I who recommended the appointees, and not the member, and when I was elected as their representative I had nothing whatever to say about patronage; and that was the situation in nearly half the constituencies in Canada under the old system. I am very anxious to see this Bill go through at once. Whatever defects there are in the Bill will appear when the Act is in operation, and we can rectify them next session. This will not be the last session of this House, we hope. Let us put the Bill through at once and

get away, because I think we could be better employed elsewhere. But if the Bill is to be held up or talked out, and that seems to be the intention, I would beseech the Government to keep in force the Order in Council doing away with patronage. I am not much of a lover of Government by Order in Council, but the situation is such that I think the Government would be justified in retaining the Order in Council if this Bill does not pass this session. I am satisfied that the vast majority of the people of Canada would approve such action, and I am satisfied, notwithstanding all we have heard this morning, that a pronounced majority of the members of this House are favourable to the principle of this Bill and favourable to the abolition of the system of patronage.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I absolutely agree with my hon. friend that we could be better engaged than in discussing this Bill. That is one of the main reasons I urged that the Bill be withdrawn, and I again ask the minister to withdraw it. So far as I can see we are operating just as effectively with respect to the Inside and Outside Service under the Order in Council passed two months ago, as we could operate under this Bill. The Government could apply the Order in Council, and then next session after we have discovered the defect in the system we could discuss the matter more intelligently. If it is not true that the Order in Council is as effective as this Bill, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the last election the Prime Minister pledged himself to the elimination of patronage in appointments to the public service. This Bill has been introduced to implement that promise, and I therefore cannot acquiesce in the suggestion that it be withdrawn. It is true that we are now operating under the Order in Council, but that was largely a direction, and not an enactment, and there are grave doubts as to the power of the Government to pass an Order in Council covering the appointments to the Civil Service in the manner indicated in the Order in Council. It is therefore considered wise and businesslike on the part of the Government to give statutory effect to the principle of the Order in Council. If this Bill were entirely new, I could appreciate the objections raised by hon. gentlemen. But ninety-five per cent of the clauses are old and have been the law for many years. The substance of the new clauses was set forth in the resolution upon which this Bill is founded, and we had quite a lengthy discussion when that resolution was moved. That was some four or five weeks ago. Therefore, I fail to appreciate the contention that the House is taken by surprise in being asked to enact this Bill. This morning there were some suggestions made as to clause 2, particularly the definition of "Civil Service." As stated this morning, paragraph (a) of section 2, which defines the term "Civil Service," is really not necessary, and so I propose that the clause be struck out. I therefore beg to move:

That paragraph (a) of section 1 be struck out; that paragraph (e) of section be amended by striking out the words "that part of the Civil Service" and inserting in place thereof the words "those officers, clerks or employees who are"; that paragraph (d) of section 2 be amended by striking out the word "Public" and substituting therefor the word "Civil" and by striking out the words "or Parliament" and also that the paragraphs be relettered from (a) to (f) inclusive.

I suggest the striking out of the words "or of Parliament," because that is covered by a subsequent clause.

Mr. CURRIE: The Acting Minister of Finance said that members have had considerable time to examine this Bill during the interval since the Bill was introduced, and also that there had been some discussion on the resolution. The members of Parliament have been getting a little bit of information about this Bill, and about the activities of these gentlemen, and this is one of the things that I intend to bring before the House. This morning I made a reference to a letter that was written by a member of the Civil Service threatening, and endeavouring to intimidate, the members of this House into supporting this measure. We have also heard speeches in the House endeavouring to intimidate threatening that if it did not carry immediately this House would be prorogued until next August. Well, we are not afraid of having this House prorogued until next August. We have had sessions lasting almost a year, and that sort of thing does not go down with the members of this House at all. We might continue in session for four or five weeks longer with benefit to the public interest. There are many things that we might go into and discuss; for instance, the appointment of a curator of German property which has never been made although we have been at war for four years. A committee of this House might spend a few weeks investigating some of the commissions that have been operating under this Government. In reference to the

question of patronage, there is patronage and patronage. The most odious form of patronage is nepotism. The outcry of the public against the administration of patranage has not been in reference to the appointment of people. I challenge any of those hon. members who have been talking about the evils and troubles of patronage to point out one single case that has occurred in the last eight or ten years where any great mistake has been made in reference to appointments. There is such a thing as patronage in the Public Works Department and matters of that kind and those are the things that the people are talking about. The Civil Service is divided into two parts, the Inside and the Outside Service. The Inside Service has been under the commission and the Outside Service has not. Anybody who knows anything about these services will unhesitatingly say that in the great majority of cases the men of the Outside Service have higher qualifications and do much harder work than those in the Inside Service, although they do not get the same money at all. They have had this organization formed amongst the civil servants to get a little rise in pay. For my part, with reference to the Outside Service, I think we might have adopted the principle adopted in England and given them a war bonus of, say, ten per cent, because everybody knows that it is very difficult for the members of the Outside Service to live under the conditions that exist at the present time. Instead of giving them a ten per cent rise you give them this Bill, which means that when they ask for bread you give them a stone. There are two kinds of patronage. This Bill is the result of an agitation that has been carried on by the Civil Service organization. The circular I read this morning shows that that organization is endeavouring to intimidate members of Parliament. I shall go further and read you a letter that members of this organization have issued in order to carry on their agitation and to extend it to all parts of the country. I hold in my hand a letter issued by the secretary of the Canadian Postmasters' Association, in which he says:

Aurora, Ont., April 19, 1918.

Dear Postmaster:

Postmasters more than any other class feel the hardships of war prices owing to the small allowances given them by the Government.

It has been decided by our Association that the time has come when we should make a determined effort to secure relief.

You must help if success is to be achieved that is, if you desire it, we believe most if not all do—you ask how—well by writing to the Member for your district at Ottawa. Explain the amount of work done in your office each day—show the cost of hired help, if any—duties of office, hours of service, rent paid, and the amount paid you each month—compare the Government pay with what you could earn with the same labour on a farm or at some other occupation, but do not find fault with any Postmaster's salary as compared with your own. Write this letter in your own words but do it at once.

If you have a local paper published in your town or village will you kindly see the editor or publisher and have him print an article calling the attention of the public and the Government to the hardships imposed upon us through the adoption of commissions dating back to Confederation—explain to him how the war has added many millions of letters and circulars, etc., sent out by the different departments of the Government upon which there is so much extra work but not a cent of pay.

Now for a big united effort and don't fear to talk plain to your Member. If you feel like quitting your job in disgust, say so. When you have done this sign the attached counterfoil and mail it to me.

This came from the town of Aurora, which I understand is also the native town of the Deputy Postmaster General. In every other department a similar agitation, a similar propaganda, is carried on, and we know very well that the agitation has blossomed forth in respect to this Bill. Now, hon. members will wonder what is going to happen to the patronage business? When this House divests itself of its power, as it is going to do under the Bill, it will have deprived itself of one of its ancient privileges and prerogatives—the right to say who shall be appointed to positions in the public service. Then the right of appointment will come not from the Crown, not from the minister, but from the Civil Service Commission. Will the commission make the appointment? I am going to tell hon. members that when the commission want to appoint somebody in their districts they will send a letter to the postmaster or the custom house official there, and these men will nominate appointees to the Civil Service in Ottawa. That is how the appointments are going to be made. Is not that patronage? One of the most prominent men in the city of Toronto was filling the columns of the papers a few months ago with weird appeals and complaints about the appointment of people to the Civil Service, and at the very same time he was seeking the appointment of his own daughter to a job in the Civil Service, and she got the position. There is a lot of hypocrisy in this world, but I think I am talking

to a lot of hard-headed men who do not take any stock in hypocrisy. Will the public interest be better served by having appointments made by the member, through the minister who is responsible, or by leaving the appointing in the hands of irresponsible people who will select whoever they like?

Now, a word about appointments to these commissions, and which are not to come under the operation of the Civil Service Act, although those staffs will. I think it is time we called a halt to the appointment of commissions for everything. This attempt at the devolution of responsibility from the Government to commissions, is something the country is wide awake to now and is taking notice of. The other day as I sat at luncheon in one of the prominent clubs in this city, a gentleman who occupied the seat alongside of me, said: "Currie, you notice all these people who are sitting here; let us count how many representatives of commissions are sitting around this room?" We started to count, and we named nineteen of them. Each one of these commissions performs functions that should be discharged by some department of this Government over which the Government should have authority to rule and as to whose proceedings they should have a say. This Parliament is becoming nothing but a rubber stamp to initial the doings of these different bodies.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The gentlemen to whom the hon. gentleman has referred were all club men.

Mr. CURRIE: They were all club men sitting round a table in that club. You can go there every day and count nineteen or twenty-five of them if you wish. I think the time has come for Parliament to put itself on record, to speak plainly and act openly. This Civil Service Commission is another commission whose hands we are strengthening and to whom we are furnishing greater powers. What is happening already? Everybody knows well, and nobody better than the ministers of the Crown, that there are several services so organized here that the members of the service, from the deputy down, will defy a minister and evade what he asks them to do, and he has no recourse. There are many men going around the Civil Service who do not do a day's work, in fact they are doing nothing but stirring up trouble, and at the same time drawing money from the people of the country. The people would be very much shocked to know that but it is a fact. These men do not do a minute's work, let alone a day's work, in their departments. They are walking around here, going to public meetings and organizing various societies, and setting themselves up as censors of the public, and all that sort of thing. If the minister in charge of a department says a word as to what is happening he is met immediately with a threat that the majority of his staff will walk out. Talk about the tyranny of the labour unions. There is one thing about the labour unions, they have men over them who are sensible and will not let them walk out without cause—they are subject to discipline. But this Bill takes the control of the discipline of the Civil Service entirely out of the hands of a minister; it will deprive him of all power to do anything with the men under him. As I said you are loading a gun that has not got a trigger on it. You cannot fire these men even if you want to, they will stay in the service for all time.

The Acting Minister of Finance has said that this Bill has been a long time before the House. Certainly it has, and the longer it is before the House the more we realize what a great mistake was made in introducing it. The Prime Minister is a very human man with a big heart. Very often his attention is called to something, and great pressure is brought to bear upon him to carry into effect what is sought. The propaganda to which I referred is worked upon him, in the same way as it is worked upon the members. He receives thousands of letters about a certain thing, and in the fullness of his heart he decides that it is better to do what is asked than to have difficulty. The demands of the Civil Service have been before this House for many years. A few years ago experts were brought in from the four quarters of the earth to go through the Civil Service and to make recommendations with the object of rendering it more efficient. The experts went to the departments and they made recommendations. Those recommendations were laid on the table of the House and Parliament was supposed joyfully to adopt them. I do not think any one of the recommendations made at that time has ever been carried out. There may be one, but if so, I do not know of it. Why the Civil Service organizations were so strong the ministers could not take action. As I have already said, the ministers are defied and they know that as well as I do. What we should do with the present Bill is to put

power in the hands of the ministers so that they shall have the power of dismissal.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have the power.

Mr. CURRIE: But you do not exercise it. I can name two or three men who have made themselves offensive to the whole Canadian public, and you do not dare to dismiss them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Name.

Mr. CURRIE: I could name them, but I will not do so. It would only make trouble and I am too good a Canadian to start trouble unnecessarily. But these men have done things that they should not have done, and the organ of the Civil Service in Ottawa is continually filled with denunciations of the Government. I would like to take that journal and read its contents to the members of the House, and I have no doubt at all they would throw this Bill out in five minutes. The columns of that journal are continually filled with attacks not only on members of the Government, but on gentlemen on the other side. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in office they often received a broadside from behind consisting of high explosives from the journal of the Civil Service. Those hon. gentlemen when they were in power could not do anything in their departments but what we of the Opposition knew all about it, showing that many members of the Civil Service are not true to their salt. I do not class all the members of the Civil Service in that category. Many of them are entitled to the highest praise, big men, who are receiving far too little money for the services they are performing. These men are doing three-fourths of the work, and the other one-fourth is distributed amongst chaps who do not do anything but walk around and look nice. Some of the members of the House are sympathetic towards this Bill, and other similar measures, because they are of the opinion they are going to pass something which will be of benefit to the public. It is not the appointment of men to office that has raised the cry about patronage. That cry has originated from such jobs as the building of sawdust wharves, and the expenditures of large sums of money on works that are not necessary in the interests of the public at all. That is what constitutes patronage, so called, and not the appointment of a few civil servants to office. In my opinion the people of this country will not stand for the appointment of men to the public service not being in the hands of the member whom they have chosen and whom they have made responsible. They certainly will not approve of handling those appointments over to the local postmaster or the local custom house officer instead of to the member for the constituency.

That is the system that is shown clearly through the method of organization they have introduced, and if the hon. member for South Perth had the means of finding out how the appointment he mentioned was made, no doubt he would find that some postmaster wrote a private letter to the department.

Mr. MORPHY: It was one of the deputies who undertook to do the job.

Mr. CURRIE: Did the deputy know the man?

Mr. MORPHY: No, he did not, or he would not have appointed him.

Mr. CURRIE: How did he get his name at all? Who sent the man's name to him?

Mr. MORPHY: You will have to ask the deputy.

Mr. CURRIE: It was probably the postmaster.

Mr. MORPHY: No chance.

Mr. CURRIE: However, that is the condition of affairs, and if members of this House feel like absolving themselves of all responsibility for appointments, and turning them over to postmasters, customs and excise officers, landing waiters and men like that, of course, they may go ahead and do it. That is what this Bill provides. If the acting minister thinks there should still be one particle of responsibility attaching to members of this House—and some responsibility should attach to them in their own ridings—then let the Bill stand. We have an Order in Council dealing with this question now. I say, let us try out the system outlined in that Order in Council and see how it works out for six or seven months, and then we will know whether or not it is a good system. The Government can cancel an Order in Council at any time, but if you pass a Bill like this it is necessary to come back to Parliament to have the matter righted. That is my argument, and I think I have put on the records of the House sufficient evidence to show hon. gentlemen how the oracle will be worked in their ridings. I do not think any man of sense would stand up in this House and support that method of patronage as the proper one as against the method that has prevailed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened to what the Acting Minister of Finance said a moment ago, and he needs not to be assured of my full sympathy for Civil Service reform. But I do not think he is backed up by his own friends. There seems to be a cleavage between the goody-goody element in the Unionist party and the other fellows. Indeed, it seems very clear that the Prime Minister himself, who, my hon. friends claim, is in favour of the Bill, is not much enamoured of this legislation, otherwise he would be in his seat and would stand by my hon. friend and see that the Bill is carried through. What have we seen since the beginning of this debate? I have seen my friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid), smiling quietly not saying a word. Of course, the railway employees do not come under the jurisdiction of the commission; they will remain under the close jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways and Canals. When my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) said we must not expect the railway men to be put under the Civil Service Commission because they are experts and technical employees, and so on, that the commission could not deal with them, he does not seem to know that the technical officers of every department come under the jurisdiction of this same commission. I say to the acting minister: If you want to abolish patronage, do not give us a sham, give us the real article, and put every railway employee from one end of Canada to the other under this commission, otherwise you will not be sincere in the eyes of the people. The acting minister, turning to his friends—I do not know if he was addressing himself to the Tories or to the Grits—addressing my friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) with some severity, said that the Prime Minister had given a solemn pledge at the last general election that there would be Civil Service reform. Surely my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance is not serious. He knows just as well as I do that the pledges given by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government cannot be taken seriously by the country more especially on this question of Civil Service reform. He should remember when we were sitting together on this side of the House, and poking the ribs of his present leader. He recollects that in 1907 the Prime Minister, in his celebrated Halifax platform, a platform which was engineered to defeat my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) just as much as his friends on this side of the House, had for the goody-goody element of the country a Civil Service reform plank. Here is what he said, when my hon. friend was the running mate of the right hon. gentleman in Halifax, that is in 1911, when he was running against him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Prime Minister said—

Mr. TWEEDIE: I rise to a point of order. What paper is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am just using a refresher.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, I think I am entitled to the name of the document from which the hon. gentleman is reading, or else he should lay it on the Table.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is too fresh.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I may be too fresh, but I would not be ashamed to give the name of any document I quoted from.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member for Maisonneuve has the floor, and no interruption, of course, can be allowed without the permission of the member who has the floor. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the same rule which applies in the House applies also in committee. While I am on my feet I shall ask the hon. member for Maisonneuve not to wander too far away from the clause under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am simply reading the article for the benefit of the acting minister.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You need not read that article for me; it was read the other day and I remember it quite well.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The other day, when the matter was up, the acting minister said that later on we would be dealing with this Bill, and then it could be brought before the House. I wish to say to my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) that I did not wish to be rude to him. After I am through I will send him the paper. But I would like to ask the acting minister: Is it not a fact that during the election of 1911 the then leader of the Conservative party, the stern, unbending leader, when he was running against the Acting Minister of Finance in Halifax, gave his pledge that he would bring about an extension of Civil Service reform? The years 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916 all passed. In the year 1917 my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was a candidate again

in Halifax. He had lost his running-mate, (Sir Robert Borden) who ran in King's county, but this time my hon. friend ran for the Union Government, and again the Prime Minister comes out before the public with the pledge, and on the 15th November last he gave a pledge of Civil Service reform, as follows:

Civil Service Reform.

With a view to extending the principle of the present Civil Service Act to the Outside Service, and thus to abolish patronage and to make appointments to the public service upon the sole standard of merit, the Civil Service Commission has already been directed to make a report to the Prime Minister as to the necessary steps for that purpose. Such arangements will be subject to the existing regulations, which give preference in appointments to returned soldiers who are duly qualified.

That pledge was given. What happens? How can we believe, how can my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance believe, in his present leader's pledge? He did not carry out the pledge of 1911; he did not carry out the pledge of 1917, because shortly after the elections, in defiance of the goody-goody element in his new Cabinet, he appointed Mr. Acres as postmaster at Ottawa. He made five or six appointments after the passage of that famous Order in Council, disregarding completely the pledge he had given the country and the susceptibilities of the goody-goody element. This promise was made by the right hon. gentleman at the last election in order to sway the public in favour of the Union Government. By whom is this Bill supported to-day? Observe our silence on this side; the quarrel is on the other side of the House. And who is most anxious to railroad this Bill through the committee? The President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) who has given Mr. Beaufort and the secretarial organizations all the fat jobs in his department in order to boom himself before the people; who is so anxious to cross the ocean to represent Canada at the Imperial Conference and advertise himself as the great saviour of the cause of union in the last election. This scheme is at the bottom of this legislation, otherwise why this agitation, why this precipitation? If my hon. friend is sincere he will accept the views of the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) who sat on this side during the last Parliament, and whose remarks a moment ago were common sense. Do you not see that your house is divided against itself?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are you in favour of the Bill?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am in favour of the Bill, but not of a sham reform. Will the hon. gentleman put railway employees under the proposed Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I gave good reasons why they should not come under it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman gave not good reasons, but pretexts. He cannot make any progress with his legislation in this form. If he will follow the sound advice given by the Hon. member from Qu'Appelle, he will let this Bill stand for further investigation and when next session comes we will see what can be done.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: To whom does my hon. friend refer when he uses the expression "goody-goody"?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will drop a line to Mr. Beaufort; he will let me know.

Mr. CHABOT: I hold no brief for the Civil Service in Ottawa, nor am I here to defend their rights or interests or to eulogize them. The attack, however, which has been made on the service in Ottawa by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is both unwarranted and uncalled for. I consider his criticism far too caustic, too harsh, even unfair. If the picture which he draws of conditions existing in the service is a true and accurate one, members of the House and the people of Canada must come to the conclusion that the Civil Service is a very inferior body and that the cases of inefficiency and incompetency among them are too numerous to mention. Canada is not leading the way in the matter of Civil Service reform. Civil Service reform has been carried out in other countries with very gratifying results and if Canada could emulate the examples of other countries in that respect, our service, which at present is second to none, would be materially improved in efficiency. I have had a great deal to do with the civil servants of Ottawa. My relations with them have been very intimate; my experiences in that line have been varied and extensive. While some men in the service are not up to the mark and some departments are overmanned, we have in the service men worthy of the positions which they occupy, men thoroughly well qualified, men who do honour to themselves and to the positions which they hold.

4 p.m.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Either I expressed myself very imperfectly, or the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has misunder-

stood or misrepresented me. I did not intend to suggest that the Bill should be held over and that we should act under Order in Council. I strongly advised the Government to push the Bill through at once, but I suggested that in case the Bill were talked out, as it appears likely to be, the Order in Council should be kept in force so that we should not go back to the miserable old system from which we desire to be freed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what I understood my hon. friend to say. He suggested what should be done if the Bill were talked out, and I pointed out that the Bill was being talked out by members not on this side, but on the other side of the House.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: My hon. friend is helping.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) intimated that he would not be induced to alter his opinion because of any threats which had been made. I made no threat. I suggested that it was the duty of Parliament to deal with the Civil Service Bill during this session, and that if we were crowded for time it was our duty to come back here in the fall and dispose of this, or of any other legislation which required attention. I was surprised to hear the attack which he made on civil servants generally. If he formed the impressions which he appears to have from the civil servants with whom he is associated in his riding, it is time that we had an investigation of that body and cleaned them all out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The member for North Simcoe said that practically no one in his riding was in the Civil Service.

Mr. TWEEDIE: He talked about civil servants as if they were blacklegs and thieves; as if they were bringing undue pressure to bear on members of this House.

Mr. CURRIE: That is unparliamentary language, and should be withdrawn. I said nothing of the kind. The hon. member is putting words into my mouth that I never uttered.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think so.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, if you ask me to withdraw those words, I shall withdraw them.

The CHAIRMAN: All I ask is that the hon. gentleman who now has the floor (Mr. Tweedie) accept the statements made by the member for North Simcoe.

[Mr. Thomson.]

Mr. TWEEDIE: I accept the statements which he made, and I interpret them as nothing more or less than a distinct insult to the whole body of civil servants throughout Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) is trying to put me in wrong with the civil servants. I have been more in touch with the civil servants of Canada than the hon. member for Calgary has, and during my public career I have had their support; with the hon. gentleman it is different. I did not insult the public service. I said that there were a great many good civil servants in the outside service and that the Government should supplement their salaries.

Mr. TWEEDIE: My hon. friend has made this statement—

Mr. CURRIE: I have the floor now; the hon. member is young in this Parliament yet. With regard to my saying that civil servants were continually threatening the ministers and endeavouring to have their own way, it is only a few hours since the member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) who is now so zealous in his commendation of civil servants, said that since appointments and promotions had been taken off his hands—a promotion means the same as an appointment—he had felt as if he were in a new heaven.

Mr. CHABOT: I referred to the system.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member used to have a levee every morning when we were in the old building. I have seen queues of applicants almost a quarter of a mile long waiting to get into his office.

Mr. CHABOT: The efficiency of the Civil Service has, no doubt, been improved by the appointments made through my influence or upon my recommendation.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member has hardly had time to eat his meals on account of the numbers of applicants for positions. With all due regard to my hon. friend and with all due regard to the Civil Service, I have said again and again that there are good people in the Civil Service, the best people in the country—the Civil Service could not get along were it not for such people—but I say that there are in the Civil Service a number of people whose services could be dispensed with. I have been on committees that have had to do with departments of Government, and I

know whereof I speak. I have no hesitation in saying this. I am not afraid of the Civil Service, neither in my own riding, nor at Ottawa, and threats by the Civil Service or by any hon. member, be he layman or lawyer, in this House representing the Civil Service, cannot frighten me. If I have to say a word about the Civil Service, I shall have my say and shall say it without hesitation.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member to be permitted to make a speech? The hon. member rose to correct a statement which I made. I was perfectly willing that he should do that, but he is going on and delivering a speech. The hon. member has delivered a speech against the civil servants; now he is compelled to deliver one in their favour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: It is not necessary for you, Sir, to rule. You know the hon. member is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I desired to rule that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) had the floor and was entitled to make a speech, but I wished at the same time to appeal to the parliamentary experience of the hon. member for North Simcoe and to ask him to confine his remarks to the clause under discussion. The clause under discussion is a definition of the words and terms and expressions used in the Bill, and I think the hon. member will himself admit that he is going a little too far afield.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not think the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) asked you to rule as to whether I should go away from the point or not. I think he said I was making a speech.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. If the hon. member for North Simcoe does not wish to abide by the ruling of the Chair, he has no right to discuss it; all he can do is to appeal to the House for a decision.

Mr. CURRIE: There has been propounded in this House a new rule, that when the Speaker makes a ruling the matter should not be argued. It has always been one of the principles of the House of Commons that when a ruling is made it is possible for members to express themselves as to whether they think the ruling is right or not; and if the Chairman does not think a point is well taken, I have seen the House of Commons adjourn and the Speaker even go and consult the ancient authorities. All I said was that I accepted the ruling of the Chair as far as not wandering from the point was concerned. What the hon. member for West Calgary asked a ruling on was not that; he asked a ruling as to whether I could make a speech or not. I think I am perfectly in order in making a speech.

Mr. TWEEDIE: That was not my point of order. While I was making my speech, the hon. member for North Simcoe rose to interrupt, and I sat down. Now the hon. member is going on and making a speech. I sat down in accordance with your suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood, perhaps, wrongly, that the hon. member for West Calgary had terminated his remarks when I gave the floor to the hon. member for North Simcoe—

Mr. TWEEDIE: I had not finished.

The CHAIRMAN: —but I shall make it a point, the moment the hon. member for North Simcoe has terminated his remarks, to see the hon. member for West Calgary and give him an opportunity to continue his speech.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member for West Calgary sat down before I rose at all. He is drawing on his imagination when he says that I interrupted him before he finished his speech. If he is anxious to take the floor, I shall give it to him for a while.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I accept with a great deal of pleasure the laudatory remarks which have been uttered by the hon. member for North Simcoe in regard to the Civil Service. I wish to call the attention of the committee again to the question of threat which was referred to by the hon. member. He read a letter which was sent to him by the Postmasters' Association, and he indicated to the committee that that was in the nature of a threat; that that was duress which was being used by the members of that association to force legislative action by the members of this House of Commons. He resents the fact that any organization of civil servants should have the presumption to address their requests and demands to this House or to any individual member of the House of Commons. The class of civil servants with whom he has had experience must be vastly different from those with whom I have in the past had experience, and while he may not personally care to receive deputations or correspondence from the members of the Civil Service in his riding, I can assure you, Sir, that I am only too glad at any time to re-

ceive any communication or any deputation, or to hear any complaint which the civil servants may have in regard to the treatment received by them at the hands of the Dominion of Canada. This House has, in the past, always received deputations in regard to various trade matters. Have we ever heard the hon. member for North Simcoe utter a word of protest in this House because the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has sent deputation after deputation to lobby the members of this House? Have we ever heard protests from him because they have put into his mail box in this House circulars pleading their particular cause? Have we ever heard complaints from him because people have come here seeking bounties on lead or zinc, or bonuses for various industries which are being carried on throughout this country? Are we going to allow such people to importune the members of Parliament, individually and through the Government, and then as representatives of the people, say here that no organization of members of the Civil Service shall have permission to send deputations to make complaints to members of this House? It is our duty to receive their protests, to hear their representations, and to give our earnest consideration to them, just as much as it is our duty to see that any other class of people in this country receive justice and fair treatment at the hands of this House.

So far as I am concerned, and as long as I may be in the public service, I intend to give heed to their complaints and to do whatever I can to ameliorate the conditions under which they may be working. Every member of this House realizes that the conditions under which the civil servants have been working for the past number of years have been more or less in the nature of an outrage. We realize that there has been no uniformity of pay for various clerks in the different departments doing the same kind of work; that there have been bonuses given to some and not to others. We realize that the highly paid employee will sometimes receive a bonus of $100, whereas the small salaried man will receive a bonus of only $50. Such treatment is wrong. The duty of this Government is forthwith to revise the whole scale of salaries paid to the lower employees throughout the Dominion, and to see that they get at least a living wage. We have had one petition presented by the postmen throughout the Dominion, asking that they be started at a minimum wage of $1,000 per annum, and that they be allowed to work up to $1,400, no matter how long they are in the Civil Service. Is there anything unjust or unfair in that request? How is it lowering the dignity of the members of this House to receive such a petition or to discuss such a question? We now realize that those men are working for a wage on which they cannot meet the ordinary cost of living. It is absolutely impossible for many civil servants in this country to live a decent, honest and comfortable life. We must not think that because they are Dominion civil servants, they are slaves who can be ground under our heel.

I congratulate them on organizing associations, whether it be of postmen, mail clerks, land's title men or any other body. I think they have come to the realization that in unity there is strength, and that they must have organizations through which to present their claims to the members of the House of Commons and to the Government itself, to get justice not only for the individual, but for every class of civil servant. So far as their communications and delegations are concerned, I submit that it is the duty of every hon. member of this House to hear their complaints, and when he realizes they are suffering, his efforts should be directed towards ameliorating the conditions under which they are working. They should be as highly paid and are as respectable a class of employees as those who are to be found working for the large corporations doing business in this country. With very few exceptions, I have nothing but praise for the civil servants. The hon. member for North Simcoe says he has heard no complaints from the civil servants themselves, and that the difficulties that have come before him have been wholly in connection with patronage in the letting of contracts and the purchase of supplies. I have heard complaints from the civil servants for years. I have heard them complain because some person with pull in the post office or some other department has been appointed at a higher salary over the heads of men who have served for ten and fifteen and even twenty-five years. That is the main grievance of the civil servants, and there has been a demand from the civil servants themselves throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion and a demand from the public; which must be heeded by this Parliament, that steps be taken towards relieving the conditions under which the civil servants of this country have been suffering for a number of years.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: If I may be permitted to say a few words—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to have it said, after the hon. gentleman has begun his speech, that I am calling him to order, but I must once more read the rule which I read last night, and again this morning, but which seems to have been forgotten:

Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

We have wandered very far from that rule. Yesterday we did it with the consent of the committee, but to-day, unwittingly, the members one after the other have failed to observe the rule. It is a very difficult position for the Chairman to be in. A moment ago I called to order the hon. member for North Simcoe, who was no more guilty than the other members who had preceded him. There must come a time when hon. members must be called to order or no progress whatever will be made with the Bill. I appeal to the hon. members to assist the Chairman in enforcing the rules of the House, and to confine their remarks as much as possible to the clause under consideration.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think if the Chairman will maintain that stand, the House will support him.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What I intended to say is not relevant to the clause under consideration. It had been my intention simply to refute some of the arguments that have been made against the Bill by hon. members. I could cite cases by the hour on the other side to show that the Act is really required, but I shall not make the argument, as I will not be the first to offend against the rule.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Civil Service Commission:

Mr. DEVLIN: I think it is somewhat unjust to pay the Civil Service commissioners a lower salary than is paid to some of the men they appoint, or at all events a lower salary than men will receive whose qualifications must be certified to by the commissioners. I call the minister's attention to what seems to me an injustice.

Mr. CHABOT: I agree with what my hon. friend has said. I think the fair-mindedness, integrity and ability of the Civil Service commissioners is universally recognized. The placing of the Outside Service under the commission will bring about forty or fifty thousand more men within their jurisdiction, and their scope of action will necessarily be widened. I think that putting the Civil Service under the commission will save the country many thousands of dollars a year, and for these reasons, and many others I could enumerate, I think the salaries of the commissioners should be increased. I think they should get the same salaries that other commissioners in different spheres are receiving, because the Civil Service Commission, in my opinion, is the most important of them all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Representations have been made by several hon. gentlemen to that effect, but the decision of the Government has been that no increase shall be made this year, but that the matter shall be considered at the next session of Parliament. I might point out that the latter part of this section is a new one, namely:

Provided, however, that any commissioner hereafter appointed shall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years from the date of his appointment, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons, and shall cease to hold office upon reaching the age of sixty-five years.

I think this is practically the same clause that appears in the Railway Act with reference to the railway commissioners.

Mr. BUREAU: I think the present railway commissioners are appointed for life or until they reach the age of fifty-five.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The present Civil Service commissioners hold their office for life.

Mr. BUREAU: But any appointed hereafter are limited to ten years, or less than that if they should reach the age of sixty-five before their ten years has expired. For the sake of uniformity I think we should delete the word "hereafter" and say that the commissioners shall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Up to date there has been no limitation as to the tenure of office of members of the Civil Service Commission. When the present members were appointed it was with the understanding that the appointment was made during life or good behaviour. We do not wish to apply the new provision to the present members.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The powers of the Civil Service Commission are very wide, and justly so. They have to supervise the Inside and Outside Services throughout Canada. They will be flooded with

correspondence and they will have to conduct investigations into the various services. I see it is provided that they shall have full power to investigate conditions in the service from one end of the country to the other. There are inequalities in the service. Take, for instance, the salaries paid to the commissioners. The Hon. Mr. Roche is given $6,000 and the other two commissioners $5,000 each. They will have jurisdiction over deputy ministers. Is it fair that deputy ministers should get more salary than the commissioners? I know of at least four of the deputy ministers whose salaries will be higher than those of the commissioners themselves. Since you are making a reform you should correct any inequalities that may exist. It is not fair that Mr. Jameson, Mr. Larochelle and Hon. Mr. Roche should have lower salaries than those over whom they have jurisdiction.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have not jurisdiction over the deputy ministers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They have jurisdiction over the Civil Service and the deputy ministers are a part of the Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have only jurisdiction in the matter of appointments and promotions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They are under the commission. They have to submit to the rulings of the commission, and it seems to me there should be a readjustment of salaries.

Mr. MORPHY: Would the hon. gentleman be willing to cut down the salaries of the deputy ministers and adjust it in that way?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not saying that, but you might perhaps increase the salaries of the commissioners.

Mr. DAVIS: Do I understand lines 31, 32 and 33 of paragraph 3 section 3 to apply simply to the commissioners who have hitherto been appointed? There seems to be a conflict between that and the provision beginning with line 35. I suggest that lines 31, 32 and 33 might be struck out altogether, and then the other clause beginning with line 35 would read:

Provided, that any commissioner hereafter appointed shall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years from the date of his appointment.

—and so on. I do not see why the commissioners already appointed should not have that limitation of ten years as well as those hereafter appointed.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. PEDLOW: I do not see why lines 31, 32 and 33 should be included at all, because the point appears to be covered by the next paragraph.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The last provision is intended to apply only to appointments hereafter made. The Civil Service Commission has been in existence for a good many years and some of the present members were appointed a long time ago. It would hardly be fair to limit their tenure of office to ten years. I think that should only apply to future appointments.

Mr. DAVIS: As the clause now stands, there is no limit of age imposed upon those who are already appointed. It is only those who may be hereafter appointed who must cease to hold office on reaching the age of 65 years?

Mr. CURRIE: There was one feature to which I referred last night when the Bill was under discussion, and that is the representation of the returned soldiers on this commission. Further on we are to deal with the matter of giving returned soldiers a preference, but when the commission is being appointed some representation should be given to the returned soldiers on that board. I suggest that the commission should be increased in number from three to five. I do not think that the returned soldiers' associations will be satisfied with the Bill as it stands, because in a great many instances, since the commission has taken charge, they have been set aside. The Government passed an Order in Council about two years ago laying down the principle that no one should receive an appointment in the Civil Service who was of military age if there was a returned soldier available. That secured the appointment of a great many men who were slightly deficient, a finger or a hand lost, but who were still able to do good work in the Service. Since the commission has taken charge of the matter that rule has been changed in this respect, that it does not apply to married men in Class 1, under the Military Service Act, up to a certain age. The result has been that married men of military age have been getting appointments in preference to returned soldiers. The returned soldier has a very difficult position when he goes into the service. For some reason—I do not know why—officials in the service, in the majority of cases, make it very difficult for a returned soldier to get along. I am referring to the returned soldier not alone in the English-speaking

parts of Canada but to other parts as well. The same thing will occur on the other side of the Ottawa river when a soldier comes back with a leg or an arm off. Men in that condition are perhaps a little short of temper and they have great difficulty in getting along in the Civil Service. I fear that, unless something is done while this Bill is before the House to see to it that in new appointments returned soldiers get a fair chance, their claims to preference will be overlooked. It is all very well to employ fine words and to say this and that shall be done, but excuses will be found for evading the provisions of the Act. Under this Bill the minister can appoint anybody to any position he likes on the understanding that he is appointing him for some technical purpose. The returned soldiers are anxious that representation should be given to them on this board. There are a lot of officers returning with empty sleeves and they could fill a $5,000 position very well. This board takes on a heavy responsibility when it undertakes to manage the whole of the Civil Service from one end of Canada to the other. It is a greater undertaking than that of the Railway Commission. The commissioners should receive the same remuneration as the railway commissioners because their position is equally important, equally responsible and there is far more work than these three men can do. The Railway Commission is much larger than this commission and I do not see why the latter should not be enlarged and divided into sections to deal with certain portions of the work. I do not wish to delay the Bill in any way, but I am going to press an amendment, and if it is defeated I will accept the decision of the committee cheerfully. I am only endeavouring to do my duty to those men who have returned from the battle front.

Another thing is that there is no provision made as to who the examiner shall be to pass upon the examination. It is easy to trick a man out of his examination. If you are going to pass this law you must give the returned soldiers a square deal, or convince the House and the country that there has been an effort to do so. That is all I want. I ask the minister if a definite decision has been arrived at on that point?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The suggestion that the commission be enlarged from three to five members is not at the present time favourably received by the Government. However, this Bill will be, in one form or another, before Parliament next session. In the meanwhile, I promise my hon. friend that due consideration will be given to the suggestion. I do not say that it is without merit, but I do not think we should enlarge the commission now.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I agree with the hon. member from North Simcoe in the principle which he has enunciated with respect to returned soldiers, and my reason is that there has already been a disposition shown to turn the soldiers down and not give them a fair show. In my own province quite a considerable number of the best offices in which vacancies have occurred have been given to old partisans rather than to returned soldiers. As this commission should be a purely judicial one, I would suggest the appointment of two returned soldiers, so as to equalise that body as far as possible and eliminate the personal equation as it applies in politics.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. member from North Simcoe. We must appreciate the fact that we have, or will have soon, some five hundred thousand men overseas, and the number may reach one million. We are now engaged in considering a Bill that will greatly affect these men, and in which they will be considerably interested. It has been suggested that the ministers do not approve of making an enlargement of the board at the present session. As I understand it, however, the Bill is before the House for its approval, and if a majority of the members decide that the commission shall consist of five members instead of three, I think their decision should go into effect. I cannot quite understand the course of the Acting Minister of Finance in objecting to the suggestion.

Mr. MURPHY: A short time ago the hon. member from Neepawa (Mr. Davis) asked a question with reference to the age limit of the Civil Service Commissioners. I did not hear the question answered, and perhaps the hon. gentleman would restate the point.

Mr. DAVIS: My question had reference to the enforcement of the age limit in the case of commissioners hereafter appointed—I understand it does not apply to those already in office. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. DEVLIN: Judges on the Supreme Court Bench are held to be competent after

they have reached the age of sixty-five years.

Mr. CARVELL: At any rate they sit.

Mr. DEVLIN: They sit and are held to be competent. Why should the Civil Service Commissioners be thrown out, without any provision apparently being made for them, after reaching the age of sixty-five? I think we should at least place the age for retirement at seventy, and after that grant them a pension, or do something for the poor fellows. Do not throw them completely on the street.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose in limiting the age was that there would be a vast amount of work to be done by the commission, largely on account of the additional duties imposed upon them by this Bill, and it was thought that men, after reaching the age of sixty-five, would be unable to properly perform the work.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is there to be no provision for them after that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No provision is made in this Bill. If Parliament ever adopts a superannuation Bill I believe it should be made applicable to them.

Mr. PEDLOW: If the principle of increasing the number of commissioners from three to five is adopted I would suggest that one of the two additional commissioners be a lady. A large proportion of the Civil Service staff at the present time consists of ladies, and in consideration of that fact I would deem them to be entitled to representation on the board. I would also suggest that a capable business man be appointed for one of the positions. If the selection of candidates for the Civil Service is left in the hands of university men, the Service will become a dumping ground for university graduates and those only. From information that I have received from many members of the Civil Service, that is one of the grievances under which they labour in the matter of appointments at the present time. Men who have been in the employ of the Government for years have to be satisfied with a lower salary than is given to recent university graduates appointees of the commission. Young men fresh from the university, because of their educational qualifications—which often have no bearing on the duties they are to perform —are brought to the Civil Service and placed in positions at much higher salaries than are paid to other persons who have been working for the Government for years. That is an injustice which is causing great irritation among the great body of civil servants, and I would like the Government to bear this point in mind when they are introducing reforms.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I also agree with my hon. friend from North Simcoe as to the desirability of appointing a returned soldier to the Civil Service Commission. I believe that for many years to come the returned soldiers will not only be applicants for positions under the Government, but will be selected in preference to others, and naturally so.

Furthermore I believe that now we have accepted the principle of women's franchise—notwithstanding the fact that I voted against the Women's Franchise Bill for the reasons I gave at the time; I thought it was a question which was not relevant to this Parliament and should have been decided by the Provincial Legislature—and now that the women of Canada are so numerous in the Civil Service, and are such excellent employees, they should have a representative on that commission.

Take the Civil Service in Ottawa: I have had some experience as Postmaster General. There were a large number of young ladies in the departments, and I am proud to say that they were about the best employees we had. I think the same compliment may be paid to the ladies who are in other departments. Throughout the land, and in all the large centres, there are also ladies employed in the outside service in the Post Office Department and elsewhere. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) smile; does he not believe as Minister of Labour that the women of Canada should be entitled to a representative on this commission? Take the inspection of factories and other places where large numbers of women are employed; public opinion has forced municipal and provincial governments to appoint female inspectors. It seems to me that as the Civil Service will be open to men as well as women there should be a representative of the women of Canada on this commission.

Mr. MORPHY: With reference to the question of salaries, I would like to know from the minister what will be paid to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, so that the House will know what this board will cost? There seems to be no provision made for the secretary. The present secretary is a very capable man——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: His salary is provided for in the estimates.

Mr. MORPHY: How much is it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He is now receiving $3,800.

Mr. MORPHY: Is that all?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: Well, he is a man of great experience, and has been secretary of the commission for about ten years, and is a very active, capable and painstaking official. It seems to me that this Bill should provide a reasonably decent salary for Mr. Foran in that position.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the estimates provided an increase for him this session.

Mr. MORPHY: Of how much?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An increase of $700.

Mr. MORPHY: Making his salary $4,500. I notice that the Railway Commission has a pretty heavy salary list, the Chief Commissioner is paid $12,500, the Assistant Chief Commissioner $9,000, the Deputy Chief Commissioners $8,000, and two commissioners each at $8,000. If the Civil Service Commission is to be of effective service to the country, there will come within its jurisdiction five thousand Inside Service employees and sixty thousand Outside Service employees. This undertaking will relieve the members of enormous work and will consequently put a tremendous strain upon the commission. I do not like to fall in just now with the appointment of either a lady or a returned soldier to the commission, because taking the personnel of the commission, I am satisfied that the interests of the returned soldier will probably be better looked after by men of this calibre who are not returned soldiers than if a returned soldier were added. The commissioners, not being of the returned soldiers class, are in a better position to render absolute justice in every case. Will an appointment such as that of Mr. O'Connor, the late Cost of Living Commissioner come under this Bill?

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is out of order. His question has nothing to do with the number of commissioners or the salaries paid to them.

Mr. MORPHY: Probably I am out of order, but I do not like to be always talking.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think if a commissioner were required to investigate specially some particular subject, he would probably be appointed by Order in Council and would not come under the provisions of this Bill. But Mr. O'Connor, I think, is a member of the Civil Service, and was merely assigned to certain duties as an investigator by the Labour Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section carry?

Mr. CURRIE: Before it is carried, I would like again to impress upon the minister the advisability of making an arrangement for the appointment of a returned soldier. Members of this House, or at least, some of them, owe their seats to the soldiers, and here is an opportunity to do something substantial for the soldier in a practical way. Instead of doing it for the soldier, with all due regard to the present personnel of the commission, it has been a little "bit" for politicians. Let us be frank about it, and take this clause into consideration before the Bill is declared passed. We have not done very much for the returned soldier this session. True, there is one measure about pensions, but pensions will not interest more than fifteen per cent of all the soldiers who return after the war is over; in fact, a great many will come back far more efficient than they were when they went away. Everybody was clamouring for the soldier when he went away, and it is "Tommy this and Tommy that" when the war is on, but after the war its Tommy get under the barn or out in the woods so far as any position is concerned. The House is sympathetic toward the returned soldier, and I think that the Government should seriously take into consideration increasing the number of commissioners to include a returned soldier. If they do not, I can assure them, that, the soldiers will come to the conclusion that they are not being considered in the matter at all. We are inclined to do a great deal of talking about the soldier and very little acting if we can avoid it. For that reason, I would ask the minister to let this section stand, and go on with some others, and to sleep over it on Sunday and see what can be done. I am not asking anything unfair when I ask that the soldiers have a representative on that commission. I am doing it in all earnestness, and I think I am supported by members on both sides of the House. There is a feeling abroad that this Bill is not doing justice to the soldiers, and here is a chance to prove that it is.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it is quite likely that the additional work which will be imposed upon the commission by this Bill will render it necessary to enlarge the personnel of the commission. I do think, however, that the commission should not be enlarged for the present year, at least while the new Act is being tried. After an experience of ten or twelve months with the new Act, the present commissioners will be able to reach a much sounder conclusion as to the increase which should be made in the personnel of the commission. I do not object to the suggestion of my hon. friend; it is quite a proper one, and has much merit. But I do think that the matter should stand over for another year. As I have already said, this Bill will almost of necessity be before Parliament next session. The Civil Service Commission in administering the Act will find many defects in the legislation, and I have no doubt they will be back at the next session of Parliament asking for amendments and additions to the present Act.

Mr. CURRIE: My reason in asking for this now is this: The Government has already appointed these commissioners, they are political appointees, and there is not a returned soldier amongst them. Not that a returned soldier has any particular merits for a position of this kind simply because he is a returned soldier, but if we are going to give returned soldiers the preference why not start by appointing two of them to this commission? I should be willing to trust the work of this commission to two Liberal returned soldiers. I fought alongside Liberal soldiers, and found them just as good as Conservatives. In the trenches there is no politics; all are equal; the only thing required is obedience to authority. I could use very strong language with regard to this matter. Every commission lately appointed that has done well has a returned soldier on it, while, strange to say, some of the commissions which do not include returned soldiers are giving the Government any amount of trouble. Take, for instance, the Food Board. If that body was in charge of a returned soldier he would make the people "stand round." We should know whether we were breaking the law at breakfast time, because a returned soldier knows what discipline means. If two men are to be added to the commission, it is well to appoint them now. The country will not grudge the salaries of two additional men, and we shall know whether the Government intends to implement its promises and pledges to the soldiers during the election—that the Government would support them both in the trenches and after they returned to Canada. Now is the time to implement that promise, but that is not being done. Before this Bill is passed the acting minister should take this matter into careful consideration with the other ministers, who, I know, are sympathetic, and with the Prime Minister, in whom the soldiers have confidence. Let us have a real Bill so far as returned soldiers are concerned; let us not leave the returned soldiers to the mercy of examiners or of the recommendations of inspectors, postmasters and customs officials throughout the country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We could not now amend the Bill so as to enlarge the commission. It would be necessary to introduce a new resolution and to give forty-eight hours' notice of it.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not think the House will object if the acting minister introduces a resolution of that kind. I have seen authority to spend $50,000,000 go through this House in a few minutes, and if the acting minister will bring down a provision such as I have suggested, I am confident that members will be willing to stay the rules and to pass it in half an hour. No man here would raise his voice against doing justice to the returned soldier.

Mr. PEDLOW: I agree with the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that in the event of its being possible to increase the number of commissioners to five, one of them should be a returned soldier who is capable of filling the position. It has been urged by several speakers during this discussion that Civil Service appointments in various localities throughout the country should be made by the selection of local candidates as far as possible. I am informed that a returned soldier was recently sent from Montreal to fill a position in the Immigration Department in western Ontario. I am glad to know that it is possible to find in Montreal a returned soldier capable of filling a position in western Ontario, but unfortunately the appointment was resented in western Ontario. The appointment of a returned soldier on the Civil Service Commission would prevent anomalies of that kind, and ensure that returned men capable of filling positions in particular localities should be taken from those localities if at all possible. I repeat again my suggestion that a woman

5 p.m.

should be appointed on the Civil Service Commission. A large number of civil servants are females who require consideration not only in point of ability but in the matter of their surroundings and in other respects, in both the Inside and the Outside Service. It is desirable that a capable woman should be on the commission, not only to assist in the selection of female employees, but also to look after their interests after they have been appointed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I strongly support the proposal that a returned soldier be appointed to the commission and I should raise no objection to the introduction of a resolution to accomplish that, even at this late stage of the session. The business of the House would not be delayed. But I should like the Acting Minister of Finance to reply to my suggestion of a moment ago. The women of Canada have been given the franchise, and have been declared competent to take their responsibility on national issues. Women have been admitted as members of the legislatures of Alberta and British Columbia. In view of the large number of women in the Civil Service—and future Governments, whether Tory or Grit, will no doubt see that the widows, mothers and sisters of soldiers get the preference in the service—my suggestion that a woman be appointed on the commission is worth considering.

Mr. BLAKE: It should not be the business of this Government to go about creating appointments which have not been asked for. In this case we have had a request from returned soldiers that one of their members be appointed to this commission, but the Government does not seem disposed to accede to it. I agree that at least one returned soldier should be made a member of that commission. There is no reason why the membership of the commission should not be four as well as three or five. As to the appointment of a woman on the commission, it will be time enough to consider that when the women's organizations take the matter up and press for the appointment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I see no objection whatever to the appointment of women to the Civil Service Commission. I do not think the statute prohibits it. At the present time, however, there is no vacancy, and it is hardly practicable to consider the question unless we decide to enlarge the commission. The commission, I think, must very shortly be enlarged, but it would be better to wait for a year and ascertain just to what extent it ought to be enlarged. The commission will in that way be able to gain a great deal of knowledge in administering the Act during the next six or ten months. If there is no objection to passing this clause, I shall during the next day or two present the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Blake) to the Government for consideration, and if the Government decides to enlarge the commission, a resolution will be introduced and the suggestion made effective.

Mr. NICKLE: As the acting minister has stated that the commission must very shortly be enlarged, I suppose that he will not be averse to going the length of saying that if that is done he will keep in mind the recommendation of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that a returned soldier should be appointed, because in my opinion it is very essential that somebody should be there who will constantly watch the interests of those men.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have no hesitation in saying that.

Mr. CURRIE: I understand then that the minister is willing to come back to this section and give us a statement as to whether or not the Government has considered this matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Under this section the ten year tenure of office seems to apply only to commissioners who may be appointed in the future. Why is a distinction made betwen present and future incumbents.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The present commissioners were appointed for life. That was the effect of the statute at the time. It would hardly be fair to cut down the tenure of office of the present commissioners.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the reason for the change?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the change is a good one to introduce.

Mr. MURPHY: I am not questioning it, I am only asking for an explanation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was based on the analogy of the Railway Commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have already stated to the committee that we are applying to the Civil Service Commission the principle which is now found in the Railway Act in respect of the appointment of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the principle laid down by the minister is a proper one—

and it is a proper one—that if a man has been appointed for life, the period of his services to the State must not be changed, surely the same principle should apply to the members of the Civil Service who enlisted under an Order in Council granting them during their time of service their full salaries in addition to their military pay. Why should there be a difference between their case and the case of the Civil Service Commissioners? Another Order in Council is passed, and the civil servants are now refused that which they were solemnly promised by the first Order in Council.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not wish to enter into a discussion as to the merits of that Order in Council. It is not relevant to this section.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is, by analogy.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before getting away from the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that two returned soldiers should be appointed as Civil Service Commissioners, I should like to say that the statement of the acting minister is quite satisfactory in one respect, but I hardly think the appointment of the commissioners has been in accordance with what we understood was to be the policy of the Government as regards the filling of vacancies in the public service of this country, that is, that returned soldiers should have the preference. With regard to the question of salaries, just brought up by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), I presume that if two returned soldiers are appointed this year or next year, they will be appointed for a ten-year term, whereas the present commissioners are appointed practically for a lifetime. The returned soldier problem is not a new one. Our soldiers have for a number of years been coming back in large numbers, and they will be coming back in increasing numbers for some time. In view of the fact that we have to-day compulsory military service in this country, the returned soldiers have the first claim to be represented on commissions that are being appointed. The feeling is very strong amongst returned soldiers that they are not, in many cases, receiving at the hands of the Government the attention to which they are entitled. That matter has been very forcibly brought to my attention in the last few days in regard to a matter which is not quite pertinent to the subject with which we are now dealing. It goes to substantiate the argument advanced by the hon. member for North Simcoe that returned soldiers should be represented on the Civil Service Commission, particularly in view of the fact that it is proposed to put the Outside Service under the jurisdiction of this commission. It is also another very strong argument why this Bill should stand over for the present session.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The principle of the Bill and the time of its introduction have been discussed for a day and a half. I have been obliged to call many hon. members to order, and the House a few moments ago agreed to support the Chairman in keeping the debate relevant to the clause under discussion. Whether the Bill should be introduced now or not has certainly nothing to do with the number of commissioners to be appointed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I submit, Sir, to your ruling. I was referring to the fact that the proposition of the acting minister was that, in the future, it might be advisable to appoint further representatives on this board, and I am of the opinion there is a connection between the two. That is the reason why I brought the matter to the attention of the committee. I should like to say a word or two as to the advisability of increasing the salaries and also of extending the scope of the commission. This is a matter we ought to consider very seriously. The financial condition of the country is such as to demand that we should exercise the greatest economy with regard to all matters of administration. We cannot see very far into the future, but I think the man is blind who cannot foresee great difficulty in carrying on in this country in the years to come. We are fixing salaries, and the minister intimates that next year it may be advisable to increase those salaries very materially; that other commissioners are receiving larger salaries. I have not anything to say with regard to that more than that I do not agree with a good many of the statements that have been made. There are, apparently, always many people who are anxious to get into the public service, and after they are once in the public service, their efficiency, in the minds of a great many people, is judged by the amount of salary they are drawing. I do not think there is any connection between the two. A man should only be appointed to a Government position because of the eminent qualifications which he possesses. If that policy were carried out in its entirety I would have no objection whatever

to the present Bill going into effect immediately, but that policy certainly has not been pursued in the past, and I do not expect it will be pursued in the future. The idea that a large salary indicates efficiency or ability on the part of the recipient is something I do not agree with.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—duties of Commission:

Mr. DAVIS: I cannot find any clause giving the commission power to recommend dismissals or reductions in the staff. I thought that one of the evils of the Civil Service was over-manning. I know of one case where the sub-head of a department has been brought before the deputy minister for inefficiency, but no one has urged this man's dismissal. I am told that on account of the introduction of machines in the Statistics branch, seventy-five to a hundred men in the Department of Trade and Commerce statistics could be dispensed with. The work of that branch is done by seventy-four men in the United States, and if they employed men there on the scale we employ them, in proportion to the work to be done, seven or eight hundred men would be required in that branch in the States. If the commission is going to effect what the people and Parliament of Canada desire, we must have some means of getting rid of supernumeraries. There is provision in the Bill for transferring supernumeraries from one department to another, but not for dismissing them from the service. Is the principle we adopt that once a man gets a Government job he has a job for life, and must be maintained whether the Government has any use for his services or not? If that is the principle, it should be clearly recognized.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The power of dismissal rests with the Governor in Council, and is provided for in section 30 of the Bill. I do not think it would be wise to put this power in the hands of the commission. Clause 4, I think, gives the commission ample authority to make recommendations to the Governor in Council, and there is on the Order Paper to-day a resolution providing that the Civil Service Commission shall prepare a list of employees who owing to advanced age, failing health or lack of experience or ability, are not capable of rendering efficient service. These men may be dispensed with on pecuniary provision to be determined by the commission. This resolution will be introduced in the course of a day or so, and I think it will give the commission the power my hon. friend desires. One of the difficulties in the past in dispensing with the services of employees has been that we have no Superannuation Act providing for the retirement of civil servants at a certain age, say sixty-five years. I think it would be in the interest of the State if we had a Superannuation Act, and that matter will have to receive the consideration of Parliament some day soon.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood that five per cent was deducted from the salaries of all civil servants.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That goes to a retirement fund, not a superannuation fund. It is paid to the civil servant on his removal from office or to his dependents in the case of his death.

Mr. CURRIE: Would it not be advisable to incorporate this resolution in the Act, with one change? If instead of the word "forthwith" we substituted the words "from time to time," that would allow the Civil Service Commission to appoint a board to make an investigation of the different departments from time to time with a view to the removal or superannuation of the inefficient. In the United States efficiency experts go through the different departments from time to time for this purpose, and if they find a man who has done no work for six months or is an idler or inefficient, they have power to remove him. If we made this resolution one of the sections of the Bill, with the change I have suggested, it would invest the commission with this power.

Mr. MOWAT: In all business concerns it has been the rule that the appointing authority shall be the dismissing authority, because that gives more power from the very moment the appointment is made. While it is proper that the Governor in Council shall assent to any dismissal, I think it would work out better if the dismissals were to be recommended by the Civil Service Commission and not to become effective until approved by the Governor in Council. Otherwise, we would seem to be returning to the old system of making the dismissals a departmental, and to some extent perhaps political, matter. Would it not be better and more convenient for the Cabinet to have action taken in the first place by the commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The dismissing power, while resting with the Governor

General in Council, virtually is under the deputy head. It must be so because nobody but the person under whom the civil servant works will have cause for dismissing him. I do not think it would be proper that the commission should have the power of dismissal because they could only do it on the recommendation of the deputy head. So long as the technical power rests with the Governor in Council that is a protection for the members of the civil service against the deputy heads.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think that what my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) says is right. If you are going to abolish patronage you should abolish it for good. Appointments are to be made on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. We are arranging that the Civil Service may be investigated by the commission, and when a dismissal takes place it should be by virtue of powers conferred on the commissioners; otherwise, the ministers and the Government would be pestered all the year round and patronage really would not be abolished. There would be some political influence to maintain in office a man who otherwise would deserve to be dismissed. If you are going to abolish patronage, wipe it out completely. The only way to do that is to leave the handling of the Civil Service, both the appointment and dismisal, to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If this Bill passes it assumes to place under the Civil Service Commission some 70,000 public servants throughout the Dominion. It seems to me that to expect three men in Ottawa to see that all these officials are efficiently carrying out their duties is to place upon their shoulders a responsibility entirely beyond their ability to successfully carry out. It brings us back to the point that if we are going to abolish patronage, we must place the power of dismisal in the hands of the man who is employing the official.

Mr. CURRIE: The commission employs him here.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The commission is the employing head just in the same degree as the executive of the Canadian Pacific railway in Montreal is the employing head but I question very much whether you would expect the president, and his first and second vice-presidents, to determine whether a section foreman was doing his duty on one of the Pacific divisions of the road. It is in that relative position that you place the Civil Service Commission. If you impose upon them the responsibility of determining whether any one of the 70,000 public servants was or was not doing his duty. The work of even investigating the circumstances surrounding those 70,000 public servants would be too great for them to do. It would be a physical impossibility for any three men you could find on the top of this earth. Some one must be placed in control of each individual who will see whether he is, or is not, doing his duty, and he must have the power to dismiss any who are not properly attending to their work. Otherwise we will get back to the point at which we started.

Mr. DAVIS: It seems to me that in this matter we are trenching on a question that is fundamental to this Bill and it is this: When this Bill comes into force who is going to be held responsible for the efficiency of the Civil Service? It is going to be the duty of the Civil Service Commission to see that we get efficient men, and they are expected to see that there is no favouritism in connection with the different employments. Should not one of their powers be to recommend that only so many men shall be employed and to determine how many may be required? They should have some knowledge as to this.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How could they get that knowledge? They will be busily engaged in performing the duties of their office, making appointments, holding examinations and attending to promotions. How could they acquire knowledge as to the proficiency of any particular official? That knowledge must be with the administrative head of the department; I do not see how you could look to anyone else.

Mr. DAVIS: Is this board only to be an examining board as to the competency of candidates for the Civil Service, and is it to have nothing to say about promotions or anything of that sort?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Promotions are to be made by the Civil Service Commission, but it is largely an appointing body. It was never intended that the Civil Service Commission should have to examine into the efficiency of departments from time to time or make inquiries as to the efficiency of any members of the service.

Mr. CURRIE: I think that is one of the weak features of the Bill. The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) pointed out what is absolutely correct, that in

the conduct of a business, say of a railway such as the Canadian Pacific, the man who is immediately over the employees, that is the superintendent or the foreman, employs the men and he must necessarily have the power of dismissal. But such is not the case under this Act. This is a peculiar Act. The party that employs here is the commission, and the party that promotes is the commission. The only party that can dismiss is the Governor General in Council. There is no provision made whereby, if a minister has an efficient employee he can dismiss him unless the deputy head approves. The Civil Service Commission should have an inspection staff whose duty it would be, where complaints were made, to investigate and, when good reason is shown, to have the employee dismissed. The postmaster of Ottawa, or of any large town, will have nothing to do theoretically with the appointment of his staff. An appointee may not be a local man or may come from any part of the country. The hands of the postmaster are absolutely tied whether the members of his staff are doing their work properly or not. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Algoma that some arrangement should be made for the maintenance of discipline in the various departments. You cannot have discipline unless the power that appoints is also the power that dismisses. There should be an appeal from that power to the Governor in Council if a man thinks he has been unjustly dealt with. The Civil Service Commission not only has the power of appointment but has the power of promotion. That means that the commission must know whether a man is carrying on his work properly and is entitled to promotion. If you are going to have promotion for anything else except for length of service—in which case a man goes up automatically—you must have some provision for determining the merits of the candidate for promotion. If you are going to have promotion for merit you must have some inspection whereby the merit of the man can be judged. I have in my mind the case of a man of high qualifications, a man who, in private life, would be drawing a salary of $5,000 or $6,000 a year. If I required his services for the business he is in I would be very glad to give him $5,000 a year. He is drawing only $1,800 from the Government, and he finds himself in the position that his salary is not adequate for him to live on. That man is an expert accountant, who could undertake the inspection of any one of the largest banks in Canada, and still he is compelled to live on such a paltry salary. How are you going to arrange matters so that the commission shall take cognizance of such cases and give these men their deserts? I want every man in the service who is doing his work well and properly to receive proper recognition. No provision is made for that in this Bill. If there were some kind of inspection bureau whose business it would be to consider the service which each person was rendering, a deserving man could come before this bureau and say: I have been working very hard night and day for the Government; I do not get paid for my night work, but I get the work done; a great deal of additional work has fallen upon me because of the war—or for other reasons—but I am willing to stand up to it and I want you to consider my conditions of employment and grant me an increase of pay. In such a case the bureau of inspection would verify the man's statement and forward his case to the Civil Service Commission accompanied by the recommendation "this man is deserving." Or an officer in charge of the business of a custom house, might say: "I have a lot of men here, but I can get along with fewer; there are three or four loafers who are doing nothing but sit round; they are all the time smoking cigarettes instead of doing a good day's work and they simply defy me." The inspector who is investigating the case would say: "Suspend these men, because we are going to report." The men would come before that inspector and would have to prove whether they were entitled to remain on the staff or not. I think that is the procedure that would be followed in the case of any large business institution. Why not make this Bill a thoroughly business measure? Otherwise we are only wasting the time of the House and doing great injury by changing the present law. Under that law you have some responsibility in connection with appointments, but unless you introduce business methods under the present Bill that responsibility will disappear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Might I draw the attention of the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) to subsection (b) of section 4. That seems to give the commission power, upon the request of the head of any department, to make an investigation as to the efficiency of a department or any branch of it.

Mr. MORPHY: I was looking at the section when the minister spoke, and it seems

to me that all these subsections give the commission all the powers that are required, without, however, the power of dismissal. Therefore if a man in one of the lower grades of the Service has been guilty of an act which would warrant his dismissal the commission has no power to deal with his case, even though they appointed him, and the matter must go to the Governor in Council. It does not seem to me consistent with modern conditions that the commission that has the supervision of all the members of the Service within the classes mentioned, and who appointed the man—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would seem quite proper that the employer should have the right of dismissal. The Civil Service Commission will scarcely ever be in a position to exercise a reliable judgment in respect of the dismissal of any person. They would have to act upon information given to them by the deputy head, or some other officer of the department under whom the person who is recommended for dismissal worked. I think the suggestion that the power of dismissal ought to go to the Civil Service Commission is unsound in principle, and, I think, will not be found in the Civil Service Act of any country.

Mr. DAVIS: I did not suggest that the commission should have the right to dismiss, but that they should have the right to recommend that the number of employees in a department should be reduced, and possibly, on investigation, that a certain person should be dismissed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think we have that power now.

Mr. DAVIS: I doubt whether it is contained within the limits of section 4.

Mr. HOCKEN: I understand from the minister that the dismissal has to take place on the report of the deputy minister. I was wondering what would have happened in the Kingston post office had the deputy minister reported that Mrs. Narraway's presence was not necessary there and asked for her removal. It just emphasizes what I said, that we are putting altogether too much power in the hands of the deputy ministers. We are making the deputy head, in the last analysis, the sole referee. Then, if I understand correctly, promotions are also made upon the recommendation of the deputy minister to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

[Mr. Morphy.]

Mr. HOCKEN: You make promotions dependent on the recommendation of the deputy minister, and he has the power to promote those who may or may not be efficient.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What could you put in place of that?

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not suggest putting anything else in its place, but I do suggest that in framing this Bill some check should be placed upon a deputy minister, and when we come to the proper clause I may have something to suggest in the way of strengthening the Bill so as to discourage that favouritism and nepotism which it is alleged now prevails.

Mr. PEDLOW: I take it that the management of the business of the Dominion Government is no different in principle from that of any other large business concern in the country. You must have centralized authority having sole control and being supreme in arranging matters of organization, filling vacant offices, making promotions, carrying out dismissals and dispensing with supernumeraries. I think it is the intention of the Acting Minister of Finance to make provision by means of this Bill along those lines. The Civil Service Commission is the best power to take the place of centralized authority, and corresponds to an individual in a personal organization. When you begin to develop the business along definite lines you must appoint heads of departments. Now, the business of this country has been developing for years, and at the present time is developing along larger lines than it has ever done before. Consequently you must organize new departments under special heads. If you want to hold the special heads—deputies, or whatever you like to call them—responsible for the working out of their departments you must place them in control of those departments. We had an exhibition in one of the departments of the Government a few days ago of the mistake of following a different course. In the Department of Labour a junior employee upset the whole machinery of the department and caused the dismissal of the best department head that the Government has had for many years past, a man who gave good service to the Government. But his work and the work of the employees under him was interfered with by the man over his head. It is a very difficult matter, as I see it, to draw the line through any mechanism of the Government

machinery, but I insist that the steps should be by easy grades, so that there will be no confusion caused by the reorganization undertaken by the Civil Service Commission throughout the many ramifications of the business of the country. The commission holds the department head responsible. He can only be held responsible provided he has control over those under his immediate charge. In that case I contend that in the case of an appointment which is unsatisfactory to the department head he should have recourse to the commission. Again, if the department head has been guilty of unfair treatment of an employee, that employee should have recourse to the commission, but only through the department head. In that way, you avoid friction. I claim, therefore, that in every case the employee should be responsible to the man immediately above him, and that man to the department head and the department head to the commission. In the case of the Department of Labour, the individual complaint—and I merely mention that to illustrate the principle—should have been to the department head, from the department head to the minister, and from the minister to the commission. And the commission, or else the Governor in Council, should have the last say in the retaining or dismissing of any employee. The same would hold good with supernumeraries. There is provision in the Bill enabling the commission to enter into any department and investigate it. I understand from Part II. that that investigation is for the very purpose of dealing with supernumeraries. In my judgment, if you are desirous of having a perfect working machinery in the Civil Service it must all work from a centre and to a centre. If there is overlapping you will have difficulty just as there was the other day with the Department of Labour.

Mr. MURPHY: In subsection (d) of this section, one of the duties of the commission is, " to obtain the assistance of competent persons to assist the commission in the performance of its duties." May I ask to what class of assistance that subsection applies?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would apply, for instance, to examiners to hold examinations throughout the country. That is what it was intended for.

Mr. MURPHY: Not to the clerical staff of the commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It has no reference to that at all.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Illegally obtaining examination papers.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask where these examination papers are printed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are printed in the offices of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MURPHY: Under their supervision?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: May I ask who prepares them? Is any provision made in this Bill whereby these examination papers will be prepared by a board, or who the board will be?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The papers are prepared by examiners specially appointed by the commission.

Mr. CURRIE: Who are the examiners?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They change from time to time.

Mr. CURRIE: Are they permanent?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Oh, no, they are not permanent.

Mr. CURRIE: Where is the authority given the commission to appoint examiners?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In sub-paragraph (d) of section 4.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Soliciting appointments.

Mr. MURPHY: If a capable and deserving official who, by reason of some feeling on the part of the deputy minister, is not given the promotion to which he is justly entitled, has representations made to the minister by the member for the constituency from which he originally came, would that be an offence under this section?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the section means that he is confined to making such representations to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MORPHY: Who is to apply the principle of dismissal?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Dismissal is by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MORPHY: Is that the intention of the Act? This board which determines a man's qualifications and selects him for appointment should be responsible for him; if he commits flagrant offences which justify his dismissal, the board should have power to dismiss him. To limit the com-

mission's power in this respect is like shearing Samson of his locks. The commission should be a strong body, with all the powers necessary to their duties, not an inefficient body, of no avail in the public service. If they have power to appoint men, they should have power to reject them.

Mr. MURPHY: Subsection 2 of section 9 says:

> Any person who, directly or indirectly, solicits or endeavours to influence any Minister of the Crown or the head of any department in favour of his appointment or promotion or to increase his salary, shall be deemed to be unworthy of such appointment, promotion or increase, and it shall not be accorded him; and if he is employed in the public service, he shall be liable to immediate dismissal.

I am speaking of a case of which I have knowledge, and in which, in an endeavour to obtain some attention at the hands of the minister and the justice that the official claims he is entitled to, representation has been made to the minister. Would such representation be deemed a contravention of the subsection which I have read.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it would be.

Mr. MURPHY: Then how is such an official to obtain justice?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By putting his case before the commission.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Subsection 3.

Mr. MURPHY: If he does put his case before the commission, the deputy minister, who would be complained of in the submission of the case, would probably make the man's life unbearable.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should think that the commission would have the right to make a representation to the minister.

Mr. MURPHY: Surely the minister is not absolved of responsibility by this subsection.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not say that. My hon. friend inquires,—does he not?—how the case may be brought to the attention of the minister, assuming that the deputy minister is unfair?

Mr. MURPHY: Partly. Representation has been made direct to the minister on behalf of the official.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Rightly or wrongly, the section seems to provide that instead of going to the minister the man himself or the person who acts on his behalf shall go to the Civil Service Commission, who, if they deem it a case of injustice, may make representations to the deputy minister. If they find those representations unavailing, they would naturally take the case to the minister. That is what I understand by the section.

Mr. CURRIE: This is a very drastic clause. Take the case of a town or village close to a recently established munition work. The customs officer there suddenly finds that he has to take care of a customs revenue of from $500,000 to $2,000,000 instead of $20,000 a year which came in before the munition work was established. If a member of Parliament should make a suggestion to a minister of the Crown that more men be appointed in that customs office and that salaries of the employees be increased, he renders himself liable to the pains and penalties of this Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Subsection 2 of section 9 would appear to be too drastic. I am willing to drop it if hon. gentlemen think that that should be done.

Mr. CURRIE: The whole section is nothing but camouflage. The importuning of ministers of the Crown will go on just the same. The clause has been in the Act since 1908, but as a matter of fact ministers have made scarcely any appointments without first being importuned.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think the note "1908 s. 42" is accurate. The provision was not in this form in 1908.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 42 of the present Act reads:

> No person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit or endeavour to influence a member of the Commission with respect to the appointment of any person to the Service.

And so on. Subsection 2 prohibits direct or indirect solicitations to influence a member of the commission.

Mr. CURRIE: Now the words "member of the commission" are omitted and the words "Minister of the Crown" substituted therefor. May we canvass members of the commission, but not ministers of the Crown? It would seem that ministers of the Crown want to avoid all responsibility.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GOSPEL WORKERS CHURCH IN CANADA.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance), the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 59, to incorporate the Gospel Workers Church in Canada,—Mr. Middlebro,—was read the second time and concurred in.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of William Leo Walpole.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Mary Claire Dawson Hislop.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Martin Hafner. —Mr. H. A. Mackie.

Bill No. 79, for the relief of Ida Sophia Wardell.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Bill No. 80, for the relief of Edward David Hill.—Mr. Richardson.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed in Committee on Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada,—Mr.. A. K. Maclean,—Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 9—soliciting appointments:

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Subsection 2 might be all right in so far as it relates to the minister of the Crown; but when you extend it to the point where you forbid an employee in any department to appeal to the immediate head of the department, the officer under whose direct control the employee may be, for promotion, or an increase of salary, or in regard to any other question that may relate to his service in the department, and instead of that pass him over the head of his immediate superior and send him on to the commission, which, as I understand it, will be the head of the Civil Service, you are entirely reversing the system under which any large body of persons can be employed. If I understand anything about the maintenance of system in the employment of any body of persons whatever, the principle is that the employee shall appeal for a recommendation to his immediate superior before going to the head of his department, and unless he receives that recommendation I do not see how the executive, if I may be permitted to put it in that way, can intelligently deal with the case. Subsection 2 might well be struck out of the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If it is the judgment of the committee that subsection 2 be struck out, I am quite content.

Mr. BUREAU: Subsection 1 of section 9 reads:

> No person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit or endeavour to influence any minister of the Crown.

Would it not be better to prevent any influence being brought to bear on the members of the commission? If they are to have the direct recommendation, and if we are going to punish anyone who solicits a minister for appointment or promotion we should also protect the members of the commission, because they are the ones to whom you are to apply in the last resort if you are going to procure the appointment or promotion.

Mr. SHEARD: Section 9, in my opinion, could very well be struck out of the Bill. Subsection 1, if interpreted strictly, debars me from giving a testimonial of character to any applicant who may wish to enter the Civil Service. If a civil servant has been unfairly and unjustly treated in a department surely the minister at the head of that department has a right to hear that civil servant and to go into the merits and demerits of the case. Otherwise, representative government is at an end so far as that department is concerned. It is the privilege and right—and it has been so stated on the floor of this House during this session—of any subordinate to go to the head of his department and to make any representations he sees fit and proper to make, and I do not see why we should deprive him of that right. This clause contravenes the broad spirit of British liberty as I understand it, and debars a subordinate from appealing to the head of his department whom we in this Parliament hold responsible for the proper administration of that department. Instead of striking out clause 2 of section 9, I move that the whole clause be struck out, as I can see no good purpose in it. We desire, if I interpret the spirit of the committee correctly, that the minister shall be the head of his department with absolute control and that the various promotions shall be subject to his approval.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is good sense in the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard). In endeavouring to accomplish a reform we must be careful not to defeat the very object of that reform. What is

the channel of communication between the people, whom we represent, and the commission if it is not the member? Many people have no other means of communication with the Government or commission. It seems to me this clause would reduce to nil the role of the people's representatives. Suppose I have in my constituency two or three returned soldiers, humble, modest fellows who do not know the ministers or the commissioners. They would naturally come to me for a testimonial, and could I refuse to give them a letter of introduction to the minister or the commissioners? One word as to the commission. It consists of three members. One from the province of Nova Scotia, one from the province of Quebec, and one from the province of Manitoba. I hold no brief for the great province of Ontario, but it seems to me that that province should certainly have a say on the commission. How will a returned soldier from the back concessions of Nipissing or Algoma communicate with the commission? Let us not turn down the representatives of the people in that way. I represent the people of my constituency and I must speak for them. If I am impelled by any unworthy motives the criminal law will look after me. But nobody must assume that the representatives of the people must not go to a minister or a commissioner to say whether in his opinion Tom, Dick or Harry is a good man for a certain position.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Apparently it is the judgment of the committee that this clause be withdrawn, and I accordingly agree.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not going to oppose the dropping of this section, but in view of the statements made by the last speaker I want to say a word as to how an applicant is going to have his case brought before the commission. The commissioners are naturally possessed of the instincts that were characteristic of them before they were appointed to their present positions, and they have their social connections, as people have in other walks of life. The result, I am afraid, will be that those who come in social contact with the commissioners will have a great advantage over those who do not, and the consequence will be that an humble individual who is not in a position to advocate his own claims will not have the same chance as the designing individual who would see to it that some one got next to the commissioner or deputy minister and argued his case, not in a way that would render him liable under this Act but in an insinuating way that would nevertheless accomplish the purpose in view. I think this section indicates that the Bill was not drafted with very much care, or it would not have contained this clause. I am heartily in accord with the views of the committee that this section should be dropped.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to oppose the dropping of this section, but it seems to me that hon. gentlemen who have made that suggestion have entirely lost sight of the third clause of section 9, which says:

> Any person shall have the right to submit to the Commission a representation in writing with respect to the appointment of any person to the public service or with respect to the promotion, transfer of or an increase of salary to any officer, clerk or employee in the Public Service.

It seems to me that leaves it perfectly open for any hon. member to make any representation he likes to the commission, which, I understand, is to be the supreme body in connection with the Civil Service. The other parts of the section are simply to prevent any influence being used with the ministers of the Crown, the political heads, and that is simply following out the idea of getting rid of political patronage.

Mr. STEVENS: How is a member to know what representations to make to the commission if no one first makes representations to him? The first part of the section says distinctly that no one directly or indirectly shall solicit any assistance. So how can I tell which one of all my constituents wants to make representations unless he first applies to me? Clause 3 is absolutely idiotic unless the two preceding clauses are removed.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The first clause says that no person shall directly or indirectly solicit or endeavour to influence any minister of the Crown. That is simply providing against bringing political influence to bear. It does not remove the opportunity for making representations to the commission.

Mr. SHEARD: I submit that clause 3 in the broad interpretation is somewhat of a gratuitous impertinence. The first two clauses deny the right to representatives of this House to any influence in the public service. In the drafting of this Bill the commission are hedged around with more red tape and precautionary measures than attach to His Majesty the King. It is going beyond all reason to say that the people's

representatives shall not have the right to submit representations to their majesties the commissioners.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not wish to oppose the dropping of this section, but I wish to say a word over its funeral. During the last session I listened to the great representative of the French Government preaching democracy—Mr. Viviani. I shortly after listened to the eloquent representative of Great Britain. They told us that this was a war for democracy. Democracy means representative and responsible government. Yet, this is an attempt largely to set up a bureaucracy. It is opposed entirely to the principle of democracy to set up such a system as that, just as if we were in Prussia where nobody would dare approach the bureau, or communicate with it, or do anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Sheard) is a student of democracy, and he will very readily understand. The clause, to my mind, is an impertinence, especially the third sub-section. I suppose we cannot even look at the commission with a spy glass. I have objected largely to all the clauses of this Bill, and I think that if the ministers will look at it from the proper standpoint they will realize that it is an entirely undemocratic measure during war time. If anything can be said to win the war, it is certainly not going back on democracy. The best thing we can do is to drop this clause and go on with something else.

Mr. MURPHY: I would like to say a word just to clarify the situation so that we may understand the effect of dropping this clause. I would ask hon. members to realize what it means, and particularly those of my colleagues in this House who have been expressing their great delight that this Bill relieves them of any further annoyance in connection with patronage. If this section is dropped—and I am not opposed to dropping it if that is the wish of the committee—it throws the whole situation open again, and gives an opportunity to any one in this country to worry and harass every public man and candidate, ministers, members of the commission, deputy ministers and heads of branches just the same as in the good old days. If my hon. friends desire that situation, I can stand it as well as they can. I deem it my duty to point out that this will be the effect of dropping that section. If the desire of the committee is to drop it, I am not going to oppose it.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not see how leaving the clause in would prevent any person from doing what is here prohibited. The clause says that no person shall attempt to influence any minister of the Crown, but supposing he does, there is no fine or penalty. This merely expresses the opinion of this House that he should not do it.

Amendment (Mr. Sheard) agreed to, and section dropped.

On section 10, paragraph 1—Organization of departments; how effected:

Mr. SHEARD: We want the word "minister" to be inserted there. The section provides that the commission shall prepare plans for the organization of the department after consulting with the deputy heads, heads of branches, and other chief officers. We want to hold the minister absolutely responsible for the administration of his department, and therefore the section should contain a provision that the minister also should be consulted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill practically does contain the provision that my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard) suggests. This clause merely enacts that the commission shall consult with the deputy heads with respect to the matter of reorganization and then report. The commission could get no assistance from a minister of the Crown that would be of value in the reorganization of the department. At least very few ministers would have that exact and detailed knowledge of the work of the department which the deputy head would have. But, when the recommendation of the commission is made, it must be approved by the Governor in Council, and accordingly the minister approves of any recomendation that may affect his department. The matter now stands just as my hon. friend would like to have it.

Mr. CURRIE: The minister should have the right to reorganize his department if he wants to without reference to the deputy head at all. Deputies have bucked against ministers in the past. When the reorganization is taking place the minister should be able to see that his department is organized in accordance with his ideas and not in accordance with the ideas of the deputy. We all know that the deputies have stood in the way of reform for years. We have had men go through the departments and we have spent large sums of money in investigating and studying the conditions, but no reorganization has been effected, because the deputies have always

hung back and opposed any change and have carried on in the same old way. The ministers should be supreme over the deputies. Why should we desire to detract from the minister's responsibility and from the authority which the minister should possess in his own department? The day has gone by when we can put square pegs in round holes in managing the departments. The minister must take charge of his department and run it. We have ministers in this Government who are capable of doing that and I propose that we shall give them the opportunity. For that reason I support the suggestion of my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard); I think it is one that the Government should adopt.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Governor General in Council cannot approve of any report submitted by the commissioners for the reorganization of a department unless it has the express approval and sanction of the ministers. The clause simply enacts that the commission, after consulting with the deputy head, shall report a system of reorganization. But it has to be submitted to the Governor General in Council for approval, that is, it must have the approval of the ministers of the several departments. It would be impossible for the commission to work out any scheme of reorganization unless they consulted with the deputy heads. I cannot see any objection to the clause.

Mr. SHEARD: I am satisfied with the minister's explanation.

Mr. CURRIE: I am not quite satisfied, because I think that the clause ignores the minister altogether. The initiative is entirely left to the deputy heads and the commission, whereas the suggestion as to what shall be done in the department should come from the minister.

Mr. COWAN: I do not think that it ignores the minister. The Bill gives the commission power to consult with the deputy heads and the heads of branches, but they may also consult with the minister and with as many other people as they have a mind to. We ought to give this commission power to get all the information they can get and to use it. Unless they get that information we cannot expect any sensible result or proposal from them. It is utterly impossible that any minister could have technical knowledge of all the branches in any one of the departments. In the case of a department of half a dozen branches under half a dozen technical heads the commission must consult with these heads in order to get the knowledge necessary to make an intelligible report.

Mr. CURRIE: I know ministers in this Government who are just dying to take hold of their own department and straighten them out. They have so stated publicly. Let us give them a chance by inserting the word "ministers" in the clause.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I understand the minister to say that after the deputy has drafted the regulations the minister must pass upon those regulations before they are adopted?

Mr. CURRIE: That is the Cabinet, not the minister.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The Cabinet is an assemblage of the ministers. If I understand the matter as presented, the ministers must necessarily pass upon what the deputy heads have placed before them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The recommendations get to council by the submission of the minister who is the head of the department.

The CHAIRMAN: If hon. gentlemen will allow me I will read the subsections before any discussion takes place:

(2) If, after such approval, the duty head or the Commission is of opinion that any such plan of organization might with advantage be in any way changed, the Commission shall in a similar manner prepare a report upon such proposed change, and shall submit the same for the approval of the Governor in Council. No change shall be made in the organization of any department until it has been so reported upon by the said Commission.

(3) As soon as any plan of organization is confirmed by the Governor in Council, the deputy head shall, subject to the approval of the Commission, forthwith cause the officers, clerks and employees affected thereby to be reclassified for the purpose of placing each officer clerk and employee in a proper place under such plan of organization.

(4) If after such organization and classification has been effected, the number of officers, clerks, and employees in any portion of the public service, or in any class or grade thereof, is greater than the number allowed under such organization, the remainder shall be supernumeraries in that class or grade respectively in which they rank, and shall so remain until they are placed in any vacancies that may occur or until they are transferred to another portion of the public service, or until they leave such service.

(5) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prejudicially affect the status or the present salaries or rights to future increase of any officer, clerk or employee, whether permanent or temporary, who is in the public service on the date of the coming into force of this Act, and if any such officer, clerk or employee is placed in any position where the maximum salary is smaller than the maximum salary of the position or grade in which he is now classified,

he shall be eligible for increases until he reaches the maximum heretofore fixed for the position he previously occupied. 1908, s. 8, amended.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is right and that the words "a minister of the Crown" should be inserted after the word "commission," otherwise you overlook the minister entirely. I understand the Governor in Council is included, but I think a minister of the Crown is an entity distinct from the Governor in Council and should be included in the section.

Mr. MURPHY: I desire to make a suggestion which, in the light of actual experience, I think will improve the section referred to. The first Civil Service Act, as the minister knows, was passed in 1908 under the Government of which I happened to be a member, and the administration of the Act was attached to the department of which, at that time, I had charge. It was found that there were a good many anomalies in the departments owing to the fact that the same system of organization and classification was not carried out throughout the service. I take it that this new section is designed to remove those anomalies, and secure a levelling up throughout the service. That will be difficult unless some specific direction is given to the commission, so as to secure similar organization and classification in each department—in other words, so that the anomaly may not be presented, for instance, of men in different departments but doing the same class of work being paid different salaries. There are many such anomalies in the service in Ottawa, and I would suggest adding after the words "public service" in line twelve, the words: "Such organization, as far as possible, to follow the same general principles in all departments." If some authority such as that be not inserted, the commission will find it very difficult, indeed, to secure co-operation in all the departments.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and I move that there be added after the words "public service" on the twelfth line, the words:

Such organization as far as possible to follow the same general principles in all branches of the Civil Service.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: A question was raised as to the reorganization being made. Reorganization is effected by consultation on the part of the heads of the departments, or the deputy heads, with the commission. Then subsection 2 provides:

No change shall be made in the organization of any department until it has been so reported upon by the said Commission.

That reorganization is in force and effect the moment it is approved by the Governor in Council. Following the reorganization, there will have to be a classification of the various employees who have heretofore been in the department, as provided in subsection 3. After this is done and the organization is complete, why not submit that organization and classification, with all the recommendations of both the commission and the deputy heads, to the Governor in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would be simply going over the work a second time. Nothing would be accomplished by that.

Mr. BUREAU: The fact that a plan of a house has been drawn does not exempt from accepting delivery of the house to complete the contract. A plan of organization may be elaborated and approved of by the Governor in Council, but the carrying out of the organization and classification is done by the deputy heads, and approved of by the commission.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. SHEARD: Before we go further I would ask the minister if there is any provision in this Bill for the dismissal of a public servant?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, we will come to it later.

Section 11—Tenure of office.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no change in this section. It is the same as in the present Civil Service Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: The section provides that appointments shall be during pleasure. Under the old condition of things that was always understood to be the pleasure of the Crown. Whose pleasure is it now?

Mr. BUREAU: The pleasure of any party that is in power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The pleasure of the Crown.

Mr. BLAKE: There are a lot of regulations providing for appointments to the Civil Service, but there seems to be no way of effecting dismissals.

Section agreed to.

On section 12—Addition to salary on appointment:

Mr. BUREAU: Is there any change here from the old Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The section is just the same, except that the sum stated in the third line is $200 instead of $500.

Mr. BUREAU: I asked the question because the note at the end of the section would indicate that it was a repetition of section 33 of the Act and the amendment is not shown by brackets. Why has the amount of $500 been decreased to $200? There must be some specific reason.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The reduction is made because under section 46 there is to be a reclassification of the several divisions. On reference to that section it will be found that there are more grades provided and that there is not the same difference in salaries between the grades as heretofore. For instance, in the first division the minimum salary at present is $2,800 and the maximum $4,000. There is now to be inserted between those two amounts another grade, and the rises are more frequent.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—Appointments to be on probation:

Mr. A. K .MACLEAN: I move to strike out the words in subsection 1: "And the cause of the rejection shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission," and to add at the end of that subsection the words: "and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission." It is practically putting at the end of the clause the words which are struck out in the middle.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The clause does not state whether or not the commission shall investigate the cause of rejection as reported by the deputy head. The deputy head may be ill-tempered—people grow old and do not retain the same equanimity as when they are young. The deputy may have a grudge against, or may not like, the employee on probation, and may at once report to the commission that So-and-so is rejected. Will the commission investigate the cause of rejection?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Look at subsection 3.

Mr. LEMIEUX (reading):

The Commission shall decide whether the name of a rejected person shall be struck off the list as unfit for the service generally or whether he shall be allowed a trial in some other position for which he may be eligible.

Mr. BUREAU: He might remain on the list and lose his job in the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On second thought, this subsection is not so clear as it seemed to me at first. It could state, by inserting a word or two, that the commission, when such a report is made by the deputy head, shall investigate. Let us take a concrete case: Suppose I am deputy head of a department and a clerk is appointed on approbation, and I do not find him, or her, as the case may be, a proper officer even on probation. I give some reasons in my report to the commission. Now the commission will decide whether or not my report shall be accepted. Will there be some investigation to ascertain whether the causes stated in the report are valid or not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I really do not think it is necessary to provide for that in the section, because the commission are obliged to make some investigation before they can render a decision.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is not very clear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: However, if the committee think that there should be an amendment, the words "after investigation" might go in after the word "shall", in the first line of subsection 3, which would then read:

(3) The Commission shall after investigation, decide whether the name of the rejected person—

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what I mean.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: In addition to that, there might also be added a rider giving the commission authority to retain the employee in the regular service. I would suggest the addition of the following to subsection (3): "or the commission shall have the power to decide whether the rejected person shall be retained in the original position."

An hon. MEMBER: The same or some other.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would hardly be wise to retain the employee in the department after the deputy head has reported him to be incompetent or inefficient. I think it would be for the good of the Service that he be not sent back to that same department.

Amendments agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 16—Professional and technical positions:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move that the word "competitive" be inserted after the word "without" in the 13th line of this section, so that it will read "either with or without competitive examination."

Mr. BUREAU: Is this not against the principle laid down in this Bill? The deputy head is supposed to accept the man selected by the commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The only difference between this clause and the clause in the old Act is that the approval is to be by the commission instead of by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SHEARD: Why does the minister put in the word "competitive"? Would a surveyor who is a Bachelor of Science be expected to enter a competitive examination in order to take a position in the Department of Public Works?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would put the same question with regard to architects and translators. When the old Act had been in force only a few months we were in need of a competent translator for the Labour Gazette. I suggested the appointment of the late Mr. Lanctot, and the question arose whether a translator was a technical officer. I submitted that a competent translator was a technical officer; the matter was discussed in Council and referred to the Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth, who prepared a memorandum on the subject which may now be found in the Department of Justice. Would an architect have to pass a competitive examination before he could be appointed to a position in the Public Works Department? It is represented to me that under this Bill he would.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: This clause provides that the commission has authority to make such appointments without competitive examination.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When departments require officers with professional or technical knowledge, in some cases advertisements are placed in the press and applicants are requested to communicate with the Civil Service Commission. If two or three of the applicants appear to have equal merits, the commission would likely adopt the procedure which I outlined last night, that of appointing a board to consider the relative merits of each. In that case some sort of examination might be prescribed. The commission are not obliged to do that, however.

9 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: Wherein does this section differ from the old section 21?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "The Commission" is inserted in place of "The Governor in Council." That is practically the only change.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think that is a mistake. The old section was intended to check the appointment of experts by requiring the submission of each case to the Governor in Council. The members of Council, sitting around a table, will not agree to the appointment of a man as an expert if he really is not an expert. I had occasion last year to look into the administration of section 21 under the present Act, and I found that considerable abuse existed. In a return brought down to the House it was shown that 175 appointments of so-called experts had been made under section 21. I found that the appointees were mostly men who were over age and who were receiving small salaries such as $1,100, $1,200 or $1,500 per annum. They were not experts at all, but they were favourites of the administration and they were called "experts" to avoid examination and placed in those positions under section 21. If you open the door any wider and allow the commission to appoint, without examination, any person that they may call an expert, we might as well dispense with the Civil Service Act altogether. I would suggest to the minister that he maintain the language of section 21, so that there will be some check in the appointment of these technical officers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would submit to my hon. friend that the old section, to which he refers was claimed by many members of Parliament to be subject to abuse. It was urged that frequently men were promoted upon the ground that they were technical or professional officers and, on the recommendation of the deputy head and the approval of the Governor in Council, such men might be promoted to a higher position and receive a higher salary. The purpose of this new section was to remove that power from the Governor in Council, which is always a political body. I thought the House would agree that the approval shall be placed in the hands of the commission just to avoid possible abuse. I think this section is much preferable to the old section 21.

Mr. MURPHY: There is just this about it, that the remodelled section may lead in its operation to a conflict between the Civil Service Commission and the deputy head, because it makes the appointment rest on the recommendation of the deputy minister. I am aware that the suggestion has been made to my hon. friend, possibly he has not had time to consider it, and I do not want to press it, but I think it proper to bring it before the committee, so that when it is sought to invoke this section, the intervention of the deputy minister should be confined to asking for an appointment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose changing the word "recommendation" to "request."

Mr. MURPHY: I appreciate what my hon. friend says as being a move in the direction of meeting the situation which I am about to disclose, that is, that the deputy minister should be restricted to asking for an appointment in a certain grade and not for the appointment of a certain individual. That feature of the appointment should be determined by the commission, and not by the deputy minister. The section, as it stands, would prevent that being done by the commission. I do not know whether my hon. friend has had time to go into the details of the question, but I desire to draw attention to it, so that if the change is not made now, it may be considered when the Bill is brought up again.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I beg to move:

That the word "recommendation" in the tenth line be struck out and the word "request" be inserted.

Mr. SHEARD: I submit to the minister that the word "competitive" before the word "examination" is an injury rather than a benefit. If, in these technical examinations such as the one illustrated, a first-class man was an applicant, I doubt very much if he would submit to enter into a competitive examination, especially if he had university or other qualifications which proved his status beyond peradventure. I know I would not if I were making application. I would say that I had got beyond that stage in my professional career. I do not think it is desirable to put in the word "competitive."

Mr. DENIS: I would like to see the words "professional or technical" in the ninth line defined. We are simply trying to avoid a difficulty by not defining those words. I wonder, if the question were asked the members of this committee individually, if there would be two opinions alike. If we do not assume the responsibility of defining those words, how will the commission define them? I would suggest amending the first clause by adding to it a paragraph defining those words, "professional or technical," or else putting at the end of section 16 a definition of those words. It is no use trying to avoid the difficulty, it will come before the commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will my hon. friend offer the committee a definition of the words "professional or technical?" I do not think it is possible to draft a section which would meet his suggestion. It rests with the commission to decide whether the knowledge and ability requisite for any position is professional or technical. I do not see how you could possibly define the words.

Mr. MORPHY: The difficulty arose in regard to section 21 in connection with the famous case in the Militia Department. An issue was raised between the minister and the commission as to the definition in connection with the appointment of a military tailor. I do not think they got beyond the regulations.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Those words were used in the British Civil Service Act and in the United States Civil Service Act, and I do not think either the British Parliament or the United States Congress has been able to find any words to define the idea.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What necessity is there for technical officers in the Outside Service. I had the honour of sitting in this House at the time the original Act was passed, and it was represented to this House that occasionally eminent engineers or men from the outside would be required to do such important work as designing the Quebec bridge or other work of that kind; that such men would not submit themselves to an examination before any commission, and that section 21 was necessary, when a case of that kind arose, to enable the Government to secure the services of an eminent technical expert for carrying on such work. It strikes me that we do not require the section so far as the Outside Service is concerned.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Take the engineers of the Public Works Department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: They are in the Inside Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, not in the several provinces. There are engineers in the Marine and Fisheries Department. In the Outside Service many technical officers are required, and, of course, a great many in the Inside Service.

Mr. CURRIE: Take the case of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Inspectors of boilers and hulls have now to pass a special examination provided by the department. Will they now be examined by the commission?

Mr. BUREAU: I do not see that the section is improved by the amendment that has been moved. The Minister of the Interior may make a request for a surveyor and it is for the commission to do the rest. Under the old Act, the appointment was made by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the minister of the department.

The recommendation of the minister was based on the report in writing of the deputy head, and the man, before being appointed, had to get a certificate from the Civil Service Commission that he was qualified to fill the position. When all these steps had been taken we had a record showing what the deputy head had reported in writing to the minister, the minister's recommendation, the certificate of qualification by the commission, and the Order in Council making the appointment. To-day all a minister has to do is to make a request to the commission that he requires an expert accountant, we will say, and we have no record showing what the man is required for or whether he is qualified. I think the clause ought to be further amended so that if a request is to be made it shall be made in writing, stating the reasons and the particular service for which the man is required.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think this clause is preferable to section 21 in the old Act, which permitted a man to be appointed when the qualifications required were "professional, technical, or otherwise peculiar." We are striking out the words "or otherwise peculiar."

Mr. BUREAU: That is not what I object to. I say the request should be in writing.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the old Act it was possible for the deputy head to read almost anything into the wording of section 21, thereby rendering the section liable to great abuses. We are here restricting the appointments to those offices requiring professional or technical qualifications.

Mr. BUREAU: That is all right. What I object to is that an appointment can be made at the request of the deputy head. Under the old Act the recommendation was made by the minister upon the report of his deputy, and then the applicant had to get a certificate of qualification from the commission. The section reads:

> If the deputy head reports that the knowledge and ability requisite for the position are wholly or in part professional, technical or otherwise peculiar, the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the head of the department based on the report in writing of the deputy head, may appoint a person to the position without competitive examination and without reference to the age limit, provided the said person obtains from the Commission a certificate, to be given with or without examination, as is determined by the regulations of the Commission, that he possesses the requisite knowledge and ability and is duly qualified as to health, character and habits.

The deputy head had to make a report in writing to the minister showing the necessity for appointing a man with technical or professional knowledge. The record was there in writing. But under this section all the deputy head has to do is to send in a request for a technical man and the commission may appoint him. I do not object to substituting the commission for the Governor in Council, but I want to know for what particular purpose the expert accountant or land surveyor is required and what branch of the service he is going to be employed in.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the old Act it was necessary for the report to be in writing, because the Governor in Council had to approve the appointment. If we compelled the deputy head to make a report in writing to the commission to the effect that a technical officer was required for some particular work it would rather tie the hands of the commission. A member of the Civil Service Commission informs me that just a few days ago they were requested to appoint a technical officer, but upon investigation they found that the work was not of a professional or technical nature. I think it is better not to embarrass the commission by a report from the deputy head as to the necessity for a technical man. The commissioners should be allowed to decide whether or not it is a technical position.

Mr. BUREAU: Perhaps I did not make myself clear. The minister says that a report in writing had to be made because

the recommendation had to go before Council. We all know that, the report in writing was to enlighten the minister, so that he could discuss the matter before the Governor in Council when he made his recommendation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the old section say that the commission shall certify that the man required is a professional or technical man? I would not object to the section in the old Act if we gave the commission power to decide whether or not the man required was a professional or technical man.

Mr. BUREAU: The Governor in Council appoints the man provided his qualifications are certified by the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But under the old Act the commission had no say as to whether the office is really one requiring a technical or professional man. I understand that the complaint in previous years, of course mostly prior to 1911, was that the Governor in Council virtually decided that any office they wanted to fill was a professional or technical office, and in that way drove holes through the Civil Service Act. If it were inserted in the Bill that the commission should decide the character of the office, and whether a technical or professional man was required, I think the old clause would read very well.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would point out further that under the present Act the recommendation of the deputy head names a person. Under this section the deputy minister is not called upon to recommend any person, but simply to advise the commission that there is a vacancy for which he requires a person having technical or professional knowledge, and the commission finds the man for him.

Mr. BUREAU: The Acting Minister of Finance has just answered my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, for he said that the deputy head advises the commission he requires a person with technical or professional knowledge for a certain position. If the deputy head is to decide whether a technical man is required or not, I do not see where the commission come in. Under the old Act they had to certify that the applicant was qualified. What does the word "request" mean? I say that the request should be in writing, stating the reasons for the appointment, so that we would have a record of all the steps gone through up to the appointment.

The insertion of this word "request" means that the deputy is going to ask for a certain man. Then the commission will send a man and say: "We certify that Mr. John Jones is a chartered accountant having all the qualifications necessary to fulfil the requisition sent in by the Deputy Minister of Finance."

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The argument of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) presupposes that the Civil Service Commission are going to make wholesale appointments to the Civil Service for which there is no justification.

Mr. BUREAU: Not at all.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If it is necessary that this clause should define the manner in which the requisitions for appointment should be made the same thing is necessary with regard to every other clause. Otherwise the commission will be going ahead and appointing men without any restraint in the way my hon. friend suggested. We must assume that the commission will only appoint men when they are necessary. The clause simply states that in any case where, in the opinion of the commission, the knowledge and ability requisite for any position in the public service are wholly or in part professional or technical the commission may make an appointment with or without examination. If a man is not required in the public service, we must assume that they will not appoint him.

Reverting to the question of the old clause which provided for leaving it to the Governor in Council, we have heard from the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that to his own knowledge when that system prevailed they loaded up the Service with unnecessary appointees.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want it to go on record that I am advocating leaving the matter in the hands of the Governor in Council or that I am afraid that the Civil Service Commission are going to make wholesale appointments. On the contrary, I want to help them and I want to trust them. They will make an appointment at the request of the deputy minister. The deputy minister makes a request and I want that request to be made in writing, stating exactly what the position is that he wants to fill. Otherwise they might send a telephone message and which would not become a matter of record. I do not doubt the ability of the commission to judge of the qualifications of the applicant, but the request from the deputy head should be a matter of written record.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If that is all the hon. gentleman requires, why not put in a blanket clause providing that a record should be made in connection with every appointment to the Civil Service?

Mr. BUREAU: We want to have a record of the requests that are made.

Mr. CRONYN: I beg to move:

That clause 16 be amended by adding, after the word "request" the words "in writing", and after words "deputy head" the words "giving his reasons for such request."

That will preserve a record of the whole transaction and meet the suggestion of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau).

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY: May I draw the attention of the minister to the possible necessity of an amendment to the last part of the section by reason of his having introduced the word "competitive" in the thirteenth line? The section originally provided that the appointee should be selected either with or without examination. My hon. friend inserted after the word "without" the word "competitive." The last portion of the clause reads:

An appointment as a professional or technical officer shall not qualify a person for appointment or transfer to any other position in the public service open to appointment upon competitive examination only.

In view of the introduction of the word "competitive," will the last part of the section still apply?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, I think so.

Mr. MURPHY: Why should it apply to a person who has been appointed in a competitive examination?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think my hon. friend understands the situation. The section provides that if one obtains entrance into the public service upon the ground that he is a technical or professional officer, he cannot later be transferred to another position the appointment to which is made by competitive examination.

Mr. MURPHY: I can conceive of a case where a person might be selected in the first instance and be debarred in the other, but if my hon. friend has given consideration to it, I shall not press the point.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—Promotion to be for merit:

Mr. MURPHY: Should not you change the word "recommendation" to "request" and make it conform to the previous section?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I read in the first line "public service." Should not that be "Civil Service"?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister struck out the first paragraph of section 2 and replaced the words "public service" in the last paragraph with the words "Civil Service;" so that all through the Bill the word "public" should be replaced by the word "Civil."

Mr. McKENZIE: This section will now, I understand, apply to the Outside Service as well as the Inside Service. The promotions in the Outside Service, I presume, will be more systematic and regular than they have been in the past. I would like to know what the machinery will be for making promotions in the Outside Service. In the Inside Service it is readily understandable how the deputy head can get knowledge and promote men. But, how has the deputy head sufficient knowledge to promote a man in the custom house in North Sydney? There must be some machinery by which the deputy head can get, regularly and properly, and without the possibility of pull as it is being used now, knowledge of the Outside Service so that everybody in that service will get promotion regularly according to his merits without being subjected to the influences that are at work now and which in past years have kept men back and put other men forward who did not deserve to go forward because they happened to have influential friends at court.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A later clause in the Bill provides for a reorganization and classification of the Outside Service, in so far as it is possible to classify it. For instance, the customs service, the inland revenue service, and the post office service in the larger cities and towns may be classified; to some extent they are classified now. In such cases, promotion will be made according to seniority and merit. The commission will secure such information as they desire from the chief officer of that branch of the Outside Service.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is understood, then, that it will devolve on the chief officer in any such service—the post office, for instance, or the custom house—to grade his officers and recommend promotions as he may deem it advisable?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The classification will be made by the commission where none exists. The head of the branch of the service affected might possibly make

recommendations. I do not know whether the commission will ask him to do so or not, but he can give them such information as they desire.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is just what I want settled and not left to haphazard. We have it well defined and laid down in this Bill, as far as the Inside Service is concerned, that promotions will be made by the commission on the recommendation of the deputy head. But as regards the Outside Service, no defined machinery exists for that purpose. I readily understand that the employees are to be graded, but how are the promotions to be carried forward according to this grading afterwards?

Mr. CRONYN: It seems to me that section 55 deals with that question as regards the Outside Service. Under that section the commission would have to go into the matter with the several deputy heads and other principal officers and employees.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the word "promotion" to mean that when a public servant is changed from one position to another his condition is bettered? Or does it only mean passing from one class to another?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is what it means.

Mr. BUREAU: Just from one class to another class, not from one position to another which would improve his status?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It means from one grade to another.

Mr. BUREAU: The section requires that in case of promotion the man must do work of greater importance and responsibility; he abandons the work of one class to take up that of another. The subsection provides that the deputy head may at any time during the period of probation cancel the promotion. The old Act provided that when the promotion was cancelled the employee returned to his former position. Now, suppose that an officer has been promoted, another man has been taken on in his place, and at the end of six or eight months the deputy head chooses to cancel the promotion. What is going to happen to the man whose promotion has been cancelled unless we provide that he shall return to the position he formerly held? There is no provision to that effect in this Bill, although there was in the old Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no express provision for such a case.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. BUREAU: There was in the old Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But he is not retired from the service.

Mr. MURPHY: Would he not go upon the list of supernumeraries?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He would probably fall into the list of supernumeraries.

Mr. BUREAU: "Probably" is not an answer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The man is not retired, at any rate.

Mr. PAPINEAU: If the deputy recommends cancellation of a promotion that should be reported to the commission, and the party concerned should have a chance to defend himself.

Mr. BUREAU: I have the old section here and it provides in case a promotion has been cancelled:

He shall then return to the performance of the duties in which he was previously engaged.

I think that is a fair provision. If a man has to abandon one class of work to take up another set of duties, the man who replaces him should be on the list of supernumeraries or hold the position temporarily. Then, if the promotion is cancelled, the temporary man can step out and the other go back to his old position.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would suggest adding after the word "promotion" in the last line of subsection 2 the following words:

"And the cause of such cancellation shall be reported in writing by the deputy head to the Commission.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: I would suggest the following addition to the subsection:

The person whose promotion has been so cancelled shall then return to the performance of the duties in which he was previously engaged—

Mr. CROTHERS: Would that not follow if his promotion were cancelled?

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think it necessarily follows.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think if you read the old section you will find this: A man may be promoted, that is on approbation, and that promotion may be confirmed by the deputy head, or cancelled. If cancelled he goes back to his former position.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) move an amendment?

Mr. BUREAU: The section can stand while I draft one.

Mr. MURPHY: Is provision made in a later section of the Bill for an annual report?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By the commission. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Are the appointments made under section 16 to be set out in that report?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We can discuss that when we come to the section which deals with the matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would move that subsection 2 be further amended by adding the following words at the end of the subsection:

And the person whose promotion is cancelled shall then return to the performance of the duties in which he was previously engaged.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think we are creating a difficulty there. Suppose the position he formerly occupied is filled by somebody else, it would necessitate a rearrangement all around. Is it not well to leave it in the hands of the commission?

Mr. BUREAU: His successor in the old position is on probation also.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would favour leaving the disposition of the individual in the hands of the commission; it would not disturb the department so much.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am informed that the party filling a position from which another has been promoted is also on probation, so that there will be no trouble in the one promoted on probation reverting to his former position.

Mr. PEDLOW: It would be an injustice to the other man if he had been filling the position on probation for six months.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 18—exchanges and transfers.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I would ask some explanation of the words "or in different branches of the public service." Under this provision, is it not possible for instance for an Ottawa man to be sent to Edmonton? We have already a number of Ottawa people, and a number from Calgary. We like these gentlemen very well, but we also like to see our men getting positions, and I submit that some protection should be given to our own people. I quite understand that a department may have a surplus of men or women, and it may be in the interest of the Government to send these people to the different branches in the Outside Service, but it creates a great deal of friction. The matter has been discussed fully and I do not care to repeat the arguments used, but I submit we should be protected so that the commission cannot say to those who are to be transferred: "You shall go to Calgary, and you shall go to Edmonton."

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I quite agree with my hon. friend from East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie). I look upon this section with a good deal of suspicion, as to how "the filling of a vacancy in a department by a transfer from the Inside to the Outside Service or from the Outside to the Inside Service in the same department or in different departments, or in different branches of the public service" will work out. That is where we are going to have the very trouble referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton, and to which I drew the attention of the committee yesterday. It appears to me that there should be some limit set. I would suggest that no more men be sent from the Inside Service to the Outside Service than are received from the Outside to the Inside Service. That is the least that can be done in the way of straightening the matter out. We want our people employed as far as possible in their own localities. They are the likely people to occupy such positions. I, for one, certainly think that the powers of transfer should be decidedly limited both with the deputies and the Civil Service Commission itself, though I think the matter is safer in the hands of the commission than in the hands of the deputy head. I understand, however, that they are both more or less concerned in the transfers, one cannot do it without the other. That is where the great difficulty will come in. It will lead to friction and dissatisfaction in the working of the Act if a large number of Inside Civil servants are sent throughout the country and placed in constituencies where they are not wanted. That is the way the Kingston affair turned out, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) last night. The minister should devise some means of limiting the powers of transfer.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I would suggest the following amendment in line 2: after the words "public service": "the transfer from one branch of the public service to another shall not be made without the written approval of the responsible minister."

Mr. SIFTON: That could be included in a new sub-section.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: It could be, but what I desire put in the section is that a transfer will not be made from one branch to another without the written approval of the responsible minister.

Mr. BUREAU: Or the head of the department.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I prefer the responsible minister. Then the commission will be very careful in making transfers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The only objection I see to the suggestion is that you are introducing a minister into Civil Service appointments. The purpose of the Bill——

Mr. SIFTON: A transfer is not an appointment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is the approval of a transfer. If it is a transfer, that means a new appointment for somebody. It is not so very objectionable, of course. It is possible that this section might give rise to the abuses suggested by my hon. friend, but, having regard to the approving power of the commission, we should at least wait until we find that it is being abused before we change it.

Mr. SIFTON: Within the last two weeks I stopped four transfers from Ottawa to the Outside Service in another province.

Mr. PARDEE: I am not prepared to offer an amendment to cover the case, but I think that some provision should be made whereby new appointments shall not be made outside the districts within which the work is to be done. I quite understand that in the event of civil servants not being required in a department in Ottawa or Toronto, places would have to be found for them in the Service. I am in favour of Civil Service reform, but I am not in favour of a number of men being sent from Ottawa to my constituency, because men in that constituency are quite able to pass the competitive examination and to carry out the duties of any position that may be vacant within it. Until some amendment is offered to cover this point, I think the clause should stand.

Mr. PEDLOW: Employees in the office of a minister or a deputy minister are sometimes sent to another branch of the department as typists or in some other capacity and are continued at such salaries as $1,400 to $1,700 a year. These persons so transferred are often not able to earn, in their new positions, the salaries which they had previously been receiving. Is the minister making provision against such an anomaly as that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no provision in the Bill for a case of that kind.

Mr. PEDLOW: Such cases have occurred in different departments.

Mr. CROWE: I agree that positions which are vacant within a province should be given to persons living in that province. Two or three weeks ago a notice was sent to members of the House, from which I quote the following:

> The Civil Service Commissioners hereby give public notice that applications will be received from candidates qualified to fill the following positions in the Civil Service of Canada.

The first position was that of postmaster at Lethbridge, and it was announced that the examination would take place in Ottawa. Why should that position be filled from Ottawa? Should not that examination be held in Alberta and the appointment made of a person in that province? The same applies to British Columbia; if a position is vacant there, why should it not be filled by someone from that province? Not long ago a matron went from Ottawa to fill a position in a convalescent home out there. Surely that is not right.

10 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am surprised to find this parochialism prevailing among our extreme protectionists. To say that a man should not be sent where his services are most required is protectionism running mad. I was told by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) the other day that I never moved very much from Cape Breton and that my knowledge was confined practically to herring. Of course, I accepted that good-naturedly, but may I point out that I live in a province where we have to take men from Montreal, Quebec, New Brunswick—all along the line of the Intercolonial. The management of the Intercolonial send their men where they are most needed, or where they can suitably fill positions. If a man is sent from Montreal to look after the station at North Sydney we do not say a word about it. It is good policy that a man shall not be transferred from one province to another if that can reasonably be avoided, but I think we may safely leave that to the department. It is altogether too parochial to say that in this great democratic country

of ours a man should not go from one province to be employed in another. The disposition of civil servants can well be left as a matter of policy to the commission and to the departments concerned.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Last evening I read from a statement prepared by a member of the commission setting forth their policy in respect to transfers from one town to another or from one province to another. I will read again that portion of the statement:

> There is naturally a very strong feeling throughout the country that positions should, wherever possible, be filled by the appointment of local persons and that except in the case of transfers, which might occasionally become necessary, "outsiders" as they are regarded should not receive preferment.

As the member for North Cape Breton says, it may be quite necessary at times to make a transfer from the Outside to the Inside Service, or vice versa. I do not see how you can prevent that by legislation. Would it meet the view of the member for Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) if this section were amended by adding after the word "of," at the end of the 4th line on page 8, the words "the heads of the department or departments affected, and by"?

Mr. MACKIE: I would rather throw the responsibility on the acting minister. My only point is the necessity of some safeguard against the making of unnecessary transfers. I may say to the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) that we are not parochial, and that we are not running mad—but we do not desire to run amuck. Because we do not take two hours to explain our views here, is no reason why we are not sensible in presenting these amendments.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not wish to half-do things myself.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In the western provinces the population is increasing very rapidly and men naturally, as they come into that country, expect to get positions. Consequently, there are men who should be promoted who will be prevented from being promoted by having some individual from some other town taking the higher position. I understand, of course, it is sometimes necessary for a department to make a transfer, but I desire to guard against a wholesale use of transfers.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose there is a good reason why the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) is afraid of competition from the outside world. As a Nova Scotian, I am not afraid of any such competition. We in Nova Scotia are ready for all-comers, and our own breed and our own production will be so superior to theirs that we are not afraid of competition. I can readily understand that men coming from some other places—I am not going to name any place in particular—may be afraid of the enlightened competition that might come from the outside world. Nova Scotia is, however, not one of those places.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In the western provinces we hope very shortly, not many years from now, to put into practice the policy which these gentlemen suggested, but which during their whole administration they did not dare to put into practice.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I beg to move:

> That after the word "of" at the end of the fourth line on page 8, the following words be added: "The head or heads of the department or departments affected and by."

The clause will then read:

> Or in different branches of the Public Service, may be made on the recommendation of the deputy head or deputy heads, as the case may be, with the approval of the head or heads of the department or departments affected and by the Commission.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What does the minister mean by the "head" of the department? I understand that is the minister.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Then why not say "minister"? If we said "minister," there would be no doubt about the matter. In some departments the supervision is more or less divided.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The interpretation section says that the "head" of the department is the minister.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I quite agree with the original draft of the section. Not only is it very much in the interest of the country that these exchanges should be made from one province to another, but it is desirable; and, as a matter of fact, the Civil Service Commission has already been making a considerable number of transfers. In Prince Edward Island we often have visits from agricultural representatives from Ontario, and we, in exchange, send our Prince Edward Island men to Ontario. Exchanges of that nature, especially in the agricultural department, are very desirable, because a number of Ontario farmers know more along certain lines than our farmers do, and vice versa. You know that two knives sharpen each other when you rub

them together, and so we are going to enlighten those western people a little, and we are endeavouring to do it all the time by sending our people out West, and we want our western friends to visit us in the East, and we shall show them some things that they do not see in the West.

Mr. MURPHY: Section 18 says:

> The Commission shall in each case determine whether a person sought to be transferred or exchanged possesses the requisite knowledge and ability and is duly qualified as to health, character, age and habits.

It is intended to restrict the work of the commission solely to that which is defined there, or is the commission to have anything to say as to the sufficiency or otherwise of the reasons of the transfer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The former part of the section says that no transfer can be made except with the approval of the minister and the commission. They must approve the transfer, and then they must satisfy themselves as to the requisite knowledge and ability, health, character, age and habits of the party transferred.

Mr. MURPHY: I am afraid the amendments have created a redundancy and a confusion there.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. PEDLOW: The matter to which I called attention some time ago deserves more than passing notice. It is an important item, and it should have been dealt with under clause 2 of this section. I would suggest that all the words in that clause after the word "shall" be struck out and the following inserted instead:

> —not necessarily carry with them the salary that the individual has been in receipt of in the previous position.

That means that that feature of the transfer will be left open to be dealt with by the commission and the deputy of the particular department. The individual may not necessarily be worth as much in the department to which the transfer has been made as in the previous position. The individual may not have been giving satisfaction in the previous position and may be transferred for good reasons, and if he is transferred to a lower position, he should not necessarily draw the higher salary. A great deal of dissatisfaction has been caused in Ottawa where transfers have been made, such transfers carrying with them the higher salaries that the parties transferred are not capable of earning.

[Mr. Read.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see what arrangement could be made in the case of a member of the Civil Service who has been receiving a stated salary in some special grade or division of the public service, and who is transferred to another department and doing work of less importance and still receiving the old salary. I think it would hardly be fair in any cases to reduce the man's salary.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think the same rule should be followed as obtains in private business, where if a man is not capable of earning his salary he is dismissed. But the Government are more lenient. I do not see why a change to another department should carry with it a larger salary than employees of that department are earning. The instances I gave are of typists earning $1,700 a year, who were transferred to a department where the employees were receiving only $1,000 a year and had been longer in the service than the ones who were transferred. I think we should provide against cases of that kind.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot suggest any method at the moment of meeting the case which my hon. friend suggests, but I will give it consideration between now and Monday, and we can then revert to the consideration of this section.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is not only the transfer from the inside to the outside service that we might object to, but the transfer from one place to another. For instance, a party might go from Ottawa—we expect most of them will,—to Toronto, or from Montreal to Toronto, and that is what we want to avoid. We do not want the large centres to get more than their share of appointees. We do not want them to be sent into the smaller places where there are comparatively a small number of offices to be filled. I do not want to be construed as objecting to a person being sent from one province to another; I never suggested that. We object to the moving from one part of one province to another part of the same province as much as we do to the transfer from one province to another. We want to get the proper number for each electoral district, and I think the minister should add something to the effect that employees shall not be transferred from one city to another city, or from one city to a village, or from one electoral district to another electoral district; I think "electoral district" is the better word.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Before a transfer can be made under the section as amended,

the recommendation of the deputy head must be approved by the minister and by the commission. I do not see how any greater protection could be afforded.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. PEDLOW: I thought the section was to stand for further consideration.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. If I can find any amendment to meet the case mentioned by my hon. friend, which I do not think is possible, we can revert to the section. The amendment, however, need not necessarily go in this section.

Mr. PEDLOW: The matter will not be lost sight of?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. BUREAU: It will only be forgotten.

On section 20—Annual increases, how made:

Mr. FIELDING: Why do you limit it to the word "annual?"

Mr. FOURNIER: Take the case of a young lady appointed temporarily to the Post Office Department, we will say, on the first of December, 1912, and who was appointed permanently in 1913, and promoted in 1914. If the deputy head has a grudge against her, he need not recommend an increase, and she will be left in the cold. What was the procedure under the old Act? Did the civil servants receive an increase every year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The present section is practically the same as the old. In reply to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), the word "annual" is inserted because the increases are statutory annual increases.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood that the Outside Service got a statutory increase of $100, and the same grade in the Inside Service an annual increase of $50. Does this section cancel that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are no statutory increases for the Outside Service.

Mr. BUREAU: Under the old Act the increase was automatic, some getting an increase of $50 and some $100 a year.

Mr. SIFTON: The increase is made by Order in Council every year.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think there is a well understood rule that the letter carriers get, perhaps without statutory provision, an advance each year until they reach a certain maximum, and it appears to me that this section is going to knock that on the head. I do not think that is desirable. I think every one who gives good service is entitled to his annual increase to the maximum of his class. Under this section, the letter carriers will not get it until every case has been considered by the Deputy Postmaster General. I think now the letter carriers get an increase of 25 cents per day each year up to about five years, until they reach a maximum of $2.75 or $3; it is certainly not less than $2.75, and perhaps it is more in the West. I think that increase should be continued without any reference to the deputy head.

Mr. PEDLOW: I had understood there was provision in the Act for a statutory increase. There is certainly discrimination between the Inside and Outside Service, if I am correctly informed, because while the Outside Service receives an increase of $100 the same grade in the Inside Service receives only a $50 increase every year. So a man in the Inside Service after ten years' service would be no better off than a man who had been in the Outside Service five years. That seems to be an injustice.

Mr. CURRIE: Section 47, which we have not reached yet, says:

> There may be given to every officer, clerk or other employee in the first division an annual increase of $100, and in the other divisions an annual increase of $50, until the maximum of the grade is reached.

That is virtually imperative. But the section now under consideration changes that. It says:

> No officer, clerk, or employee shall receive any annual increase of salary except on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the Commission, that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase.

That clause permits a great deal of what we may call the old political spirit, and I think it should be amended to say that:

> Every officer, clerk or employee shall receive an annual increase of salary, except on the special report of the deputy head, concurred in by the Commission, that such officer, clerk or employee is not deserving of such increase.

Then the increase comes automatically, unless the officer has a black mark against him and the deputy can show any special reason why he should not have his increase he will get it. As it stands there, when one side of politics gets in, the fellows of that political colour get their increase automatically every year and the other fellows do

not. If we are going to take the service out of politics, or drive all kinds of partisanship out of it, I think it would be only fair to change that clause in that way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That clause has been in the Civil Service Act for quite a number of years. It was never intended that the increase should be received by a civil servant as a matter of course. I doubt very much if that amendment should be carried. That section was drafted having in mind the Inside Service and, I am going to ask the committee to allow me to drop it here and when we reach the clauses having reference to the Inside Service we will take the matter up and it can be considered.

Mr. CURRIE: That clause has caused more canvassing and difficulty than anything else in the service. Civil servants, within three months of the time when the annual increases are given, start writing to members and importuning them to go and see the ministers in order to help them to get their increases. This removes that difficulty. If the civil servant knows that his increase will come to him automatically if he has done his duty and if his conduct has been good, he will not bother about it and that difficulty will be overcome.

Mr. TRAHAN: If the suggestion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is adopted, there will be a report from the deputy head stating that the officer does not deserve an increase and that report must be concurred in by the commission. Would it not be just to the employee that the report, before being sent to the commission, should also be sent to the employee so that he will have the right to defend his case before the commission? That will prevent an abuse of power by the deputy head.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would not think that would be in the interest of the Civil Service.

Mr. TRAHAN: Why not? It is in the interest of the public service that when a report is made against an employee he shall have an opportunity to defend and protect himself. That is the way to protect civil servants. If you have a deputy who wants to persecute some employee without reason and make adverse reports concerning him why should you not give that employee a chance to defend himself before the commission and to contradict if possible the adverse report that is made?

Section dropped.

[Mr. Currie.]

On section 23—salary to be raised to new minimum:

Mr. BUREAU: I see that the grades are changed by this Bill. We shall come to that later on. Take a person in 2B under the Act of 1908 with a salary of $1,600 and who has been for over a year at the maximum. He is eligible for promotion to 2A, the maximum salary of which is $2,100, on the recommendation of the deputy head. Does this clause mean that that employee shall be classified in grade D under this Act, with salary beginning at $1,700 and rising to $2,100? He has reached the maximum of his class but he finds himself in a higher class, under the new classification, than the one which he has now reached. Yet this Bill provides that there shall be no promotion from one class to another. What is to become of that officer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If under the new grading the maximum is below the maximum in the existing division or grade that officer goes to the present maximum.

Mr. BUREAU: He will have the benefit of the higher grade in order to reach the other maximum?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: Has this section any relation to the employees in the Customs Department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It has relation to the employees in all the departments.

Mr. PEDLOW: Then I would like to refer to the Customs Department where the employees are underpaid.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the hon. gentleman please reserve his remarks on the subject of salaries until we come to section 46?

Section agreed to.

On section 24—Additional payments forbidden.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What significance have the words "permanently employed" in the fourth line of this section? Under section 3, which we have passed, the officers are employed on their good behaviour, and in section 11 it is provided, that except where otherwise expressly provided, all appointments to the public service shall be during pleasure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "During pleasure" means a permanent appointment.

Mr. CURRIE: Does this section bar the granting of additional salaries by Order in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: A great many employees in one department are working overtime in another department. Will this section debar them from receiving payment for that overtime?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It does do that.

Mr. CURRIE: What about customs officers who, as the minister knows, work overtime for extended periods?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Remuneration for that is voted in the estimates.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have knowledge of the fact that some employees in the Post Office Department are doing night work, at the present time, in the Department of Finance, and are being paid for their overtime. Will this section prevent those employees from doing that work and getting paid for it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it does prevent that.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think they should be permitted to do this work, if it is necessary, and be paid for it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think at one time that was permissible, but it led to certain abuses and Parliament prohibited the practice. I do not know to what extent abuse has occurred, but I think it is better that those in the public service should not be allowed to engage in additional work after hours—it leads to favouritism and disturbs the service.

Section agreed to.

On section 25—Temporary employment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This section is exactly the same as the present section 23, except that the authorization has now to be made by the commission instead of by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CAHILL: Should not the request referred to in the section be a written request?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think this section is too drastic for the requirements in some branches of the service when it necessitates that no one shall be employed, practically, unless they have passed the Civil Service examinations. During the Christmas season in all cities and towns there is a large requisition for temporary employees for work that will last a week or ten days. At that season in the Brantford post office for several years past from twenty to twenty-five persons are temporarily employed many of whom are school boys of sixteen years of age and less. All they require is a go-cart and a pair of good legs to help the postmen to deliver the mail. Surely it was not intended that no one can be temporarily employed in such work as that without passing a Civil Service examination?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Another section in the Bill provides that the commission may make regulations regarding appointments of that character, and I should think that in such cases an examination would not be exacted.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If that is going to be done all right. I wish to draw the attention to the provision that temporary employees shall not be employed more than six months. That is not going to be lived up to at all, nor is it likely to be lived up to unless the regulations are entirely changed. As I pointed out in my remarks last evening there are many employees in the Brantford post office at the present time who have been at work there from three to four years and they are still called "temporary" employees. These men are relieving other employees who have gone to the war. It appears to me that a man who has been employed for three or four years in any branch of the public service should no longer be classed as a temporary employee. He is there nobody knows how long, but until the war is over. Perhaps some of the men will never come back; some will be killed, others maimed. All through these four years these so-called temporary employees have had to submit to the status of temporary men—and did not get statutory increases, their uniforms were not supplied, and many other perquisites that would go to the regular occupant were not given to them, because they are classified as "temporary" employees while really they are permanent employees. This system is decidedly wrong.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree that possibly there have been abuses. It has been a method employed to get persons into the service. I trust now that the commission will have jurisdiction, the Act in this respect will not be subject to such abuses in the future. My hon. friend inquires how the temporary employee may be kept in the position which he fills during the absence of the civil servant on military service. A way in which it could be done is that a new employment could commence at the end of the six-months' period.

Mr. MOWAT: The last clause provides for that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: When a man has thoroughly mastered his job, he will be changed off or dismissed at the end of six months? That is not the intention.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That last part of the clause reads:

> One or more extensions of such period of employment may be granted by the Commission, but each such extension shall be limited to a period not exceeding six months.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a new clause?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, provided especially to meet cases of that kind.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think it is very objectionable.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Instead of the extra assistance being secured on the report of the deputy head, it should be asked for by the minister, because it calls for expenditure, and the minister is responsible to Parliament.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am afraid, if the minister is to make the authorization, there will be a very much greater expenditure of money.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I want to keep the minister responsible to this House as much as possible.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it is much safer to have the authorization made by the commission.

Mr. CAHILL: I would suggest that in the third line of subsection (1) the word "written" should be inserted so that it will read: "on the written request of the deputy head, that such extra assistance is required."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the word "report" is more suitable than the word "request."

Mr. SIFTON: There is no objection to inserting the word "written?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, that can be inserted.

Mr. MURPHY: There should be some limit set upon these six months' periods. If not, they may be continued for such a length of time that temporary employment would really become permanent employment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is quite true that there might be room for abuses, but I do not see how you can provide against that very well.

Mr. MURPHY: Unless you would limit it in the case of a particular individual to a certain number of renewals.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is a difficult case to provide for in a Bill.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It has resulted from war conditions.

Mr. MURPHY: It is an abuse that existed before the war, and which has been aggravated by the war.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We shall see how it works out this coming year.

Section agreed to.

On section 27—Holidays.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would suggest that the word "may" in the first line of this section be struck out and the word "shall" substituted. I think it only right that civil servants should be entitled, as a matter of right, to eighteen days' vacation as provided in this section, that it should not be left to the deputy head to decide whether or not an employee shall get his holiday. In my constituency it has been brought to my notice that there are employees in the public service who have received no holidays whatever for some years, and I have been requested to bring this matter to the attention of the House and to point out that there has been an injustice in some cases. I suggest that the minister consider the advisability of making this section mandatory instead of permissive.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would suggest in addition to the first part of this section. It reads:

> The deputy head may grant to each officer, clerk or other employee a yearly leave of absence for a period not exceeding eighteen days in any one fiscal year, exclusive of Sundays and holidays.

I would add the words "after they have been one full year in the service."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to propose that as an amendment?

Mr. PEDLOW: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall accept that amendment.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I think eighteen days is too short a time for a vacation.

Mr. SIFTON: It is really twenty-one days, the Sundays are not counted.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Even so, take for instance the inspector at Edmonton, Mr. Cairns, a very efficient man, who has been in the service a long time. That seems a very short holiday to give an efficient public servant. There seems to be no discretion to grant a longer period of vacation than twenty-one days. I submit that it should be left to the discretion of the deputy head.

Mr. SIFTON: There is provision for a longer absence under certain conditions.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment moved by Mr. Pedlow carry?

Mr. BUREAU: What about the first amendment substituting the word "shall" for "may"?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In answer to the suggestion of the member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie that the word "shall" be substituted for "may," I wish to point out that this section applies to both the Outside and the Inside Service, and in many cases it would be impossible to grant members of the Outside Service a holiday. I do not think it should be obligatory in any event. As a matter of fact, the Inside Service regularly get their holidays, I think, with rare exceptions, but it might happen in some years that a great number of employees could not be spared for one reason or another. I think we may well trust the administrative heads of departments to see that all employees get the regular holiday unless there is some good reason why they should not.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Why is it not possible to arrange holidays for employees of the Outside Service as well as for those of the Inside Service?

Mr. SIFTON: In many customs offices where only one man is employed, the office would have to be closed if he took three weeks holidays. Besides, in many cases the employees have no desire to go from where they are.

Mr. McKENZIE: As to the question of using the word "may" or "shall," when you are dealing with the prerogative of the Crown the word "may" is always used, but it is construed to mean "shall." In this case the deputy minister is exercising the prerogative of the Crown.

Section agreed to.

On section 30—Dismissal:

Mr. BUREAU: We are closing one end of the pipe of patronage and opening the other. If a man does not suit the gentlemen who are running the department, he may be dismissed on the recommendation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see how this section can be amended. The power must remain in the Government to dismiss.

Mr. BUREAU: So far as appointments are concerned I have no complaint, but there should be a safeguard also in the matter of dismissals. Let this section stand and we will think it over on Sunday and come back on Monday with some inspiration in the matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Let us pass the section, and we will revert to it later.

Mr. BUREAU: How can we revert to it if we pass it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By consent of the committee.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that the idea is to pass the Bill to-night, and then we shall hear no more of it. If the Bill is not to pass to-night, all right; I reserve the right, with the consent of the Government, to come back to this section later.

Mr. MURPHY: By section 2 "deputy," or "deputy head," is stated to mean the Auditor General, in all cases in which such meaning is not inconsistent with his powers and duties under the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. The Auditor General cannot be dismissed except by a vote of Parliament.

11 p.m.

Mr. SIFTON: The Auditor General is really not a deputy head.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He is given the position of deputy head for the purposes of this Act. All persons who are in charge of a number of employees are called deputy heads.

Mr. MURPHY: I direct the attention of the Government to this so that the argument may not afterwards be made that the dismissal of the Auditor General was provided for or intended by this section.

Section agreed to.

On section 31—suspensions:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move:

That, in clause (a) of subsection 1, the following words be stricken out: "or from the receipt of his salary."

They do not seem to serve any good purpose there. The words rather suggest that a man might be performing his duty

by working in a department and not receiving his salary. That would hardly be fair.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: I beg to move:

That in the first line of subsection 2 after the word "suspension" the words "with the reasons therefor" be inserted, and that after the word "reported," the words "in writing" be inserted.

The subsection will then read:

All cases of suspension with the reasons therefor shall be reported in writing by the deputy head to the Commission.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 32—commission to control staff:

Mr. BUREAU: This is an entirely new clause. In this Bill we have so far been dealing with the Civil Service Commission and the commissioner or commissioners. This section says: " or other members composing any commission or board appointed by the Governor in Council." What commission or what board will that be?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This would apply to any commission appointed by the Governor in Council. It is designed to put the commissioner or commissioners in the position of deputy heads under this Act. For instance, one or more of the pension commissioners would make all such recommendations as are made under this Act by deputy ministers.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not answer my question. Power is here given to the Civil Service Commission to "oversee and direct the officers, clerks and employees under its, his or their control," By this section this power is also given to "other members composing any commission or board." Why does the minister not say: " or the commissioner or head of the commission appointed by the Governor in Council?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would be just the same. If my hon. friend will read the last two lines of the section he will there get the reason for the section. The last two lines reads:

And shall, with respect to such officers, clerks and employees, have all the powers conferred by this Act on the deputy head of a department.

Frequently throughout the sections which we have passed, the hon. member will notice, the deputy head will make a request to the commission to make an appointment. In the case of these commissions, outside of departments, that request will be made by one of the commissioners or by them all. I think it is necessary to have that clause.

Mr. PAPINEAU: I understand that there will be a commissioner who will have all the power of the deputy head, so that he will replace him in the department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A commissioner will have the power of a deputy head for the purposes of this Act only. If the Railway Board wants to make a transfer or a promotion, the head of the board makes the request in writing to the Civil Service Commission, just as the Act now requires a deputy head to make that request.

Mr. BUREAU: In a department, the deputy head has to make that request. In the commission or board, any member of the commission or board may make it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I should think that the chairman of the Railway Board, or in his absence, the vice-chairman, would make the request. I do not think it would be well if any member of the commission might make requests. By this section we are giving members composing any commission or board appointed by the Governor in Council wider powers than the deputy heads now have. The duties of the deputy heads are defined by Act of Parliament, but here you have members of a commission or board each acting as an independent deputy head.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. BUREAU: I would suggest that the section read:

The Civil Service Commission, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission or the acting Chairman, and the Chairman of any board or commission appointed by the Governor in Council, or the acting chairman for the time being.

Mr. DAVIS: If in line 28, after the word " conferred," the following words: " and be subject to all the duties imposed " be added, so that the clause would read:

And shall with respect to such officers, clerks and employees have all the powers conferred and be subject to all the duties imposed by this Act on the deputy head of a department.

Would that not meet the case?

Mr. BUREAU: That does not affect my suggestion. My idea is to have the head of

a commission or board or some one acting in his stead, perform the duties and take the responsibility.

Mr. FIELDING: In some cases there is only one commissioner.

Mr. BUREAU: Then so much the easier.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think this section is entirely superfluous. We have now the Civil Service Commission with a head properly appointed, and certainly he has all the powers necessary for the working of that commission. Now you are making him and the two other members of that commission deputy ministers. In the case of a commission with half a dozen men they would all be deputy ministers. That seems to be creating confusion unnecessarily. I think the Order in Council appointing any commission should define its powers.

Mr. DAVIS: Having in mind clause 3 of section 4, I beg to move that after the word "conferred" in section 32, there be inserted the words "and be subject to all the duties imposed." Clause 3 of section 4 reads:

> The deputy heads and all other officers and employees in the Public Service shall give the Commission such access to their respective departments and offices and such facilities, assistance and information as the Commission may require for the performance of its duties.

Amendment stands.

Section stands.

On section 34—Oaths.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I object to schedule "B," which reads as follows:

> And that I will not, without due authority in that behalf, disclose or make known any matter or thing which comes to my knowledge by reason of my employment as (as the case may be).

We do not want a civil servant to be a spy, but at the same time he is an officer paid by the Government of this country to fulfil his duties conscientiously. This oath of secrecy would prevent him from divulging any scandalous proceeding, we will say, that came under his notice in the performance of his duties.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is applicable to the Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It extends to other employees. Clause 2 reads:

> In the case of the Clerk of the Privy Council, and all officers, clerks and employees under him, and in the case of any officer, clerk or employee of whom the Governor in Council requires the same, there shall be added to the oath at the asterisks, in the form of the oath in the said Schedule A, the words contained in Schedule B. to this Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is, when designated by the Governor in Council for special reasons. This has always been the law, and I think it is a very good provision.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like a better reason than that from my hon. friend.

Mr. DAVIS: What force does my hon. friend attach to the words "without due authority in that behalf" in schedule B?

Mr. LEMIEUX: A civil servant may discover in the performance of his duties some gross disregard of the public weal; something scandalous may be going on, but he may be debarred by the deputy head or some other person in authority from divulging what he has seen. He might say "I am under oath of secrecy and cannot divulge these things." I quite agree that there must be secrecy in some things. For instance, the Clerk of the Privy Council cannot divulge what takes place in Council. If it should apply only to the Clerk of the Privy Council I would raise no objection, but this subsection is not at all clear. I am only raising the point in order to make it clearer. It applies to "any officer, clerk or employee of whom the Governor in Council requires the same."

Mr. SIFTON: The Dominion Police force, for instance.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quite understand that detectives must take an oath of secrecy and must not divulge what takes place. You ought to make it clear so that there will be no ambiguity. The Government might appoint a commission or a board and the Governor in Council might direct the deputy head to give special instructions to the men employed under him not to divulge what should take place.

Mr. SIFTON: They would have to go before the Clerk of the Privy Council and take an affidavit to that effect? A mere instruction would not be of any use.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) can understand how and why there might be many officials in the Naval Service or the Militia Department who should be bound to secrecy. This section has been in the statute for a long time; it has not created any difficulty in the past and I think it is a very wise provision.

Mr. BURRELL: Take the case of confidential documents being sent down to the King's Printer to be printed; it is necessary

to have all the clerks in that department bound over to secrecy.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not object so much to that, but I would like to know the reason why the law is being changed. In the old law it is provided that the officer shall take and subscribe to the oath of allegiance and also the oath contained in schedule C, which is as follows:

I....solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfil the duties which devolve upon me as.....and that I will not ask or receive any sum of money, services, recompense or matter or thing whatsoever, directly or indirectly in return for what I have done or may do in the discharge of any of the duties of my said office, except my salary or what may be allowed me by law or by an order of the Governor in Council.

I think that is a wise oath. I would like to know the reason why that oath, as well as the oath of allegiance, has been suppressed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The oath of allegiance is referred to in connection with section 34, but it is not in the schedule. We will insert the oath of allegiance when we reach it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Surely the oath of allegiance is in the schedule.

Mr. MURPHY: The text is not given, but it is referred to in the section.

Mr. CURRIE: I cannot understand why that schedule A is amended. With reference to schedule B, wherein the officer declares that he will not make known any matter or thing which comes to his knowledge by reason of his employment, why should a man be debarred from telling his superior, or the deputy minister, if anything occurs to the detriment of the service? He is precluded from doing that now. He has to close his eyes to anything that takes place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The schedule will stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You will amend the form?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then how can we pass the clause? The clause is subject to certain conditions and those conditions are contained in the schedule.

Mr. SIFTON: You can put in any conditions you like.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. BUREAU: But schedules A and B are part of the clause. If you pass the clause you cannot change them.

Mr. SIFTON: My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance says he is going to make new sections.

Section agreed to.

On section 35—Voting at elections permitted, but partisan work forbidden:

Mr. BUREAU: I think the last words in that section "dismissed from the public service," are sufficient. All that is necessary is to provide is that the person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of an offence and shall be dismissed from the public service.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Does that mean that he is debarred from taking part in a municipal election?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Should you not mention that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. BUREAU: It says in any Dominion or provincial election.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But it does not say that he is not debarred from taking part in any municipal election.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is better as it is; he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He is not debarred.

Mr. FIELDING: The clause, I believe, has been in the law for some time, but I happen to know that in a matter of very great importance the word "provincial" was held to cover everything municipal inasmuch as the provincial authority creates the municipality.

Mr. MOWAT: Very often the postmaster or the collector of customs occupies the position of reeve, or other office in a municipal council, and it would be a pity to deprive them of the enjoyment of that privilege.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Would this be considered partisanship: A postmaster is a road foreman under the provincial government. He has power to engage men and dismiss them as he likes, and I know of instances where he has exercised the power just as he fancied. Would that be called partisanship?

Mr. MACLEAN: This section would not cover that case.

Mr. CURRIE: Would he not be using party funds? As the schedule does not contain a definition of what "party funds" are I would like to know from the minister what is meant by the term?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know, perhaps my hon. friend would undertake to give a definition.

Mr. BUREAU: Nobody in this House could define what party funds are.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let us be serious. I consider that the last line of the first section advertises Canada in rather a wrong way. It smacks of corruption and I would drop the expressions used there.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "Party funds" need not necessarily suggest corruption.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Generally it does.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not always.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Generally it does, from what I have seen in the case of others. I do not think it is a line that should be allowed to remain there because you seem to say by this section: "You A, B and C in the Civil Service being electors and on the list can cast your vote. I, your chief or your party leader, may receive and deal with any money or any party funds, but not you." It seems to me that we should not advertise in this way the political corruption that may take place in the country.

Mr. CURRIE: We will take another round out of this clause which reads:

No deputy head, officer, clerk or employee in the public service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election.

As a matter of fact I understand that in some of the provinces, Dominion civil servants are not permitted to vote at provincial elections. I think that is the case in the province of Ontario. It would seem as if this section confers upon such civil servant the right to vote in provincial elections which we have no power to do. As long as we say that they are not debarred from voting in the Dominion elections, that is as far as we can go. The section goes on to say:

If, under the laws governing the said election, he has the right to vote; but no such deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work.

—and so on. Now we have discussed what constituted partisan work in this House and we have had some very violent arguments about it. It was declared at that time that partisan work was not objectionable unless it was of an offensive character. The mere fact that a man went around in the company of a few party friends smoking his pipe peacefully, or attended a political meeting, was not regarded as partisanship as long as he did not do anything offensive or act in a partisan way. But we are leaving the word "offensive" out altogether in this Bill, and a man who simply attended a political meeting would be considered guilty of an offence as the Bill stands. A member of the Civil Service who went to a political meeting and merely listened to the speakers, he would be regarded as having engaged in partisan work. I think the minister would be well advised if he inserted the word "offensive" in the section. That would give a man in the public service a chance to justify himself who happened to be in a crowd listening to a soap box orator who was delivering an arraignment against this Government, because that man could say, "I did not take any part in the proceedings. I was only an on-looker." The clause as it now stands is a very drastic one and could be construed in a very drastic manner. Under the old definition everybody in the service knew what was meant; they could attend a political gathering and they could vote, but they could not become agents or canvassers or take an offensive part in an election. That is only fair; I would not deprive any man in the service of the right to attend a political meeting. He has the right to vote and before voting should have the right to listen to both sides if he so desires. For that reason I would ask the minister to insert the word "offensive" before the words "partisan work." Hundreds of men have been charged with violation of the law and taking part in elections offensively and it all hinged on whether they were offensive partisans or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who shall decide whether a civil servant has been engaged in political work such as to merit dismissal?

Mr. BUREAU: The judge.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If dismissal was a penalty I suppose the minister, the deputy head or the commission should decide that. I think it very important, now that the Civil Service Act is being made applicable to the Outside Service, that all public servants abstain from taking part in elections. They are, of course, entitled to the right of attending meetings and to vote.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You invite them under this clause to take part in politics. They are not debarred from voting at elections.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have the right to vote but not to engage in partisan work. I mention this in the interest of the service—and I think it is also in the public interest—that hereafter they abstain from taking part in an election.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who shall decide whether an officer has been offensively partisan and deserves dismissal? Will it be the minister, the deputy head or the commission?

Mr. BUREAU: The Governor in Council under section 30.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would say the commission.

Mr. BLAKE: The word "active," if inserted in the section, would solve the problem. There is no harm in a man attending a political meeting, but if he goes out and canvasses, or does any work in the election on behalf of any candidate, or takes any part in organizing, he is an active partisan.

Mr. CURRIE: I object to the clause as it stands, because it is open to such wide interpretation. The Elections Act provides that a man taking part in an election must either be an agent or a canvasser, drive voters to the poll, and so on. All these things are clearly defined as taking a partisan part in an election. If we are providing a penalty of $500 or imprisonment, we should not leave the interpretation of political partisanship so wide open. If a public servant happens to stand on a street corner when a political meeting is taking place, he might be charged with partisanship, taken before a magistrate and fined $500. The wording of the clause is altogether too loose with a penalty so high as that, and in justice to these men it should be clearly stated what partisanship consists of, whether attending public meetings, speaking, canvassing for votes, driving voters to the polls, treating or entertaining them in any way.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no more treating.

Mr. CURRIE: There is, in some parts of the country. Some definition should be included in this clause similar to that contained in the Elections Act. There are certain definitions in that Act of what "taking an active part in an election" is, and of what an "agent" is. But this section is open to any construction whatsoever.

Mr. HOCKEN: I think the section is correct as it stands. I do not think any person in this House will have any difficulty in deciding whether or not a man is taking a partisan part in an election. And I do not think you can make this provision too strict. I think that men appointed to positions in the public service should absolutely eschew partisan politics; they should not do any more than cast their ballot. That is what this clause gives them permission to do. I think we are splitting hairs. I do not think this section can be misunderstood by any person. And if any civil servant is in doubt as to its meaning, it is his business to be on the right side, and if he keeps on the right side he won't be fined $500.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Might I call attention to what I consider to be a somewhat drastic provision. We are all actuated by the desire to punish men on the opposite side of politics, and we are always prepared to condone anything our own friends do, and candidates always try to get everybody to do as much as possible on their behalf. This section provides that any person violating its provisions shall be tried summarily. But who is going to lay an information against an individual whereby he is going to be penalised and fined $500?

Mr. BUREAU: The other fellow.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Who is going to take the responsibility of seeing such a man go to jail and his wife and family suffering because he has been induced to do something which has been created a wrong by this section? Is it not sufficient to have that man dismissed? Another objection to the clause is this, and I think some of the ministers in the House will confirm what I say. You proceed under summary conviction and go before a justice of the peace. Now I know how these gentlemen are appointed, and I am free to say that if there was a Conservative Administration in the province of Alberta they would probably dismiss every justice of the peace and put their own people in.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Because it is done in practice, the same as it is done in all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is a reflection on the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton).

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The Minister of Customs would not do it himself personally.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It would be done by others more criminal still.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: It may be more criminal. However, it is a fact, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) knows, that this practice pertains not only to the province of Alberta but also to the province of Quebec.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Then I should like to live there and learn the political ethics of that fine province.

Mr. BUREAU: You would learn to put in more of your friends but not to dismiss the old ones.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I am not going into any vicious practices in Alberta. But from my experience there, the justices of the peace are all good politicians, and I fancy you would have to take appeals in all of these cases and go before the district court. I think the section is a little too drastic. And if the public servant does anything politically which he ought not to do, under this section, it seems to me, that he has a fairly good punishment if he is put out.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the old law?

Mr. BUREAU: The old law had no sanction at all.

Mr. MURPHY: No penalty?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no penalty in the present Act.

Mr. BUREAU: I move that the words "be guilty of an offence and liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or imprisonment for any period not exceeding one month and to" be struck out. Under the Elections Act a penalty is provided for certain offences. The fact that a man is a civil servant does not prevent his coming under that law, but here, because he is a civil servant, we make a further punishment. We all know that in an election feeling runs high. If I saw a civil servant running against me, while I might not personally say anything, my political friends will say: "I will have this fellow fined." That is not fair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is dismissal sufficient?

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly. I think it is the only power we should exercise.

Mr. CURRIE: Why put impossible and sumptuary legislation such as this on the statute books? We all know very well that when an election takes place in some quarters of the country feeling runs high and hot, and men have been taken and locked up in jail, habeas corpus and everything else forgotten, simply because they have been found as strangers at a hotel. We should put an end to that kind of nonsense, and clearly define in this section what partisanship shall consist of. I would like the minister to have inserted after the words "shall engage in partisan work" the words "such as canvassing, speaking" and so on, or put in the definition which is in the Elections Act as to what constitutes agency. In that way the public servant will know exactly what he can be convicted of.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall this clause stand?

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

Monday, May 13, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIALS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his recommendation and the clerk's report in the matter of the promotion of Mr. W. H. Dickson, Chief Reporter of the Committees of the House, to the position of Reporter of the Official Debates of the House of Commons.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

YUKON ELECTION.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor-General) presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and moved:

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: From the tenor of this motion I cannot tell whether my hon. friend intends to move that the report be concurred in. If he has no such intention, I think it would be advisable to have the evidence printed before we take the report into consideration.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No evidence was taken before the committee. The only document before the committee was the official return which has been printed and distributed amongst hon. members. Apart from that, we only had the statements of the parties concerned and of their counsel; I believe those statements were taken down and would be available if desired. It is not

my intention to move that the report of the committee be adopted by the House, because I do not apprehend that it is my duty to make such a motion. As chairman of the committee it is my duty to report to the House the committee's finding, and also, as laid down in Bourinot, on page 553:

It is usual for the Chairman to move, after he has presented his report, that it be taken into consideration on a future day, and it shall be placed on the Order Paper for that day. After that motion, when it is on the Order Paper, it is open to any member of the House to make such motion in regard to its adoption as he sees fit.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not a very graceful way of dealing with a report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) confirms my understanding that strong arguments have been made on both sides of the question, and as notes have been taken of the argument I think it would be advisable to have them printed for the information of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know to what extent they are available, but I shall confer with the Solicitor General, and if the statements are available there is no reason why they should not be printed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Abstract of statements of insurance companies of Canada for the year ended December 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMMISSION.

INTERIM REPORTS PRESENTED.

Hon. FRANK CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): I beg to lay on the Table interim reports Nos. 2 and 3, by Mr. Sanford Evans, of the Georgian Bay Canal Commission. A number of copies of the first report were printed, and I understand there are still on hand some 2,113 copies of that report in English and 1,369 in French. I therefore beg to move:

That five thousand copies of these two reports be printed in English and five hundred in French, and that Rule 74 be suspended in connection therewith.

Mr. MURPHY: I would suggest that the number to be printed in French be one thousand.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no objection. The statement which I have had prepared at the request of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) shows the number printed in French and English is: English 7,800, cost $2,045; French 1,900, cost $787.

They were distributed as follows: English 5,347; French 491. The demand for French copies was very small and I believed that 500 would have been sufficient but I have no objection to accepting the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY: The demand might be larger now.

Mr. CARVELL: It might be larger now and I will make it a thousand in French and 5,000 in English. The motion will therefore read:

That 5,000 copies of these reports be printed in English and 1,000 in French, and that rule 74 be suspended in connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT—SENATE BILL.

On the motion that Senate Bill No. 88 to amend the Judges' Act be read the first time:

Mr. LEMIEUX: That Bill was debated last session by the House of Commons. It had been grafted on another Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). I see that the Hon. Senator Ross of Halifax has introduced the same principle in this Bill by itself. If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice would explain to the House whether this Bill is objectionable and, if so, how, it might be possible for the House to dispose of it now. As I understand, the Bill is not distributed yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Properly speaking the order should stand because on the first reading there can be no debate.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not prepared to say at present in what respect the Bill is objectionable or if it is objectionable. Before taking it up there are some matters which it raises that require consideration. I would like to look into them before taking a position on it and that is the reason I do not desire to take the Bill up at the present time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 95, for the identification of traders in German goods.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 96, to incorporate the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood.—Mr. John F. Reid.

DELEGATION OF FARMERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MURPHY: I have been requested to ask what time and place have been fixed by the Government for dealing with the delegation of farmers who are to be in Ottawa to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Really, I do not know. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) will be glad to give that information later on. He has had the matter in hand.

Mr. CAHILL: With the consent of the House might I ask the Prime Minister if he would now give an answer to the question put by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) as to the meeting place for the farmers? I see the Minister of Agriculture is now in his seat.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: The Department of Agriculture has secured the Russell Theatre for the forenoon and afternoon, and I understand it was arranged that whatever members of the Government could attend would meet them there at 11.30 a.m.

CENSORSHIP REGULATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I would like to ask the Government a question with regard to the position of the Order in Council No. 915 brought to the attention of the House on April 16, 1918. This Order in Council dealt with the publication of information and also the expression of opinions by people throughout the country. I want to know whether the Order in Council has been laid on the table of this House and if so has it been disposed of in any way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was brought down and laid on the table of the House. I do not quite understand the other part of my hon. friend's question. The Order in Council has been operative since it passed.

Mr. CURRIE: If an Order in Council or regulation of a department adopted under a statute, is objectionable, according to the authorities—May and Redlich—it is competent to take action with regard to that Order in Council or regulation on a motion for an address. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, some time before to-morrow, to consider that point, to consult the English authorities and to find out whether it is competent for a private member to move an address upon the order for motions dealing with a document of that kind provided no minister has done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall make inquiry.

BELLEVILLE PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

On the motion of Mr. Richardson the House went into Committee on Bill No. 28 respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company—Mr. Porter—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Directors to have power to regulate tolls.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have the tolls mentioned in the Bill been agreed to by the opponents of the measure? I understand there was very strong opposition to this Bill from the people of Belleville and the surrounding municipalities.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In the absence of the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter), I undertook to look after this Bill, and I might explain that the Private Bills Committee spent nearly three sittings considering the measure. A subcommittee of the Private Bills Committee, of which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was a member, also considered it privately, and the rates set forth in the clause under consideration were agreed upon as the result of a compromise. Originally the bridge was started by the city of Belleville and the surrounding municipalities, who expended upon it some $33,000 or more. They then got to the end of their financial tether and borrowed from an estate an amount equal to about $50,000. They were unable to pay that obligation, the bridge came under the hammer and was bought in by the estate that had advanced the money, and which has since been operating the bridge at, they contended, a considerable loss. The committee decided that they would have an investigation, so the whole matter was referred to Mr. Clarkson, the accountant, who, after a week's investigation, brought down a report which was considered by the subcommittee referred to, and it was arranged that a clause should be inserted in the Bill giving the municipalities the power at any time to purchase the bridge for $72,500, which was an amount agreed upon by the two interested parties.

Mr. BUREAU: Within six months.

Mr. RICHARDSON: They have six months in which to make the purchase.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was the price fixed?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The price was fixed in the Bill, and the bridge can be taken over at any time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the price?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The price is $72,500. The chartered accountant who was asked to look into the matter, reported that if the estate who own the bridge were allowed six per cent on their money, they would receive $117,000, and if allowed five per cent the amount would be considerably less. There were certain disputes as to when the period should begin, but the amount fixed was a compromise arranged between the parties, and all those interested agreed that the increase in tolls was a fair one, and would not produce more than five per cent on the money invested.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was Mr. Parliament, the local member for Prince Edward, a party to the arrangement?

Mr. RICHARDSON: He was a party to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did he accept the tolls agreed upon, and also the price?

Mr. RICHARDSON: He did.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the new conditions?

Mr. RICHARDSON: He accepted the price and the tolls. The ex-reeve of the municipality was also present and also agreed that the tolls were reasonable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then the objecting parties were satisfied?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member for Maisonneuve has asked if Mr. Parliament attended the Committee. I do not believe he was before the sub-committee, or at the last meeting of the Committee, but he was present previously. The city of Belleville was represented by its solicitor and mayor, and the township of Prince Edward by Mr. Dempsey. The Sutherland estate was represented by one of the estate and by their solicitor, Mr. Kilmer. By arrangement, Mr. Clarkson, accountant, was chosen to make an investigation, and the sub-committee reported that all the interested parties had agreed, although I may say that the city of Belleville gave instructions to Mr. Pringle not to consent to anything. But we put the restriction within the Bill that within six months the municipalities would have the right to purchase for the sum of $72,500, and to complete the purchase within one year. So as to make the terms more convenient between the parties, the tolls, which were based on recommendations made by Mr. Clarkson, and which permit of a reasonable profit figured at five per cent to be made by the operators of the bridge, will not come into force before three months from date. The object of this is to allow all parties to get together, and take advantage of the provision which was introduced into the Bill, that upon giving notice by any municipality interested in the bridge within six months it can be purchased for the sum of $72,500. Nobody was left in ignorance on the matter, everybody interested was invited to state their views, and the sub-committee reported, after all the evidence had been taken and everybody had been given a chance to present their claims.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I might further explain that the municipalities interested sent representatives to wait on the Ontario Government to see what assistance they would grant, and that government agreed to assist to the extent of at least forty per cent, with the object that the parties concerned might be able to so arrange it that the bridge would become a public work.

Mr. MURPHY: We may assume then that whatever objection originally existed with respect to the tolls to be charged has disappeared, in view of the compromise arranged in regard to the purchase of the bridge?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely.

Section agreed to, and Bill reported and read the third time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 89, respecting The Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 90, respecting The Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 91, for the relief of Francis Newman.—Mr. Lalor.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Henry Ernest Saxby.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 93, respecting a patent of Jacob David Wolf.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 94, to incorporate L'ordre des Dominicains ou frères prêcheurs au Canada.—Mr. Chabot.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the total amount paid or payable for the services of the several Exemption Tribunals in the County of L'Assomption-Montcalm?

2. What amount has been, or is still, payable to each of these tribunals for rent, fees for judges and salaries of other employees?

3. What are the names and addresses of the persons who have been so paid or to whom amounts are still due?

4. What amount has been paid, or is still due, to each of these persons, and for what service?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. Tribunal No. 129, $542.50; tribunal No. 130, $349.16; tribunal No. 156, $457; tribunal No. 157, $65; tribunal No. 158, $516.65; tribunal No. 159, $256.68.

3. Tribunal No. 129: J. E. Duhamel, l'Assomption, Que., services of member, $50; J. S. Rivest, l'Assomption, Que., services of member and stationery, $122; Louis Potras, l'Assomption, Que., services of constable, $58; E. Marcelois, l'Assomption, Que., services of member, $120; corporation l'Assomption, l'Assomption, Que., rent and heating, $120; Jules Jairy, l'Assomption, Que., services clerk, $72.50. Total, $542.50.

Tribunal No. 130: D. Locat, Laurentides, Que., services of clerk, $60; L. Desmaris, Laurentides, Que., services of member, $120; G. Brossard, Laurentides, Que., services of member, stationery and postage, $126.16; corporation Ville de Laurentides, Que., rent, $40; Jos. Paquette, Laurentides, Que., services of constable, $53. Total $349.16.

Tribunal No. 156: J. H. Lesage, St. Jacques, Que., services of member, stationery and postage, $160; J. A. D. Forrest, St. Jacques, Que., rent, $80; Albert Dugas, St. Jacques, Que., services of constable, $62; J. B. Dugas, St. Jacques, Que., services of member, $155. Total, $457.

Tribunal No. 157: D. Beauchamp, St. Donat, Que., services of member and rent, $40; J. H. Lavoie, St. Donat, Que., services of member, $25. Total, $65.

Tribunal No. 158: John Copping, St. Patrick de Rawdon, Que., services of member, $150; Ed. Morin, Rawdon, Que., services of member, $150; J. B. Morin, Rawdon, Que., services of clerk, rent, postage, etc., $216.65. Total, $516.65.

Tribunal No. 159: J. A. Perrault, services of member, $79.18; Jos. Beaudry, services of member, $75; I. Beaudry, services of secretary, $37.50; Emile Ethier, services of constable, $30; E. Ethier, rent and caretaking, $35. Total, $256.68.

4. All accounts received from the above tribunals have been passed for payment, but amounts due cannot be ascertained until further accounts have been received.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Have all the Judges of Exemption Tribunals established under the Military Service Act, 1917, been paid the fees to which they are entitled in connection with their work?

2. If not, when does the Government intend to settle with them?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. All accounts received have been paid or are in course of audit and payment.

2. Any accounts not paid will be paid as soon as the amount justly chargeable can be ascertained.

M. D. No. 4 ADVANCES.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence been called to the two items which appear in Vol. 4 of the Auditor General's Report, recently tabled, under the expenditure for the Fourth Military Divisional Area (Montreal): Capt. W. H. Suckling, advance unaccounted for, $5,500, Hon. Lt.-Col. Du Verger, advance unaccounted for, $1,000?

2. Have the above amounts unaccounted for been remitted?

3. If so, when?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. These two items represent advances on account of recruiting expenses, 242nd Battalion, $5,500; 150th Battalion, $1,000. Both items have been under observation. Capt. Suckling has submitted vouchers which were returned for correction on February 27th last, to the headquarters of the Battalion in France. The Paymaster, Military District No. 4, submitted vouchers from Lt.-Col. Du Verger on 18th March last, for additional information. No replies have come to hand in either case. A reminder has been sent out in both cases.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

THE PARASITES PROHIBITED.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government suppressed or Forbidden the circulation of a book or pamphlet edited by the Rev. Benjamin Spence, Toronto, containing an article wholly or in part written by Arthur Mee, on Temperance?

2. Was such book or pamphlet printed in the city of Toronto?

3. Was any member of the Government aware of the fact that such book or pamphlet was being prepared, before the same was in print?

4. What action has the Government taken to suppress such book or pamphlet?

5. Will the Government produce the said book or pamphlet for the information of the members of the House?

6. Is a criminal proceeding now pending against the Rev. Benjamin Spence for publish-

ing and circulating such book or pamphlet? If so, what are the grounds for such criminal proceedings?

7. Was the said book or pamphlet published or circulated by the Rev. Benjamin Spence with the knowledge or sanction of any member of the Government?

8. If so, what member of the Government was aware of its publication or circulation?

9. Has the said Rev. Benjamin Spence or any of his friends interviewed or conferred with any members of the Government regarding the criminal proceedings now proceeding against the said Rev. Benjamin Spence? If so, what took place at such interview or interviews?

10. Has the said Rev. Benjamin Spence written or communicated with the Premier or any members of the Government regarding the criminal proceedings which are now pending? If so, what was the nature of such communication?

11. Did any members of the Government answer in writing any of the written communications received in connection with the book from the Rev. Benjamin Spence, or any of his friends? If so, what was the nature of the replies?

12. Has any member of the Government interviewed or conferred with the Censor regarding the said book or pamphlet edited by the said Rev. Benjamin Spence?

13. Did the Censor make any report to the Government for the suppression of the said book or pamphlet? If so, what was the nature of the report?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. Suppressed under the authority of the Censorship Regulations.

5. As distribution of the book was prohibited it is obviously undesirable to have it produced.

6. It is understood that the local authorities instituted proceedings.

7. No.

8. Answered by No. 7.

9 and 10. A lawyer representing Mr. Spence saw the Minister of Justice and suggested that in view of Mr. Spence's submission to the Order criminal proceedings be dropped, and was informed that action in such a matter was a question for the Attorney General of the province and the Government had no desire to interfere.

11. Various letters were received and some answered. It was pointed out to Mr. Spence that it was not considered desirable to remove the decision arrived at.

12. The Chief Censor conferred with the Secretary of State and recommended the suppression of the book.

13. Answered by No. 12.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

MR. E. BEAUFORT.

*Mr. PROULX:

Referring to the answers of the Hon. Mr. Burrell to questions regarding one E. Beaufort, as reported on page 1413 of Unrevised Hansard:

1. Did the said Beaufort go to Halifax to perform work in that city while he was employed on the Chief Press Censor's Staff?

2. While so employed on the Press Censor's Staff did any letters, telegrams or other correspondence of the said Beaufort come into the hands of the Chief of the Dominion Police?

3. If so, would the said correspondence have come into the hands of the said Chief of Dominion Police if Beaufort had not been watched or placed under surveillance?

4. Since the said Beaufort has represented the Christian Science Monitor in the Press Gallery of the House of Commons have any letters or other correspondence between him and the Christian Science Monitor come into the hands of the said Chief of the Dominion Police?

5. Is it not a fact that within the week ending March 23, 1918, the Chief Press Censor stated publicly and within the hearing of more than one person on a street car in the City of Ottawa, (a) that Beaufort had worked on his staff; (b) that he had in his possession letters and telegrams compromising the said Beaufort, and (c) that it was in consequence of this correspondence and of the general suspicion attaching to him that Beaufort had been dismissed or let out—or let go—or words to the like effect?

6. Before recommending the said Beaufort for appointment, did the Chief Press Censor look into his Winnipeg record?

7. What was the total amount paid Beaufort by the Government?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1, 2, 3, 4. Matters of the character alluded to are necessarily confidential.

5. The Government has no such information.

6. Yes.

7. $1,322.93.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.—CENTRAL APPEAL JUDGE.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an article in the Montreal Star of April 27, 1918, under the heading:

"My Canadian Visit—Continued."
"By the Right Hon. Sir Frederick Smith, Bart., His Majesty's Atttorney-General, Treasurer of Gray's Inn, Hon. Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford",

and containing the following:—

"Thursday, January 24.—In the morning we skated again.

"We lunched at the new hotel, the 'Chateau Laurier,' with the members of the Canadian Club. Judge Duff, one of the ablest members of the Bench, who is to-day sitting in final appeal over the decisions of the tribunals in the Province of Quebec, was in the Chair. Sir Robert Borden and many other ministers were present."

2. Did any member of the Government inform Sir Freedrick Smith that Judge Duff had to

deal only with appeals from the Province of Quebec?

3. Was any such instruction or direction given Judge Duff as Central Appeal Judge under the Military Service Act?

4. If so, what other Judge was appointed to deal with appeals from the other provinces?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No.

2. No. Mr. Justice Duff, under the provisions of the Military Service Act and as Central Appeal Judge, deals with the appeals from all the provinces.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Is the Government aware that Mr. Justice Duff, appointed Central Appeal Judge under the provisions of the Military Service Act, is also President, or Chairman, of the Round Table Club or Circle, of Ottawa?

2. Is it not a fact that one of the chief features of the Round Table Club propaganda is to promote in the Dominions Overseas the policy of Compulsory Military Service?

3. Has the attention of Mr. Justice Duff been called to the impropriety of acting as Central Appeal Judge as long as he remains President, or Chairman, of the Round Table Club?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. The Government has no information.

3. No.

POST OFFICE LOWER L'ARDOISE.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Who is the Postmistress at Lower L'Ardoise?

2. When was she appointed?

3. Who are her sureties?

4. Have any complaints been made to the department regarding the said Post Office?

5. What was the nature of the complaints?

6. Has the money order service at said Post Office been discontinued?

7. If so, for what reason?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Mrs. Sophia Sampson.

2. On the 20th January, 1917.

3. The postmistress is insured in the Post Office Guarantee Fund.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Yes.

7. Because of irregularities in connection with the money order accounts.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—QUEBEC.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is there an officer called Capt. Grenier employed in the office of the Registrar of the Military Service Act at Quebec?

2. If so, what salary does he earn?

3. By whom was he recommended?

4. Is he of military age?

5. In what medical category is he?

6. Has he obtained his exemption?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. $40 per week.

3. Was on staff of the late Colonel Jones, district military representative, and has continued his work. Is on command from M.D. No. 5.

4. Yes; 30 years of age.

5. Category C-3.

6. Exemption automatic until category C called

Mr. POWER:

1. Is there an officer called Capt. Couillard employed in the office of the Registrar of the Military Service at Quebec?

2. If so, what salary does he earn?

3. By whom was he recommended?

4. Is he of military age?

5. In what medical category is he?

6. Has he obtained his exemption?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. $50 per week.

3. Was on the staff of the late Col. Jones, then District Military Representative and has continued this work. Is on command from Military District No. 5.

4. Yes; 26 years of age.

5. Returned overseas officer.

6. Answered by No. 5.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is there an officer called F. J. Belanger employed in the office of the Registrar of the Military Service Act at Quebec?

2. If so, what salary does he earn?

3. By whom was he recommended?

4. Is he of military age?

5. In what medical category is he?

6. Has he obtained his exemption?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. $50 per week.

3. Was on a staff of the late Col. Jones, District Military Representative, and has continued since on command from Military District No. 5 and is now Assistant Deputy Registrar.

4. Yes; 28 years of age.

5. "A-2."

6. Is an officer of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. POWER:

1. Where are the offices of the Registrar under the Military Service Act at Quebec situated?

2. Are certain premises being leased for the purpose of the Military Service Act?

3. If so, what price is being paid and to whom?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. On seventh and eighth stories of the Chateau Frontenac.

2. The Department of Public Works is endeavouring to arrange for suitable quarters for the registrar's office in place of the present quarters. Arrangements not yet completed.

3. Answered by No. 2.

CASUALTY REPORTS.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Was Mr. Frederick Lalonde, of the 38th Battalion, C.E.F., enrolled as Number 410,524?
2. If so, was the soldier in question reported as a casualty, and when?
3. If the said soldier was living at the time of last report, what was his address?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Was Mr. Mark Norman, of the 2nd Divisional Remount Depot, enrolled as Number 49,475?
2. If so, was the soldier in question reported as a casualty, and when?
3. If the said soldier was living at the time of last report, what was his address?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, June 7, 1917.
3. Address on last casualty report was Canadian Convalescent Hospital, Epsom, England.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Was Mr. Robert Cleland Killen, of the First Pioneer Battalion, C.E.F., enrolled as Number 487,327?
2. If so, was the soldier in question reported as a casualty, and when?
3. If the said soldier was living at the time of last report, what was his address?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, January 8, 1917.
3. Address on last casualty report was Moore Barracks Hospital, Shorncliffe.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Was Mr. Harry Cecil Bull, of the 4th Brigade Canadian Field Artillery, enrolled as Number 84,108?
2. If so, was the soldier in question reported as a casualty, and when?
3. If the said soldier was living at the time of last report, what was his then address?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, September 4, 1917.
3. Address on last casualty report was Military Hospital, Shorncliffe.

PRESS CENSORSHIPS.

*Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. Have the Press or Cable Censors for Nova Scotia at any time during the years 1917 or 1918 reported to the Chief of the Dominion Police or to the Chief Press Censor regarding communications addressed to a person in Halifax and signed in some instances "Five" and in others "Beaufort"?
2. If so, what action was taken with regard to such report or in connection with the said communications?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1 and 2. It is not customary or in the public interest to disclose particulars regarding censorship matters.

TRANSFERS FROM ROYAL FLYING CORPS. TO C. E. F.

Mr. NICKLE:

1. Has a Canadian, while in Canada, enlisted in the Royal Flying Corps or Royal Air Force, the privilege of transferring to the Canadian Expeditionary Force?
2. Has the Canadian Government jurisdiction or control over Canadians in the Royal Flying Corps or the Royal Air Force?
3. Is a Canadian, while in Canada, enlisted in the Royal Flying Corps or Royal Air Force transferable against his wish to the British Infantry or other units of the British Forces, if he does not wish to continue as a member of the Royal Flying Corps or Royal Air Force?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. He has no right of transfer.
2. No.
3. No.

Lt. BERTRAM DIMOCK.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY:

1. Is Bertram Dimock in the employ of the Militia Department of Canada or Great Britain, or attached to any Militia Unit of Canada or Great Britain? If so, what is the rank of the said Bertram Dimock, what salary, if any, has he received to date, and what is the total amount so received?
2. Has the said Bertram Dimock served any time in the trenches in France or Flanders? If not, why?
3. Who was sent to England in command of a draft from the British Expeditionary Force stationed at Windsor?
4. Is it the policy of the Government to give commands to returned soldiers? If so, was the party who took the draft of the British Expeditionary Force which left Windsor on the first, second or third of April, an officer or soldier who had seen service in the trenches?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Bertram Allison Dimock holds the rank of Lieutenant in the 81st Hants Regiment, Active Militia. He is not now actively employed. He was appointed to recruit and take charge of No. 13 Reinforcing Draft, Canadian Railway Troops, on May 3, 1917, and proceeded overseas with the draft on August 3, 1917. He was returned to Canada in October, 1917, and struck off strength of C.E.F. on October 29, 1917. Whilst in Canada, Lieut. Dimock of No. 13 Draft, Canadian Railway

Troops, received the pay and allowances of his rank, amounting to $295.10. Whilst in England, he received the pay and allowance of his rank.

2. No. This information is being obtained from the overseas authorities.

3. If the hon. member will give further details as to which draft is referred to, the desired information will be obtained.

4. Yes, when returned officers are available. A draft which sailed from Halifax on April 9, 1918, from Windsor, N.S., was in charge of Major H. H. Stearns. This officer proceeded to England with the 202nd Battalion. He has not seen service in France.

MAJOR F. W. D. BREMNER.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY:

1. What position, if any, does W. F. D. Bremner, of Falmouth, in the county of Hants, hold in the Active Militia of Canada?

2. If the said Bremner is in the Active Militia of Canada, what is his salary, how much has he received from the department from the outbreak of the present war to date?

3. Who went overseas as second in command of the 112th Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force, and where is the said officer at the present time?

4. Is the wife of the said Bremner in receipt of Separation Allowance? If so, how much has she received to date?

5. Was the said W. F. D. Bremner stationed at Halifax in the Active Militia of Canada since the present war began, in command of, or in connection with any battalion or company of soldiers? If so, was he relieved of his command, and what was the cause of his being so relieved?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Captain in the 81st Hants Regiment. Employed recruiting for Canadian Engineers.

2. The pay and allowances of his rank, totalling $4,068.40.

3. Major F. W. D. Bremner, C.E.F. (Captain in the 81st Regiment). Employed in Military District No. 6, headquarters at Halifax, N.S.

4. Separation allowance was paid at $40 per month from November 26, 1915, to February 29, 1916, and at $50 per month from March 1, 1916, to February 28, 1918; a total of $1,326.

From March 1, 1918, the account was transferred for payment to District Paymaster, Military District No. 6, and it is presumed payments are still going forward regularly at $50 per month.

5. (a) Yes, this officer—for cause—was relieved of his command, but on account of the excellent reports from his Commanding Officer, and the O. C. of the District, he was reinstated, by authority of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence.

EXEMPTIONS IN BERTHIER.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. Has the Government, through Mr. Arthur Ecrement, a Notary of Montreal, and a defeated candidate in the Constituency of Berthier at the elections which took place on the 17th of December, 1917, or any of its members received exemption demands from certain conscripts residing in the Parish of St. Cuthbert in the Electoral District of Berthier?

2. If so, has the Government or any of its members granted, or are they willing to grant said exemption or exemptions asked for?

3. What are the names of the conscripts who have also been exempted through said Arthur Ecrement?

4. Has the Government or any of its members authorized the said Arthur Ecrement to state that the electors of the constituency of Berthier who had voted in his favour at the last election would be exempted, and that those who had voted for Dr. Gervais would be enlisted as conscripts?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am informed that many persons are exploiting the good faith of the farmers by promising to secure exemptions for them. If a statement were made to the House and the country that such methods as are mentioned in this question should not be adopted, I think much good would result.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This question relates entirely to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, and should be answered by the Minister of Justice, who is, of course, prepared to make a statement. Indeed, the statement can now be made. No person in this country has the slightest authority to promise exemption by the tribunals; it is entirely out of the question that there should be any such condition. The stand taken by the members of the Government with regard to this is that such matters must be determined by the tribunals according to their best judgment; the Government will appeal whenever it is considered desirable in the public interest that appeal should be asserted. But no person, I repeat, has any right, through members of the Government or otherwise, to influence the decision of the tribunals in respect to exemption.

THE KENT HOUSE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has the Government considered, or is it considering the proposal of taking the Kent House and adjacent buildings and cottages at Montmorency Falls, near Quebec City, for the purpose of using same for a military hospital?

2. If so, what does the proposal consist of in the way of rent or other conditions?

3. Is the Government aware that the Kent House is a summer resort visited each year by thousands of people, is situated at a short

distance from the golf links, and offers too much attraction and noise to turn same into a hospital?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, an offer has been made.

2. A rental of $6,000 per annum is being asked by the owners.

3. The Board of Medical Consultants have reported strongly in favour of its use as a hospital, but no decision has yet been arrived at by the Government.

MEMBERS OF Y.M.C.A. AND SALVATION ARMY IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many persons formerly in the employ of the Y.M.C.A. are now in the employ of the Government? What are their names?

2. How many former officers or employees of the Salvation Army are now in the employ of the Government?

3. Were all these appointments made on the recommendation of the President of the Privy Council?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: If the hon. gentleman will make this question a little more specific, it will be possible to answer it. Otherwise, it should stand as an Order for Return.

Question stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CURRIE:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Registrar, E. Hart Nichols, under the Military Service Act, Halifax, N.S., and the Military Service Council or any member thereof, during the years 1917 and 1918; concerning non-compliance with the Military Service Act in Lunenburg County, N.S.; also for copy of all correspondence between the Military Service Council, or any member thereof, or the Minister of Justice, or the Deputy Minister of Justice and Mr. William Duff, M.P., Lunenburg, N.S., during the years 1917 and 1918; also a copy of any statements, affidavits and declarations now on file in the Military Service Council in respect of the administration of the Military Service Act in the County of Lunenburg and more particularly in respect of any alleged interference by Mr. William Duff with the proper enforcement of the said Act.

Mr. CURRIE:

For a copy of the contract made between the Government of Canada and Mr. Mosher of Feltzen South, in the County of Lunenburg, for the carrying of His Majesty's mails between Feltzen South and Rose Bay, in the County of Lunenburg. Said contract being executed during the month of September, October or November, 1917, and having as one of the bondsmen on the said contract Mr. Wm. Duff, of Lunenburg, in the County of Lunenburg.

Mr. McKENZIE:

For a return giving a copy of all complaints, correspondence, letters, memorials, telegrams, etc., since the 1st day of September, 1917, passing between the Post Office Department, the Post Office Inspector for Nova Scotia, and any other person or persons relating to the Post Office at Lower L'Ardoise, Nova Scotia.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of the Order in Council appointing Mr. Main Johnson and passed under the War Measures Act as mentioned by Hon. Mr. Rowell on page 1350 of Unrevised Hansard.

Mr. CANNON:

For a copy of all documents or correspondence between the Hon. Albert Sévigny and the Director General of Government Railways or the Superintendent of said railways; also copy of the reports or inquiries held in connection with J. W. Boivin, Transcontinental Agent at St. Malachie, Dorchester County.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS:

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER:

1. Is the Government aware that in the past sixteen months in the Cities of Winnipeg, Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal, the following quantities of foodstuffs are reported to have been ordered to be destroyed as unfit for human consumption:—

(a) Meats: Winnipeg, 7,262 lbs.; Hamilton, 4,874 lbs.; Toronto, quantities not given in lbs., only sides, quarters, legs, etc.; Ottawa, 7,787 lbs.; Montreal, 105,898 lbs.

(b) Poultry: Winnipeg, 11,364 lbs.; Hamilton, 8 fowl; Montreal, 2,344 lbs.

(c) Fish: Winnipeg, 9,066 lbs.; Toronto, 74,587 lbs., weight not given, only number of packages for remainder; Montreal, 137,903 lbs.

(d) Vegetables: Winnipeg, 265,565 lbs.; Toronto, 5,855 lbs. cabbage, the rest weight not given, only crates, baskets, etc., also recently 48,010 lbs., or 24 tons of food unfit for human consumption; Montreal, 13,940 lbs.

(e) Eggs: Winnipeg, 3,013 lbs.; Hamilton, 40 doz.; Toronto, 1,050 doz., 6 tubs, 1 pail, and 8 gallons yolk.

(f) Butter: Winnipeg, 3,374 lbs.; Hamilton, 22 lbs.

(g) Fruit (fresh and dried): Winnipeg, fresh, 46,375 lbs., dried, 37,207 lbs.; Hamilton, fresh, 12 baskets; Montreal, fresh, 3,362 lbs.

2. If so, what action does the Government propose taking to prevent a continuance of such waste?

Mr. CHISHOLM:

Referring to the statements appearing in a despatch from Ottawa to the Toronto Globe, on Friday, April 19, 1918, in regard to Power for Munition Needs and the Government's connection therewith:—

1. To what extent has the Government assisted the Imperial Munitions Board financially?

2. When was Sir Henry Drayton appointed Power Controller?

3. Had he been investigating matters connected with Power for Munitions or other important undertakings in advance of his appointment as Power Controller? If so, for how long?

4. Had Sir Henry Drayton any actual previous experience operating large steam or water-power producing machinery?

5. Did Sir Henry Drayton in or about the month of November, 1917, direct the Toronto Power Company to deliver a large amount of

power to the Ontario Power Company or to the Hydro Electric Power Commission? If so, upon what authority was the direction or message based?

6. Has the Toronto Power Company rendered bills for supplying the power referred to in Question No. 5? If so, what is their total amount?

7. Did the Power Controller make any arrangements whatever for the payment of the bills referred to in Question No. 6 either at the time referred to in Question No. 5, or at any subsequent time? If so, (a) what arrangements were made; (b) when were they made, and (c) what amounts, if any, have been paid and upon what dates were they paid?

8. If Sir Henry Drayton failed or neglected to provide in advance for the payment of the bills in question will the Government or the Imperial Munitions Board be compelled to deal with them?

9. The public press of April 19, 1918, credited Sir Henry Drayton with the following statement:—"I am sorry to have to report that, so far as hydraulic power is concerned, no more power is at present available." Upon what date did Sir Henry first learn that no more hydraulic power was available?

10. Has Sir Henry Drayton authority to enforce the carrying out of any order or other direction, to (a) The Ontario Power Company, and (b) to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, to deliver power to essential munition works or to other important war undertakings? If so, has he issued any such directions?

11. When and in regard to what works or other undertakings were such orders or directions issued and have they been obeyed?

12. Referring to another statement credited to Sir Henry Drayton in the public press of April 19, 1918, as follows:—"The power shortage on the Hydro lines has to be admitted as resulting from contracts the Hydro has already made or assumed,"—can the Power Controller or the Government provide any measure of financial relief to those with whom the Hydro has failed to execute its contracts?

13. Has the Power Controller issued lists of specific places or works to which power must be supplied in advance of all other places or works, on account of their importance as war works or necessities?

14. If so:—(a) What places or works were enumerated? (b) Upon what dates were the lists issued? (c) How many horse-power were involved? (d) How many of the orders were obeyed, and when, in each case?

15. Referring to the statement attributed to Sir Henry Drayton in the said Globe despatch of April 19, 1918, "that munitions plants were being insufficiently supplied with power, and that the nation's war effort was thereby hindered and impaired,"—upon what date did the Imperial Munitions Board first make such complaint?

16. Referring to Sir Henry Drayton's statement that power had been supplied to the American Cyanamide Company, which was making fertilizers, but "in view of the emergency this supply was very properly cut off,"—did Sir Henry Drayton have anything whatever to do with the cutting-off of power to which the reference is made?

17. When was that power first "cut-off," and what are the names of the more essential war works to which the power in question was diverted?

18. Referring further to the alleged statement by Sir Henry Drayton that "under an order made by me, electricity is continued to be supplied by the Canadian Niagara to the Power Commission,"—has Sir Henry made any provision, upon which the Canadian Niagara Power Company can rely, for payment for the power to which he refers? If so, what are the details thereof?

PRIVATE BILLS LEGISLATION.

SUSPENSION OF RULES RELATING TO PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That owing to the advanced period of the Session the following Rules relating to Private Bills be suspended for the remainder of the Session, viz:—Rules 28, 28A, 52, 103 and paragraph (a), subsection 3 of Rule 89; and that Private Bills reported on Private Bills days by any Select Standing Committee be placed on the Orders of the Day of the same day for consideration in Committee of the Whole amongst Private Bills, or if reported on days other than Private Bill days then immediately after Routine Proceedings.

He said: This is the motion which stood over Saturday at the request of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope that my right hon. friend will not persist in this motion, which has reference to the safeguards which are provided in the rules of the House with regard to Private Bills. Many of the Private Bills which come before the House affect the rights of third parties—divorce Bills, for instance, or applications for patents, which we have before us very often. All the rules mentioned in this motion safeguard the rights of third parties who may have objection to such Bills. Without going in particular into any one of these rules, let me call attention to one or two. Rule 52 says:

Every Bill shall receive three several readings on different days, previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

If we dispense with this rule a Private Bill may be railroaded through the House and a party who may desire to present his objections to it will have no opportunity of doing so. This rule has very seldom been departed from.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it has been usual at the end of each session to make some departure from the strictness of the rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not so wide a departure as this.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps this motion goes too far. I am not very familiar

with its terms; it came to me from the Private Bills Committee. Possibly it may require some modification.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I should say so. Of course, in the case of a Bill of special urgency, it might be necessary to dispense with the rule that every Bill shall receive three different readings on different days, but to dispense with the rule altogether seems to be a very dangerous proceeding.

Mr. STEELE: As Chairman of the Private Bills Committee, I wish to say that if we are going to finish the business of the House this week, as I am sure every hon. member desires, practically all Private Bills will, unless there is some suspension of the rules, be blocked from now on.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many Private Bills are left?

Mr. STEELE: Quite a number. There are the Bills on the Order Paper to-day, and there are still some others to come over from the Senate. Under the ordinary rules it will be quite impossible for any of those Bills to be considered by the committee, brought back to the House, put through the House in the usual way, and then go to the Senate and pass there. With the suspension of some of the rules, thus enabling the Bills to come before the House without the delays consequent upon the rules, those Bills can be got through.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let my hon. friend bring his suggestion before the House in regard to each Bill. While there are many Bills, such as Bills of incorporation, to which I am sure no objection can be taken, which do not affect any private rights, there are other Bills, such as Bills for divorce or for renewal of patents, in regard to which the rules should be rigidly enforced, because rights of third parties may be affected by them. If my hon. friend, who is Chairman of the Private Bills Committee, will explain the nature of such Bills, I think, by unanimous consent, they could be passed. It would be better to let the motion stand for to-day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I entirely agree that the rule as to the readings might be eliminated from the motion, because that is a matter of importance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would be better to let the motion stand for to-day, so that the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee may inquire to see how far his wishes may be met.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not remember ever seeing rule 52 suspended with regard to Private Bills. It seems to me that my right hon. friend is quite right in regard to that. The House, in regard to each Bill, should and can determine by unanimous consent. As far as the other rules are concerned, I do not see that there is any great importance connected with them. I have looked over them just now, and they seem to relate altogether to details, such as posting and other matters of that kind, which are really not very essential, because my impression, from more than twenty years' experience in this House, is that very few members go to the trouble of ascertaining whether the matter is posted or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Unless a member has a Bill of his own.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He will do so with regard to his own Bill, but as regards Bills of other members, he does not pay much attention to those details.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. member (Mr. Steele) who so efficiently presides over the Private Bills Committee, attends the sittings of the House when any of the Bills come up, the House will accept his word that all interests have been safeguarded, and we can then proceed with the Bills.

Mr. STEELE: Besides that difficulty, there is the difficulty of getting the Bills before the House. Under the rules, the Bills which are on the Order Paper to-day, which came over from the Senate, cannot be considered by the Committee for at least twenty-four hours. That will preclude the report of the Committee on those Bills coming before the House until Friday evening, the first occasion on which, after Tuesday, Private Bills can be considered. One can well understand, if the House is to prorogue on Saturday, that we cannot deal with them after that.

12 noon.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should think that perhaps the suggestion of my right hon. friend would be fulfilled if we struck out rule 52 and paragraph 3, subsection (a) of rule 89, with regard to fees. Those would properly be determined in respect to each Bill. The other rules relate only to matters such as posting and other details, which, while very desirable, are not absolutely essential at this stage of the Session. The motion would then read:

That owing to the advanced period of the Session the following Rules relating to Private Bills be suspended for the remainder of the Session, viz.:—Rules 28, 28A, and 103; and that Private Bills reported on Private Bills days by any Select Standing Committee be placed on the Orders of the Day of the same day for consideration in Committee of the Whole amongst Private Bills, or if reported on days other than Private Bill days then immediately after Routine Proceedings.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

BILL TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TO BRING THE OUTSIDE SERVICE UNDER ITS PROVISIONS.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair (From May 11.)

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose on Saturday, we had reached section 35. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) had moved, in amendment, that subsection 2 of section 35 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "shall" in the second line of the said subsection, as far as the words "be dismissed from the public service" in the last line, so that the said subsection would now read:

Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall be dismissed from the public service.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section, as amended, be adopted?

Mr. TURRIFF: I was not here on Saturday when this section was adopted. Was subsection 1 passed as it is in the Bill?

The CHAIRMAN: Section 35 has not been adopted as yet.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think subsection 1 should be amended to provide that all civil servants appointed in the future should not have the privilege of voting. The Civil Service should not have the vote, but I should not like to take the vote away from any of those who were appointed in the past when that was the law of the country. But if we now amend the Act to provide that any civil servant appointed in the future should not have the vote, then no one would have anything to complain of because, if a person wishes to retain the vote, he need not take a position under the Government. It would be much better for the Service and for the country if the Civil Service did not have the franchise. We now propose to bring the Outside Service under this Act, and the Government is taking over a big mileage of railways and we shall have thousands and tens of thousands of officials under the Government, so that the question of this vote may be a serious one. It has been found better in the Old Country that civil servants should not vote. Very few of them now vote, and there is no doubt, if civil servants did not have the vote, we would have a better service, and there would be less politics in the Service and fewer dismissals of officials when there is a change of Government. I should like to see that subsection changed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was the desire of the Government, in presenting this Bill to Parliament, to avoid the introduction of any new matter other than was absolutely necessary. My hon. friend's suggestion involves a very important principle, which will have to be considered some time, but I would not be disposed to view it favourably this session. When the Government consolidates its railway interests in this country, it is probable that some provision will have to made in respect to the railway employees voting at elections. In one of the provinces of Australia, I understand the railway employees have the right of selecting a parliamentary representative from among themselves. I do not know just what the details of the legislation are, but there is undoubtedly something to be said in its favour. For a great number of years the civil servants in England were debarred from voting; that rule was afterwards relaxed, but in the last fifteen years I understand that efforts have been made on many occasions by members of the British House of Commons to revert to the old rule. However, I think it is too late in the session to take into consideration a matter of such importance.

Section agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: Before proceeding with the next section I would remind the minister to what took place last Saturday in connection with section 30. I took exception to that section as not being absolutely in line with the principle of the Bill, which was to abolish the abuse of patronage, and the minister said:

Mr. A. K. Maclean: Let us pass the section, and we will revert to it later.

Mr. Bureau: How can we revert to it if we pass it?

Mr. A. K. Maclean: By consent of the committee.

Mr. Bureau: I understand that the idea is to pass the Bill to-night, and then we shall hear no more of it. If the Bill is not to pass to-

night, all right; I reserve the right, with the consent of the Government, to come back to this section later.

I should like to come back to this section for just a moment. The exception I took to this section on Saturday was this: During the general discussion of the principle of this Bill it was stated by every member who addressed the committee that the object was to make the Civil Service a career so that the best possible men would come into it, and with that in view, political influence was to be abolished in the matter of appointments and dismissals. I am in favour of that principle, and in favour of this Bill, but I do not want a sham Bill, or a Bill whose pretended good effects will disappear as soon as the legislation has been put on the statute book. The great complaint about patronage in the past has been not so much concerned with appointments as with dismissals; for every ten lines of Hansard relating to appointments there are ten pages relating to dismissals. I claim that if we want to make the Civil Service efficient, if we want to induce men of ability to enter it, we must give these men some protection. Now, this section gives no protection whatever to the men who enter the Civil Service. Of course, I may be told not to think that the heads of departments are going to act in an arbitrary way. But we never know what may happen. We have seen things done in the last few years which we never would have dreamt of. But assuming that the head of a department or the deputy head will never arbitrarily dismiss a man, there nevertheless remains the fear in the heart of a man who may seek an appointment that he is liable to be dismissed at the caprice of the minister or the whim of the deputy head. When I brought this question up on Saturday the minister said that he did not see how the section could be amended. The power to dismiss must remain in the Government, he said. I do not share the view of the minister. The object of this Bill is not only to control appointments, but to show the people of this country that the Union Government is determined to carry out its promise of abolishing patronage. I understand that its object is to better the conditions of the Civil Service so that men of ability will be induced to devote their services to the country, that salaries will be increased, and that there will be a more careful picking of the best men. The Minister of Customs said on Saturday that he did not see how the section could be amended very well. Now, I have prepared an amendment which I am going to submit to the committee. If it is rejected I shall nevertheless feel I have done my duty by trying to protect the Civil Service as far as possible. I therefore beg to move that the following be substituted for section 30:

Subject to the provisions of section 3 of this Act the power to remove or dismiss any deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall vest in the Commission.

Before exercising such power the Commission shall require a statement in writing from the minister in the case of a deputy head, and from the deputy head in all other cases, giving the causes, reasons and facts invoked for such dismissal. Upon receipt of such statement in writing the Commission shall forthwith communicate a copy of same to the deputy head or other employee whose dismissal is sought. The deputy head or employee shall within three days after the receipt of copy of said statement file with the Commission a statement in writing in answer to such charges, in default of which the Commission may proceed on the statement submitted asking for dismissal.

That provides for notice being given to the man whose head is at stake that he is charged with such and such an offence. and gives him the opportunity an accused enjoys in any court of law of making answer to those charges. If the accused does not submit an answer within three days, the commission can proceed ex parte on the statement submitted asking for dismissal. I think this amendment, if adopted, will protect the civil servants; it will also serve to test whether this Bill has not been brought forward knowing that it is lame in many respects. If we are going to improve the Civil Service we want people to know that the country is willing to protect the members of the service, and we do not want to leave in the hands of a minister or deputy minister the right to dismiss an employee at will. Some one may object that section 30 does not provide for dismissal by the minister or deputy minister, but by the Governor in Council, but we all know how that works out. The Cabinet is now composed of twenty-three or twenty-five members, and each member has ten or a dozen commissions to supervise, as well as the legislation of his department to look after. The consequence is that when a minister comes before council with a recommendation for such a paltry thing as the dismissal of an employee, the recommendation will not be inquired into very closely, and the minister's colleagues will let it go through as a matter of courtesy. My amendment may be voted down, but, I repeat, I have submitted it for two pur-

poses, first to protect Government employees and secondly, to test the good faith of those who are promoting this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not understand why it is necessary to suggest that the amendment is submitted to test the good faith of those who are promoting this Bill. My hon. friend, I think, is illogical there. It is quite true that the question of dismissals from the Civil Service has been more or less a political question. But the Governor in Council has never been in the habit of dismissing employees of the Inside Service; at least, I know of very few cases in which any employee of the Inside Service has been dismissed by the Government except for cause. I think that every regard has been paid to that part of the Civil Service in which appointments are made by competitive examination and promotions made upon merit. Inasmuch as the system of competitive examination and promotion by merit is to be applied to the Outside Service, I think it is not necessary to suggest that the power of dismissal be placed in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. Many hon. members have been protesting against this Bill on the ground that it will create a powerful bureaucracy. This is carrying that idea farther. I think it is perfectly sound to say that the power of dismissal should rest with the Governor in Council. Civil servants are employees of the Government, and I do not think the power of dismissal should rest anywhere except with that body. I do not think the civil servant would suffer in any respect whatever by the power resting with the Governor in Council. It is preferable that it should be there.

Mr. H. A MACKIE: Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) allow his amendment to stand until we have had an opportunity of seeing it in writing and studying it? Some of the things suggested by the hon. gentleman commend themselves to me, but I would desire to criticise some other portions of the amendment. I do not, however, feel like doing so until I have had an opportunity of seeing the amendment in writing and considering it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We will revert to that when we reach the end of the Bill.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Might I suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) that he should shorten his amendment and confine it to the question of whether the power of dismissal should rest with the commission or the Government; leaving out the provision that in each case there should be a trial to determine whether a man should be discharged or not? That seems admissible to a certain extent, but it might not be a good idea to have a trial in every particular case. It seems to me that that would be impracticable. If the amendment could be confined to the question as to whether the dismissal should be made by the commission or by the Government, and if that question were dealt with by itself, it would perhaps be better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) might have copies of his amendment made at noon and circulate them among the members. We shall revert to that clause when we come to the end of the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: I just drafted the clause since I came into the Chamber, but I have thought it over. I am willing to accept any suggestion, the adoption of which will ensure the protection of the civil servant. I do not object to the power of dismissal remaining in the Governor in Council, but I think we should make a provision that when a minister makes a recommendation to Council for the dismissal of a civil servant the brief of the employee answering the charges made against him should be attached to the recommendation so that the Governor in Council may have both sides. The hon. the Acting Minister of Finance says that I am illogical, but my position is this: This Bill is brought before the House for the purpose of keeping a political pledge, and if so all these various clauses are useless. The pledge that was made, as shown in the Order in Council of the 13th February, 1918, and in the words of the Prime Minister was "Civil Service reform with the view of extending the principle of the Civil Service Act to the Outside Service." I want to impress the Committee with a realization of the meaning of these words; they mean abolishing patronage. The promise was made that patronage should be abolished and that the Outside Service, as well as the Inside Service, should be brought under the Civil Service Commission. If that is all you propose to do, I do not see why you should pass this Act. On the other hand, if your object is to improve the Civil Service Act, I would say: Let us go into it, make our suggestions, discuss them and see whether we cannot improve the existing Act. It has been stated by the Acting Minister of Finance that there are only a few clauses to be changed. I think we ought to change more if we are going to take the matter up. I believe in improving the Act, and I

believe in doing it this session. To say that we can amend the Act again next session, is no reason why we should not pass the best Bill that, in the limited time at our disposal, we can agree upon.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We will let the clause stand and I will confer with my hon. friend with regard to it.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 36—record of attendance:

Mr. McQUARRIE: The punctuation of this section is defective. If you will look at the last part of it you will see that it says:

> At such times as are determined by the deputy head of the department or some other device.

I take it that the other device is not going to determine the time, but that it means that there shall be a book or some other device or system for keeping a check on the attendance of employees.

An hon. MEMBER: A time clock.

Mr. McQUARRIE: A time clock, for instance; I suppose that is the idea.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, that is what is used now.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I suggest that after the word "determined" in the 43rd line you put in a semicolon, or some other proper punctuation.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it not the rule that time clocks are used for this purpose in almost all departments of the service?

Mr. TURRIFF: Under this clause as it is proposed each department will be able to have a different system. At present there is a great deal of difference in the manner in which the departments record the attendance of their officials. Usually there is a book to be signed. In some of the departments the officials have to sign the book when they come in, when they go out at noon, when they come back after lunch and when they leave. In other departments the official signs the book when he comes in the morning and when he goes in the afternoon but at no other time. In some of the departments at half past nine a red line is drawn below the signature of those who have come in on time and all those who are late sign under the red line, thus there is a record showing whether they are late or not.

In other departments there is no red line drawn and no record taken. The official is allowed to mark his time whenever he likes. If he comes in at 9.30 a.m. and chooses to mark his arrival at 9.15 a.m., that is all there is to it and he gets no black mark. I claim there should be some uniformity in the system that is followed. If only to sign twice is the proper thing, well and good, but have it apply to every department. I think it is a mistake to leave it to the deputy minister, or the head of the department, to say what system shall be followed. The Civil Service Commision should have the necessary power, and there should be one uniform rule for every department in the Service.

Mr. MORPHY: I would suggest that the best way to fix the matter would be to have a short section reading something like this:

> There shall be kept and used in each branch of the Civil Service a book, system, or device, approved by the Commission, for preserving a record of the attendance of officers, clerks, and employees.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am willing to accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The section as amended will now read:

> There shall be kept and used in each branch of the Civil Service a book, system or device, approved by the Commission, for preserving a record of the attendance of officers, clerks and employees.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 37—Part of Act to apply to officers of Parliament.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is the same as the old section.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are retaining control of the employees of the House of Commons and the Senate?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 38—Work during recess.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the minister explain just what privileges the staffs of the House of Commons, the Senate and the Parliamentary Library, enjoy during recess.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A number of the staffs of the Parliamentary Library, the Senate and House of Commons are only employed for a few months of the year, or, perhaps, during the session only. In the case of some employees their remuneration is a per diem one, and the present provision is to enable them to take outside work at the close of the session. The clause is an old one.

Mr. TURRIFF: The leading officials of the House of Commons, the Senate and the

Library are all permanent officials, as I understand, and are paid salaries on the same scale as the officials in the other departments—I mean deputies, chief clerks, and the higher classes of officials. They are paid annual salaries and are not employed simply for the session.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I suppose the Hansard reporters come under this clause?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Hansard reporters have always been permitted to work outside after the close of Parliament. That has been the rule. But the number who are continually employed is growing, I understand, each year. I do not know much about the personnel of that part of the Civil Service.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It seems to me that all these officers should come under the supervision and direction of the Civil Service Commission. It may be that we pay large salaries to a large number of these officers, for the few months of the session, sufficient, perhaps, to keep them. Then, if they are able to earn other large salaries, perhaps their income is too great. I think they should be put under the control of the commission, so that the commission may see that the country avails itself of the services of these officials during the period they are not working for Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will see that we must not curtail the privileges enjoyed by the House of Commons and the Senate. We must observe the traditions which exist not only here but in England. We have the same traditions as they have in England, and there the Hansard reporters are on exactly the same footing as they are here. Take, for instance, the Hansard reporters: they work during the session, and everybody will admit that they do excellent work. After the session, what prevents them from being engaged in reportorial work, for instance in investigations and matters of that kind? They are supposed to be the most expert stenographers in the country, and, for my part, after they have done arduous work during a long session, I would not object to their acting as reporters in investigations.

Mr. MURPHY: The information sought has reference not to exactly the class of officers of which my hon. friend from Maisonneuve has just spoken, but to the staff employed by the Parliamentary library, I understand, having regard to the wording of this section. My impression is that in addition to the regular and well known employees of the library, with whom all members of Parliament and the public generally, are constantly in contact, there are several extra taken on during the session, and that a distinction obtains with reference to their employment under this section, and that it applies rather to that group. However, I would suggest to the acting minister that he might make inquiries and inform the committee this afternoon.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think a great deal will depend upon what salary is paid the officials of Parliament and of the Library. If they receive a very substantial salary, then I think their whole time should be devoted to the public service. The Speaker of the House of Commons is now engaged in the preparation of a report upon the reorganization of the staff of the House, and while I am not sure that it will be presented to Parliament this Session, it will be next Session; and after we have received that report we may take into consideration the suggestion to amend this clause.

Mr. CURRIE: Is this the same clause we have been working under in the past?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is an old clause; there is not a word changed.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Because it is old may be a very good reason why it should be changed.

Mr. CURRIE: So far as I can see this affects the reporters and the sessional clerks, and assistance brought in during the Session. There has been no complaint that officers who are getting large salaries go away and leave the Library or other offices in the interval between the Sessions and neglect their work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They are doing excellent work.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes; and the Library is open during the Recess as it is during the Session. But after the Session is over, there will be nothing for the Hansard reporters to do but to sit down and waste their time around here, and they are not paid sufficiently well to warrant the House in retaining their services. They go outside and do outside work as the ex-minister has stated. I think it is only fair to them that they should be allowed to do that extra work, because if we do not allow them to do that, we must substantially increase their salaries; which would involve adding fully one-third more to the expenditure of the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We must have the clause in in some form.

Mr. RICHARDSON: On the assurance of the minister that we shall get a report from the Speaker—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Speaker is now engaged in the preparation of a report on the organization of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If this House could get a report from the Speaker, or some authoritative official, as to the number of men included in this clause, the salaries they get, and the amount of work—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The character of the service.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The character of the service, and the period of service they render to this House, I would be disposed to withdraw any objection. But I do not agree with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve that we should have any particular regard to British or any other traditions. What this House wants is service, and service from all officers, and if it does not get it they should be dismissed. We should insist on service.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think the minister's idea of waiting for the report of the Speaker of the House is a very good one. I have not the slightest intention of interfering with the official stenographers during recess; they work here, I understand, by the day during the session. Under this clause as it stands, the permanent officers of the Senate and of the Commons and of the Library of Parliament, drawing from $2,000 to $5,000 a year in salaries, can, this year, for a ten months' interval, go out and compete with others who have not a big Government salary at their back. I do not know that they do that; I have never heard of their doing that; and I do not think it is likely. At the same time, it is quite possible for them to do so under this clause, and I think it should be amended in that respect. It is all right now, when labour is scarce, and when several departments are looking for workers all the time, for these officials to do extra work. But, ordinarily, it is not fair to the outside public to have an official drawing a big salary from the Government go out and compete with ordinary labour during one-half of the year.

Mr. MORPHY: For the benefit of the Civil Service Commission, I would like to speak of a practice that prevails here in Ottawa. The employees of the Members' Stenographers' branch in the House receive $75 a month, and I believe they occupy their positions only temporarily. But some of the departments of the Government are very hard pressed to get stenographers and are paying $1,200 a year, whereas the employees I have referred to, during the temporary period, which period usually brings larger pay, because Parliament cannot go on without them, are getting $900—

Mr. McISAAC: At the rate of $900 per year.

Mr. MORPHY: Yes. I mention the fact so that the Civil Service Commission can consider the anomalous situation which apparently exists. I know that some members of that staff have been here for some years, and were induced, through the importunity of the chief of the members' stenographers' staff, to leave positions paying them $1,200 to come and work here.

There came a time during this session when the staff was thirty short. Mr. Smith told me that it was very difficult indeed to get the number necessary to complete his staff; he had to advertise for them throughout the country. The efficiency of this service is impaired because of the fact that those engaged in it are not sufficiently paid.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the deficiency was due to the fact that the several War Commissions required large numbers of stenographers. They employed their own stenographic staff before the passage of the Order in Council, but since that date employees of these commissions have been appointed by the Civil Servce Commission, and there is not that wide discrepancy in the salaries that prevailed last year. I think $900 is the maximum ordinarily given to stenographers, outside of these commissions; though possibly in some of the departments where experts are required higher salaries are paid.

Mr. McISAAC: This section provides that Hansard reporters may engage in other work during the recess. Does this mean governmental work—in connection with investigations or such work as the Government may have—or outside work?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They may engage in private work.

Section agreed to.

On section 39—Civil Service list:

Mr. BUREAU: What changes have been made from the old Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "April" is substituted for "July," in the provision as to the date of submitting the report. The words "the appointments and promotions made" have been inserted in line 39; the words "transfers, exchanges" in line 41, and the words "both Houses of" before the word "Parliament" in line 44.

Mr. HOCKEN: I wish to move an addition to this clause, in the following words:

2. The Commission shall prepare a report separate from the Civil Service list of Canada, giving the names of all appointees for the current year, the positions to which they have been appointed, and their salaries; also the promotions, transfers and exchanges made during the year and the names of any of the relatives by blood or marriage that any of them may have in the Civil Service or the public service at the date of their appointment, promotion or transfer.

My object is to give publicity to the names of appointees who have relatives in the service. The proposal is not to exclude from the service any person who has relatives in it, but to provide a check on the deputy ministers, which is possible only through a report to Parliament.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If we are to have appointment to the service on the basis of competitive examination or of promotion by merit, surely relationship to somebody else already in the service should not make any difference. My hon. friend's suggestion is rather destructive of the principle of appointment to the service by competitive examination.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not agree with that, because if the Act passes in its present form a deputy minister may set aside, after a short period of probation, the man standing highest in the competitive examination and put somebody else in. This Act puts the whole service into the hands of the deputy ministers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. HOCKEN: Everything is done on the recommendation of the deputy minister; in the last analysis he has control of the appointments. The fact that an efficient man might not suit him is recognized by a provision that a man selected by the commission and rejected by the deputy may appeal to the commission. There cannot be any objection to our getting full information with regard to appointments and promotions, and that information should include a list of those appointed under the competitive system and of those who, selected by the commission, have not been found satisfactory by the deputy minister and have been replaced by some one else.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It does not make any difference how many members of one family or how many persons of one relationship are in the Service, provided each one is capable of carrying out his duties properly Something has been said by way of criticism of the Auditor General because a number of his relatives are in the Service. I do not know anything about the facts of that particular case or the capabilities of the different members of his family who are in the Service, but the point is whether or not they are doing their work properly. I think that this part of my hon. friend's proposed amendment should, in any event, be struck out.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Is it possible, in the order of selection by the commission, that relatives of those already in the Service can have precedence over anybody else? If it is possible, in the making of selections, for heads of departments to choose whom they please, then my hon. friend's amendment is apropos; if not, I do not see that it is necessary

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The heads of departments make no appointments. They make recommendation for promotion, but that is subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. If they desire the appointment of an official, they make a request to the Civil Service Commission for such an appointment, and the commission proceeds to make the appointment. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) seeks to destroy nepotism by publicity—I presume that is the purport of his amendment—but it is open to the objection which I stated a few moments ago. Under the Civil Service Act, appointments are to be made upon the competitive system. If that principle is sound, then I think relationship with any others in the Civil Service should hardly be a bar to promotion or appointment.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the objection?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There was some criticism of recent appointments made by the Auditor General, and perhaps that criticism may be well founded. Generally speaking, however, I do not think there have been in the past years abuses of that kind in the Inside Service at Ottawa. At least, I have never heard of them.

Mr. HOCKEN: Although I have been in the House only a few days, I have heard

of a great many cases, and I am surprised that the minister has not, during all the time he has been in this House, heard of cases of that kind. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) who spoke first on this Bill, referred to the very grave dissatisfaction that existed in the old country when the Civil Service Act was first put into operation there, and one of the chief objections raised was that there was nepotism exercised in the service to the exclusion of those who were not connected with important officials. I may be peculiar in my views, but I am frank enough to say that if I had to choose between the present system and a system which makes a family compact possible, I prefer the present system. I do not think there is anything more objectionable than to fill up the Service with the friends or relatives of a certain group of men who may be in important positions. Notwithstanding what the minister has said, my information is that this practice has been going on in Ottawa for a good many years. While I have not had an opportunity of analysing the Civil Service list for this purpose, I am convinced that, if you take the Civil Service list as it is to-day, you will find case after case where there are in the service just as many relatives of a certain official as there are in the case of the Auditor General. I am not saying that those men and women are not doing their work efficiently, but that is information that should be placed before Parliament, and surely, if there is nothing to cover up, there can be no reason why this amendment should not be agreed to.

At one o'clock the committee rose.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 39—publication of Civil Service list:

Mr. HOCKEN: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HOCKEN: I now beg to move that section 39 be amended by adding after the word "made" in line 39 the following:

—and the names of any relatives by blood or marriage that any person so appointed, transferred, or promoted may have in the Government, in the Senate, in the House of Commons, or in the Civil Service at the time of such appointment, transfer or promotion.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the object of the amendment?

Mr. HOCKEN: It is to have a report by the Civil Service Commission of the number of relatives that each person may have in the Civil Service at the time of his appointment, transfer or promotion.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I presume the object is to obviate nepotism, which is so rampant at the present time.

Mr. CAHILL: What has that got to do with this Bill?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is an effort to put a stop to nepotism.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not think it matters whether a man has relatives in the service or not. We should trust the Civil Service Commission and the officials of the Government.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It can do no harm.

Mr. CAHILL: What good can it do?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It seems to me we would make very much more sensible progress, to say the least, in discussing a matter that deals with the whole Civil Service of Canada, embracing some seventy thousand employees, if we came down from the air and treated the whole subject from a practical point of view. Just such a step as is contemplated by the amendment was taken by some of the large corporations in this country some twenty or twenty-five years ago but it was found to be absolutely unworkable and inapplicable. The plan followed by the most successful corporations in this country in employing men is not to discourage the appointment of those who have relatives in their service, but just the reverse. They do not consider it a detriment to a man to have relatives already in their service. To my mind the amendment would bring into contumely efficient public servants just because they had in some other department of the service a cousin or a brother or a father. The whole thing is entirely out of harmony with what in my judgment should be the aim in securing an efficient public service. If the apprehensions that have been expressed on the floor of this House with regard to the deputy ministers and those in charge of departments are justified, I think it is time we set about to find a group of honest men to place at the head of those departments. Personally it has not been either my pleasure or my misfortune to be brought into very close touch with the cloven-hoof breed from which these men are evidently recruited if they are what they have been represented to be. If they are of that breed, we should certainly try to find means of getting rid

of them, because in an efficient public service it is necessary to have honest men at the head of departments. I do not wish to be understood as casting reflection on these men. I have heard them referred to in commendable terms as being efficient, honest, hard-working and painstaking officials, anxious to do their duty to their country. But to entertain the suspicion that they are constantly trying to load the public service with inefficient employees just because they happen to be their relatives is to my mind an insult. That is what the amendment is to my mind. If the men at the head of departments of the public service are so small and narrow as to be influenced by considerations of that kind, we had better get rid of them and find other men big enough to do the work.

Mr. HENDERS: I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Nicholson). If the Civil Service Commission has not for its object the elimination of the evils that are sought to be prevented by this amendment, I fail to see of what use the commission is. As the commission is to hold competitive examinations they and the deputy ministers and the ministers should be responsible for seeing that the proper persons are appointed to the service, and if the commissioners do not do their duty the Parliament of Canada can get others in their place.

Mr. MANION: In what way would the commission find out what relatives a man had in the public service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Personally I am not favourably disposed towards this amendment, and I fail to see how the commission could get the information. They may be able to get it to a certain extent, but it would entail a great deal of work and, I should imagine, an increase in their staff.

Mr. MANION: If this amendment were carried it seems to me it would be simply putting a premium on lying. The only way the commission can find out the relatives of an applicant is by asking him, and if the man happened to be inclined to tell a lie would simply say he had no relatives in the service, but if he is truthful, and says "I am a cousin or a distant relation of the Minister of Finance" why should we cast a slur upon him? His appointment might be just as legitimate as that of anybody else to the service. I do not think the amendment is a good one.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR: I wish to record my opposition to this amendment. It is not so important that we should spend a great deal of time in discussing it, but I do not think it adds anything to the Bill, and it would be rather undignified for the House to pass it. The responsibility must rest upon the commission to appoint the best men they can get. I do not care who the man may be related to if he happens to be the best man available for the position. The only party that would be accused of nepotism in connection with appointments to the public service would be the party in power. The ministers of the Crown are the parties who have the say as to whether a man should be appointed or not, or who would have any opportunity of influencing the commission. I regret that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has so little confidence in the administration as to move such an amendment as this.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not think this amendment would have been moved had it not been that several times during this year the question of nepotism has come up in this House and has caused what we might call a mild form of scandal. There is the case of the Auditor General, a man whom we all respect. It has been stated in this House that he virtually compelled the commission to appoint his sons to lucrative office in the public service. The Auditor General is the man who supervises the service of everybody in the department, and he would be a rash man, indeed, even if he were a minister, who would refuse him an appointment. Another case is that of my esteemed and gallant friend, Colonel Labatt. Colonel Labatt is a man who is quite capable of standing on his own merits anywhere, but he has the political misfortune to be related by marriage to three ministers of the Crown and his case has been cited all over the country as being one of nepotism and favouritism and sneers have been indulged in with regard to his appointment. In view of the fact that these prominent cases have come to our attention, I think the time is opportune to take some stand with regard to the matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Civil Service Commission never issued any certificate in connection with the appointment of the son of the Auditor General.

Mr. CURRIE: How did he get the appointment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He did not get a certificate.

Mr. CURRIE: He did not need a certificate because, being a lawyer, his technical qualifications were such as to qualify him for the job.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The case is in dispute yet.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not object to Mr. Fraser's son getting an appointment; he may be the very best man in Ottawa for it. I do not think this case should influence anybody but still the fact remains that it has had a certain effect upon the public mind. The suggestion is made that when the House is dealing with this matter now it would be advisable to have something put in the Act as a check, or a brake, on deputy ministers so that they would not put all of their own families into office. We are all human; everybody is human. This would not prevent a deputy minister from putting his son into a job in the service that possibly called for a very high salary, such as a position in the first division, but if the deputy minister knew that he would have to state that the man whom he had appointed was his son and that that report would be presented to this House, he would hesitate. It is puerile to say that all this information cannot be easily obtained by the Civil Service Commission and that before a man is appointed the commission cannot ascertain whether he is the relative of any person already in the service, whether he is a Protestant, a Roman Catholic, or a member of any other religion, his age and whether married or single. To find that out does not require a staff of 300 or 400 people. In view of the agitation which has gone out all through the country because some of these things have come to the attention of the public within the last four or five months, we should do something to avoid any complaint in the future as far as nepotism is concerned. Everybody knows that possibly 65 per cent of the deputy ministers of the Crown are either ex-members of Parliament, defeated candidates or men who have been in politics. I think they are a very efficient lot of men but my experience is that both out of office and in office they are very strong partisans. I found during the regime of the old Government that when I recommended an efficient man for appointment to the service, because he belonged to one party and the deputy minister belonged to the other, the appointee's tenure of office would only be a few months. Some excuse was found and he would be put out of his position. Those deputy ministers belong to the old regime. Until we create a set of deputy ministers who are neutral we will have this strong party bias manifested in the administration of the departments. The old political parties are not dead yet. There is a lot of the old Adam in people at the present time and you cannot eliminate it. Perhaps after all, it is better that we should stick to the party system because my researches in history have shown me that the only safety for the people's liberties lies in party and not in faction.

Mr. MORPHY: I fail to see that there is anything wrong with this amendment. I have not heard any strong argument why such an amendment should not be passed, and I think some very forcible arguments have been presented why it should be passed. There is no doubt that in the public mind the idea is that nepotism and favouritism exist; that is the putting into positions, sometimes with large emoluments, of people who have nothing to recommend them except the pressure and influence exerted by their friends. It is no doubt true that in the city of Ottawa there are many families who have extraordinary advantages, in that members of these families have been placed one after another in positions in the Civil Service. Living next door to a widow with a couple of girls who have no influence, no one to go and put in a word for them, you may find a family with six or seven members in the Civil Service and another one growing up and also getting into the Civil Service, while the widow and her two children have no chance whatever. It is all very well to say that this is done by examination. Of course it is, but the fact remains that one can bring pressure and influence to bear and the other cannot. I do not say that necessarily the commission would be unduly influenced, but, as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) says, we are all human. The principle of the amendment offered by the hon. member for West Toronto is something that this House and the country can understand. What wrong will be done by giving the lever to the Civil Service Commission that this amendment will give, and enabling it to say, when somebody wants to get a position, "It is true you have passed the examination, but here is a person who has also passed the examination; you have six members of your family in the service already; you cannot get the position." It is about time that somebody took hold of the affairs of the country along the line which the amend-

ment suggests, so that favouritism shall be abolished.

What do we hear every day from the military service point of view? The cry is put up: This family has two boys gone to the front, you should not take the last one. By analogy I would like to see—when a family has been well taken care of in the Civil Service by a number of its members being employed,—the same principle act in the opposite way, and have it declared: You shall not go into the Civil Service, because there has been enough done by the country for your brothers and sisters. I find myself in this matter desirous of corroborating the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), because to my knowledge, obtained in a casual way, there is a great abuse in the practice which is aimed at and sought to be stopped by this amendment. It does seem to me that unless some sound reason to the contrary is furnished, the amendment should be adopted. It does not do merely to say that because certain persons are competent to do the work, that therefore they should be appointed. I am assuming the competency of ten members of a family, but I do not see why those ten persons should be given positions when there are other persons standing by who ought to be chosen, who are equally competent, who have passed the necessary examination, but are not able to get a hearing before the powers that be—they have not got the aggression or knowledge of the way to go about it,—and, therefore, they suffer.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It seems to me that we should not worry about the possible effects of this amendment. It is not going to interfere with any appointments that are being made, it is not going to prove a bar to the appointment of even relatives. Hon. members who have studied the Civil Service, and know anything about the condition of affairs, will agree with me that we ought not to be too delicate about hurting the feelings of civil servants in this country. We have had whole families living at the public crib; sisters, cousins, and aunts, have all piled in. The average member of Parliament knows nothing about this, but it is an absolute fact. The amendment of the member for Toronto is only designed to guard against a certain state of affairs, and to protect the public and the Civil Service itself. As I said, it is not going to prove any bar to the appointment of any person to the Civil Service, but the amendment embodied in the Act will be a deterrent to deputy ministers and to other civil servants, and through its agency we will probably put a check upon nepotism. Those of us who know anything about the conduct of the Civil Service know that nepotism has been rampant in the country for the last thirty or forty years. We need not worry about whether there is a precedent for our action or not. This is a Union Government, composed of, and supported by, two parties, and it can afford to establish precedents. What do we care about British or other traditions in connection with this matter? We are trying to do the best we can for the people, and God knows they need some service at the present time. If, by the introduction of this amendment, we can prevent nepotism and assist the people of the country in saving a little money, by all means let us adopt the amendment.

Mr. CAHILL: As I apprehend it, the Civil Service Commission are to conduct examinations and pass on all appointments. I, for one, am assuming that the Civil Service Commission is composed of honest and honourable men. If they are, I cannot understand why we should clutter up their report with the names of aunts, cousins, brothers, sisters or any other relatives that may be in the service of the country. If there is an application from a person to be appointed to the Civil Service, and he is not qualified, having a brother or a cousin already there is not going to get him into the service. If he is qualified for the position the Civil Service Commission will recommend him, otherwise they will not.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: If there were ten relatives of an official of the Government who made application for an examination, and all passed, how will the amendment prevent any one of them from being appointed?

Mr. RICHARDSON: It does not prevent their appointment; that is why I say it should pass.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Then what is the use of the amendment?

Mr. RICHARDSON: It would not prevent it if there were fifteen such persons. Even supposing there were twenty-four members of a family, coming, say, from the province of Quebec, where they raise large families, they might all get into the service, and this amendment would not prevent it. But surely there is no harm in adopting the amendment so that a light should be

thrown on what is being done, and, moreover, as I say, it constitutes a check upon nepotism.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The remarks I made this morning upon a previous amendment apply equally to the present one, and I have been wondering whether the mover of the present amendment has really considered what it means. It provides that upon the appointment, transfer or promotion of persons the names shall be given of any relatives, by blood or marriage that any of them may have in the Civil Service or public service. In my opinion, the thing is absurd. Take my own case, for instance. My wife has sixty first cousins, and I have about thirty. Besides, there are uncles and aunts, and grandfathers and grandmothers.

An hon. MEMBER: And grandchildren.

Mr. McQUARRIE: And grandchildren. It seems to me there must be some limitation to the degree of consanguinity in applying the word "relatives." Otherwise, you impose a task on the Civil Service Commission that would take up all their time.

Mr. BUREAU: They would need a staff of investigators.

Mr. McQUARRIE: They certainly would need an additional staff to work out the family tree for generations back, and include it in this report of theirs. Speaking seriously, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that, the amendment is impracticable, and that it is a joke.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I did not have the good fortune to hear the discussion on this question this morning, as I was attending the sittings of a committee of the House, but I can see very little objection to the amendment which has been offered. We were given to understand that one of the objects of the Bill was to do away with the influence that might be exerted in securing appointments. Now, we are told that it would be a reflection on some people if lists of their relatives were published. I have been in public life, more or less, for sixteen years—including service in the provincial as well as the Federal House—and during that time, so far as I know, not one relation of mine, either by blood or marriage has occupied a position in the service, of either the province or the Dominion. Therefore, I am not as sensitive about publication in this matter as some other gentlemen may be. There is a suspicion in the minds of the people, and it is useless trying to ignore it, that friends of the Government have received favours indirectly at the hands of those who have a right to recommend appointments. You cannot pick up a newspaper these last few days without reading a reference to something of the kind. I think the amendment is a very good one, and it will tend to check anything of that nature. I regret that it should be necessary to provide such safeguards, but I have no more confidence in the Civil Service Commission than I have in a great many other people, and for that reason I do not see any reason why the light of publicity should not be flashed upon every appointment made to the Civil Service in Canada.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: My main reason for not supporting the amendment is that I do not see what purpose will be served by it. As my hon. friend from Edmonton has said, there will be nothing to prevent the appointment of nine or ten members of the same family provided they pass the required examination. The amendment will not remedy the evil complained of. As to the evil of nepotism in the Civil Service and its elimination, I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman, but it should be made a matter of a special amendment, as it is in the American Civil Service Act. There is a section in that Act providing as follows:

> 9. That whenever there are already two or more members of a family in the public service in the grades covered by this Act, no other member of such family shall be eligible to appointment to any of said grades.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: As to the objection offered by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) a few minutes ago as to the meaning of the word "family," I notice a decision which has been rendered stating:

> The family consists of those who live under the same roof with the pater-familias—those who form....his fireside; but when they branch out and become heads of new establishments they cease to be part of the father's family.

So my hon. friend's conscience need not be troubled.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If the hon. gentleman has reference to me, I did not speak about the meaning of the word "family," but the word "relative." That is quite a different thing.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I see the difference.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I agree with the hon. gentleman regarding the word "family."

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It would be easily overcome by using the word "relative," instead of "family." So I will say to my hon. friend that if, instead of pressing his amendment, he moves to have a special clause in the Bill similar to that in the Civil Service Act of the United States, I shall be inclined to vote in favour of it.

Mr. HOCKEN: There is nothing in my amendment which will prevent the hon. member introducing a clause such as he suggests, and it might very well supplement my amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw yours.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HOCKEN: There seems to be a misunderstanding on the part of the hon. member for Algoma that I am trying to exclude a man from the public service who already has a relative in the public service. That is not the purpose of the amendment at all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no advantage secured by the hon. member's amendment, and it will cost several thousand dollars a year to get the information.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would cost several thousand dollars, and it would probably require volumes as large as the three volumes of the Auditor General's Report.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Two thousand have been added to the Civil Service since the thirteenth day of February by the Civil Service Commission, and it may very well happen that in a full year five or six thousand would be appointed. If such appointees had relatives to the number the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) has intimated, a simple mathematical computation would ascertain what size of a volume it would take. Did my hon. friend hear the section which is in the American Civil Service Act?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that the purpose is not to put in this report every relative in the world that an appointee may have. I do not want to know the names of the grandmothers or grandfathers unless they are in the service. The member for New Westminster seems to have got the wrong idea entirely. He seems to imagine that if a man is appointed to the service the report must contain the name of every relative he has. That is not the idea.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What I suggested was—

Mr. HOCKEN: It is to put in the name of every relative he has in the service.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I did not mean that exactly. What I meant was that you would require a family tree for every man and woman in Canada if this law went into force.

Mr. HOCKEN: You would not require anything of the kind, Mr. Chairman. Here is a point I would like to submit to the House. I have never found any objection on the part of any man to the widest publicity if he has done anything that he can defend. Now, whether we are going by this Act to establish a system that will result in a very serious degree of nepotism can only be ascertained from the information we would get in this report. As the Civil Service stands to-day you can go over the Civil Service list with some person in the service familiar with it, and pick out a great many cases where there are four or five, or half a dozen or more, of the same family in the service. To make an investigation of that kind would be an exceedingly difficult thing to do, and take months to complete. But if we get a report such as I am suggesting every year we would be able to tell each year how far this practice of nepotism is getting into the service. If it is not getting into any degree which seems to us to be dangerous, that ends it. If it is getting in, we will have the information in such a way that we can see it at a glance. If that happens—and we are making it a possibility under this Act, Mr. Chairman—and we discover it in the first, or the second, or the third year, then this House will take some action to put an end to it. Unless it has that information the House cannot proceed at all. I submit there is no other way, no better and no cheaper way. The acting minister says this will take one large volume, perhaps two. That only proves my case, because if they are going to make so many appointments that it will take two or three volumes to print the names of their relatives already in the service we ought to know it. I do not think there is any information that will be more desirable or interesting to this country than would be contained in those two or three volumes. If the cost will be as great as to require the printing of two or three volumes, it would

be necessary for this House to take some action at the next session of Parliament.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I would like to understand the hon. gentleman. He says that if we found a great number of such appointments we would put an end to it. Suppose he found there were five or six relatives of an appointee in the service already, would he propose to throw them out?

Mr. HOCKEN: I would submit, in answer to the hon. member for Red Deer, that, if it is found from these reports presented to this House from year to year that the practice is going on of filling up the service with the relatives of deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers and other men in important positions of that kind, there would be an amendment to this Act, and it would be based upon the information obtained in the manner I propose. I do not propose that if a man is appointed he shall be dismissed because he already has a relative in the Service. I say we do not need to go that far, but we can prevent it going any further.

Mr. ROBB: A few moments ago the Acting Minister of Finance made a statement as to the number who had been added to the Civil Service list since the thirteenth of February, and there seems to be some doubt on this side as to the correctness of the figures. Would he mind repeating the statement?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I said two thousand had been appointed since the thirteenth of February. There were 465 permanent appointments and 2,409 temporary appointments.

Mr. FIELDING: If this Bill has any merit at all—as to this some hon. gentlemen seem to have doubts—it is that we are to abolish patronage and favouritism; that we are to have a free-for-all, the best man to win. If the Bill does not mean this, it is all humbug. This being our object, why should we stop to inquire about a man's relatives? The motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) implies that it is a great wrong to have several members of one family in the public service.

Mr. HOCKEN: It does not imply anything of the kind.

Mr. FIELDING: Then why does my hon. friend want the information? Appointments to the public service are not to be viewed as favours; they go to those who receive them as a matter of right, on their merits and qualifications as disclosed by the examinations. If that be the case, why should we inquire whether one, two, or a dozen members of the same family are in the Civil Service? If the principle of examination and competition is to prevail—and that is professedly the very essence of this measure—surely we do not need to inquire how many relatives the candidate has in the public service. Reference has been made to the Auditor General. I have not looked into his case; I only know that he is an able and faithful public official. But if any son or daughter of the Auditor General submitted himself or herself for examination and won the prize legitimately, why should he or she not receive the appointment? Is the member for West Toronto not defeating the whole purpose and intention of this Bill in the amendment which he has submitted? True, he does not say that you must not appoint more than one or two members of the same family, but if his amendment does not mean that, what is the object of getting all this information, of investigating family trees and holding these inquests from ocean to ocean? If the principle of this Bill is not that of establishing a system of open, free, public competition, then, as a distinguished statesman once said, "There hain't nothing to it." Let men be appointed simply on merit, regardless of colour, creed, politics, or relationship.

Mr. MURPHY: May I suggest to the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), who was not here on Saturday evening, that the striking out of section 9 robbed this Bill of the only principle which my hon. friend rightly says entitles it to consideration?

Mr. BUREAU: The member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) said that he had heard no reason why the amendment should not go through. It is for the mover of an amendment to make good his case, and in the remarks which the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has made I see no reason why the amendment should be accepted. He suggests that the Acting Minister of Finance has proved the worth of the amendment by saying that, if it were accepted, it would cost the Government a lot of money to carry it out. I do not think that that proved the case at all. Investigation may be made whether an applicant has a relative in the Senate, the House of Commons or the Civil Service, and it may be shown that he has none;

but in every case a special staff of inquisitors will be required. It has been pointed out that if you rely on the statement of the applicant as to his family connections, you open the door to his giving false information. In other words, the making of this provision would be detrimental to the country, first, because of the expenditure involved in carrying it out, and, second, because of your opening the door to a man's avoiding the truth in order to further his own ends. It would give members of this House a chance to vent grievances they might have against other members or to hold other members up to the country as having come into the House for the purpose of getting their relatives into the Civil Service. I can speak on this subject quite freely, because I have not a relative, either near or distant, in the Civil Service. I do hope, for the sake of my relatives, that they never will be in the Civil Service. I do not say that as a disparagement to any one. We want civil servants, and we want good ones, but they should not be subjected to the criticism of members of Parliament because they happen to be related to members of the Civil Service Commission, deputy ministers, or members of this House or the Senate. It seems to me that the only object of this motion is to give to those who desire to obtain political advantage the chance to come into the House and say: So-and-so has been abusing his powers, So-and-so has come here solely for the purpose of getting members of his family into the Service. I agree with all that has been said by the member for Shelburne and Queens. This legislation is either a camouflage or the basis of a real law. I think it is to be a real law, and that everybody in the House is endeavouring to do the best he can to make it a good law, in the short time that we have at our disposal. I look upon this motion as a reflection on the motives of members of this House. It suggests that gentlemen come here with no other purpose than that of getting their relatives into the Civil Service, and if only for the sake of the dignity of the House, I shall oppose the motion.

Mr. TURRIFF: The member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is putting up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking it down. There would be no difficulty whatever in getting the information. When a candidate for a position applies to the Civil Service Commission he has to answer certain questions and if he were asked what relatives he had in the Service, the information could be obtained without expense and without the services of a large staff of inquisitors. Moreover, two or three volumes will not be required to publish the names. The suggestion that a report of this kind would be voluminous, is in itself a reason why the amendment should carry.

Mr. BUREAU: That is locking the barn when the horse is gone.

Mr. TURRIFF: Those who have been in Ottawa for years and know something about the Civil Service realize that members of the Civil Service themselves have far more influence in the matter of appointments than all the members of the Senate and the House of Commons put together. The amendment is not designed to prevent any class of persons from entering the Service. I would not for a moment suggest that a man should be debarred because he has two or three sons or daughters in the Service, but there is no reason why the information referred to in the amendment should not be given to the House and the country. That is why I support the amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: If this amendment is intended to combat or to prevent an evil, let us determine by legislation the degree of relationship that will prohibit a man's entering the Service. This amendment is designed either to prevent nepotism or to serve some ulterior purpose which has not been divulged.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The member for West Toronto suggested that I had misunderstood the object of his amendment; that it was not to prevent those who had relatives in the Service from retaining the positions which they had or from obtaining appointments. I appreciate the intention of my hon. friend's amendment. If it is not to prevent persons who have relatives in the Civil Service from obtaining appointments, it is at least to provide a means by which odium can be cast on efficient public servants, and is based purely on the assumption that when a man enters the public service he gets something in the nature of a gratuity. My understanding of the relationship between employer and employed is that the employee gives, not the employer. The whole thing narrows itself down simply to this, that by this amendment we say that, if a man who is in the public service, permits a relative of his also to get into the public service, reflection is going to be cast on either the one or the other. With regard to the opportunity for ascertaining whether a man has a relative in the public service or not, I question very much whether the hon. member for West

Toronto (Mr. Hocken) could tell us where all his blood relatives and the blood relatives of his wife happen to be.

Mr. HOCKEN: There are none of them in the public service.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It is absolutely necessary that you know where they are if you know they are not in the public service.

Mr. HOCKEN: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend means the Inside Service only.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I refer to the employees of the Crown from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Is there, in this House, an hon. member who can say that there is no relative of his or his wife, distant or near, somewhere employed in the public service?

Mr. BUREAU: Somebody unknown to him.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Who may not be known to him. This amendment, however, implies that you must give all this information. It has been said in this House that the whole country is agitated on account of the degree to which nepotism has already existed. The whole country may possibly be agitated, but if it is agitated at all, that is due to the unwarranted emphasis which has been placed by hon. members on the fact that some of our public servants may have a relative somewhere giving service to the people of this country.

Mr. PROULX: I do not approve the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). A more effective measure to include would be a provision, like the one in the United States Civil Service Act, limiting the number of the members of a family who can obtain employment in the Civil Service.

Mr. CURRIE: The United States will allow only two.

Mr. PROULX: I understand so; in the same grade.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: In all grades.

Mr. PROULX: That is only the same family, those living under the same roof. I would approve a provision, if the minister would include it in this Bill, limiting the number of the members of the same family who could obtain employment in the Service.

Mr. CURRIE: That would have to come under another clause.

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

Mr. PROULX: After this amendment is disposed of, we could add another clause. I do not think we should extend this provision to the Outside Service, but in the Inside Service we could very well limit the number of members in a family who could obtain positions.

Mr. CAHILL: If this amendment does not assume that the same old patronage is to prevail, how is the commission to be influenced by members or senators? I have no relatives in the Civil Service, and I am satisfied that several hon. members who have spoken in opposition to this amendment have no relatives in the Civil Service. But we shall have this list before us next year, and we shall have some cheap political sniping at people in the Civil Service by hon. members who have nothing better to do, just as we have heard during the consideration of this Bill, imputations being made against certain men who are employed in the Service. If you have any charge to make against members of the Civil Service, make it, but do not make imputations against them.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I have listened very carefully to this discussion, and I must say that I feel disposed to vote against the amendment. It appears to me that both the mover of the amendment and his chief supporters put it up and then ran away from it. I put to the mover of the amendment a direct question as to what its effect would be upon relatives already in the Service, and he obviously shrank from saying that he would take any steps to remove people who are now in the Service. My hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson), and my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), said that they would not take any steps to prevent, or they did not understand that the amendment, if carried, would prevent numerous members of a family from being appointed. Then in the name of common sense, what would it do? The only possible answer is that given by my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), who, I think, put his finger on the real objection to the amendment when he said it would afford an opportunity for holding up to odium those who are already doing good honest public service; otherwise, I presume they would not retain their positions. Not only would that apply to the discussion in this House, but the members of the public would have recourse to this public list, and animosity, strife and trouble would be raised without the supporters of the amendment doing any-

4 p.m.

thing to cure the evils created by this method of appointment. The evil exists, and yet my hon. friends shrink from saying they would cure it as far as it already exists. This evil has grown up under both political parties and under the Government of this country. The only purpose of this amendment would be to cure this evil, but it would not cure it. The only practical suggestion I have heard has come from my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe). Without stirring up strife and animosity and raising invidious comparisons between the families of the country, let us be practical and bold. If there be an evil, then do not let us go on the limping logic of my hon. friend. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) says, in one sentence: I do not want it passed because it would prevent ten relatives being appointed to the public service. In the next sentence he says: It would be a good check on nepotism. If you are going to make it a check, do not make it a check on future appointments, drawing from it the possibility of dealing frankly with past appointments. Let it be a workable check, and if we can, let us adopt the provision in the American Act to which my hon. friend has drawn attention.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I remember there was at one time a discussion, in connection with Government matters, as regards a certain appointment. I had the honour of proposing a gentleman with a very distinguished Canadian name, and the question was raised: How many of the Casgrain family are to be found everywhere in the Dominion? I thank God for it, men of that ability and character can be found, and it would be better if more of them could be found. The Casgrain family was mentioned then and I hope I may be excused for mentioning it here. The point is not that there are many members of a family in the Civil Service, but that sometimes improper means may be taken to put them there. Then it is time for the Government to know that. The question is not whether a clerk may happen to have two or three brothers or sisters in the Service, but whether the power behind those people is improperly used to get those positions. I have had occasion to refer to a particular case in this House, and I maintain that improper influences are used to get members of certain families in this country in certain positions. I do not want to blacken the name of any civil servant, but I do want, if possible, to stop—and this Civil Service Bill, I presume, does so,—those people getting their friends into positions through improper influence. I understand the Civil Service Commission was bulldozed by a gentleman holding a prominent position in Canada, to make an appointment which they did not consider advisable to make. That was improper influence. I do not see anything whatever in the amendment.

Amendment put to the vote in the Committee. Amendment negatived: ayes, 19; nays, 73.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I would like the annual report of the commission to show the number of transfers made from the Inside to the Outside Service and from the Outside to the Inside Service, with the origin and destination of the transfer in each case. I do not think there can be any objection to that. It would not require a great deal of extra work and would enlighten the country to what extent transfers were being made from Ottawa and other large centres to the country districts. That is valuable information, and though its publication would not prevent the transfers being made, it would inform the members what was being done. I beg to move therefore that after the word " appointments " in line 39 the word "transfers" be added.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The report has to contain the names of the successful competitors and candidates. I think the word "and" in line 39 should be "or." Otherwise the names of all unsuccessful candidates would have to be published, and there might be many thousands of them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I beg to move that the words " competitors and " in lines 38 and 39 be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE: I think it is very important to leave the section as it stands. It is very necessary that we should know who tried the examination. If everybody passes, the examinations would simply be a farce and not worth the time and trouble. We should see that the examinations are being conducted properly.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The section as it stands does not require the names of the unsuccessful candidates to be given.

Mr. BLAKE: I would understand it to mean that the names of all the candidates should be given.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not the purpose of the section.

Mr. BLAKE: Will the number of those rejected be given?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 40—regulations:

Mr. BUREAU: Is that a new clause?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. I beg to amend this section by prefixing to it the words, "The Commission with the approval of," by changing the word "he" to "it," and by adding after the word "Act" the words "and such regulations shall be published in the Canada Gazette."

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister object to having a copy of the regulations laid before Parliament? That is done as a rule.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is provided for in section 39.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not quite sure whether that would cover it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 39 provides that the "regulations made during the year respecting appointments, promotions, etc., shall be presented to both Houses of Parliament."

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister thinks that covers it, I have no objection.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why should the Governor in Council have the initiative? Why not say the commission shall recommend to the Governor in Council?

Mr. A. F. MACLEAN: That is the effect of my amendment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not see that that gives the commission the initiative. I would say "the commission may recommend to the Governor in Council."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The commission can make regulations, but before they become effective they must be approved by the Governor in Council. That is tantamount to a recommendation.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 41—appointments to be made by competitive examination:

Mr. McQUARRIE: I propose two amendments to this section. I beg to move:

That section 41 be amended by inserting after the word "Council" in the eleventh line thereof the following words:

"Except as to the city of Ottawa all such appointments in any province shall, so far as possible, be made from bona fide residents of that province; and that there be inserted after the word "practicable," in the twentieth line the words "advisable or expedient."

It is hardly necessary for me to elaborate on what the effect of the first part of the amendment would be, namely, that all appointments should, as far as possible, be made from residents of the province in which the appointments are to be made. It may be said, perhaps, that I am drawing upon my imagination in suggesting that there is any real necessity for a provision of this kind. When applying, within the last two or three days, for an additional stenographer in one of the offices in New Westminster, I was told that if another stenographer was needed we could have one, but that one would have to be sent from Ottawa instead of being appointed from my own constituency, where a number of capable stenographers are available. A provision of this kind is a very reasonable one. When it comes to appointments in the city of Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, where so many of the head offices of the departments are situated, it would be objectionable to provide that all appointments should be from residents of the province of Ontario. I know very well that, in so far as we of the province of British Columbia are concerned, it is very easy for the people of Ontario and Quebec to forget that we are in existence at all. It seems to be the tendency for people in Ontario and Quebec to think that they constitute the whole of the Dominion. I say that without any disrespect at all, because I happen to come from the province of Ontario myself; I was born in the city of Ottawa, about 200 yards away from this very building. But when you have the Civil Service Commission composed of residents of Ontario and Quebec, as I suppose it, perhaps, always will be—

Mr. BUREAU: There is no Ontario representative on the commission.

Mr. McQUARRIE: They are all from Quebec?

Mr. BUREAU: They are all western men.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Oh, no. They are likely to forget that there is such a province as British Columbia, and they will make all the appointments from the East. I am not going to elaborate on that argument; the point is self-evident to every-

body. If you are in favour of it you will support it; if not you will vote against it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Would the hon. gentleman object to treating this as two separate amendments? The amendment deals with two separate questions, and if he would deal with them separately he might find that some hon. gentleman might support one and not the other.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I shall be glad indeed to accept the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. gentleman has leave to divide the amendment?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McQuarrie moves that section 41 be amended by inserting after the word "council" in the 11th line thereof the following words:

Except as to the city of Ottawa all such appointments in any province shall, in so far as possible be made from bona fide residents of that province.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We would like to hear from the acting minister as to that.

Mr. FIELDING: If this amendment is to have any meaning you must limit it to applications from the different provinces. There is no use of throwing the competition open to the wide world if an outsider is not going to get any chance of appointment. I am not objecting to the principle that is put forward in the amendment but you should say that applications shall only be received from each province.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Before that amendment is put to the vote I want to express my own view in reference to it and to call the attention of the committee to what seems to be involved. In the first place, when the amendment was read, it grated upon my feelings as a citizen of a united country. It seems to me that the principle involved in this tends to cut us off into provincial sections, to can us in sectional compartments. It therefore puts up a barrier against the free currency of the service and the talent of the whole country as devoted to the work of the whole country. It seems to me that it tends to cultivate provincialism rather than nationalism. What reason in the world is there why a man who is born in British Columbia and has talents and capacity should not have an opportunity of serving in the public service in any part of Canada? From my point of view that seems to be the broad ground upon which we should develop. If, on the other hand you make a regulation by which you virtually say that no one but a British Columbian shall be allowed to act in the service of the Dominion in British Columbia, no one but a Quebec man shall be allowed to act in the public service anywhere in Canada except in Quebec, and so on throughout all the provinces, you rather bar the current of communication, sympathy, active service and nationality. I do not think there is any better basis than that the appointments which are to be made by the Civil Service Commission will be made for the good of the service. I should think that it would be the inevitable tendency that for the larger proportion of the offices there would be sufficient material in the different localities of the different provinces to look after the public service in those localities. But I think also there is a very great advantage in having free currency so that the stronger and better minds in public service work may have free access to, knowledge of, and communication with every part of the Dominion.

I should be sorry to think, if I were an applicant for a Civil Service position—it might be a medium position, it might be one of very great importance—that I was debarred from seeking that in any but my own province of New Brunswick, or my own province of Ontario. I simply give expression to the feeling produced, that it rather works, as it seems to me, against a full and broad citizenship of the country, against that nationalism which we all wish to cultivate, and that it rather tends to can us up into small divisions, and to perpetuate the feeling of provincialism rather than of nationalism, and I say that in the broadest sense. For my own self I would be sorry to see a principle like that embodied in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister permit me to point out that in the majority of the advertisements for examinations issued by the Civil Service Commission, it is utterly impossible for a candidate from British Columbia to compete, because the advertisement will probably reach there about the time the returns from the examinations should be in Ottawa, or about the date of the sittings for the examinations. A case occurred about a week ago where a vacancy in a certain position was advertised. Dozens of persons in British Columbia wished to compete for the position, but British Columbia was not on the map as far as that advertisement was concerned, and no examination was held in that pro-

vince at all. The date of the examination fixed in the advertisement would not permit of a candidate coming to Ottawa in time, although when I brought the matter to the attention of the commission they did make provision. The same thing applies to tenders. It is impossible to get a tender to Ottawa by the date fixed in the advertisements. If the commission will make provision for the ten days needed to send out the advertisement and get the examination papers back, thus giving applicants in British Columbia the same chance as candidates in Ottawa or other parts of the country, there would not be very much ground for objection.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend refers to a point that I was just rising to direct his attention to, and it is a thing that is absolutely wrong. In advertisements announcing examinations to choose persons for the public service, sufficient time should be allowed to afford equality of chance to every section of the Dominion. I think that is the way to cure the evil complained of. I would rather cure it by having a sufficiency of time provided than by attempting to cure it in the way proposed.

Mr. FIELDING: If there is a vacant position in British Columbia, why should any man be asked to travel from that province to Ottawa for examination? Why should not the examination be held in British Columbia?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: So it will be.

Mr. FIELDING: To that extent I am willing to be a provincialist. On the larger question my sympathies go very largely with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I certainly think that if there is a position to be filled in British Columbia, the examination should be held in that province. That would work out probably that, practically speaking, only British Columbians would apply, and the result might be reached in that way; but I am strongly of opinion that the attempt to hold examinations for all these services in Ottawa ought not to be made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Act provides for an examination at any point in Canada upon the request of five persons.

Mr. FIELDING: Such examinations should be held without any request, it seems to me. If there is a vacancy in an office in British Columbia, certainly I would be provincialist to the extent of saying that the examination should be held in that province, so that the candidates there might certainly have the advantage, and that advantage I would willingly give them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Will the Chairman read the proposed amendment again?

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved to add after the word "Council" in the eleventh line, on page fourteen, the following words:

> Except as to the city of Ottawa, all such appointments in any province shall, as far as possible, be made from bona fide residents of that province.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think the minister took an extreme view of the proposed amendment which only says "as far as possible". That is a very limiting phrase, and I think it is a very wise one. This is a very important question to outside members, and I think that we are justified in taking very strong grounds upon it. A gentleman who sits on this side of the House, after the discussion the other night, said to me that recently two appointments had been made in his riding, both at comparatively large salaries, and both made from Ottawa, apparently without consulting him. But, he said, when it comes to a position of $300 or $400, and they fail to get anybody from Ottawa who will go up there they will say to me: "You can make a suggestion with regard to that." That is not the sort of thing that we want. My hon. friend has made a very fair proposition. British Columbia is an integral part of the Dominion, and I do not think he is at all provincial in the proposal he makes. He simply is looking after the interests of his own people, and his own constituents to some extent, so far as the administration of the Civil Service is concerned. Every district is entitled to a certain number of officials of that kind, and the reasonable place to take them is from the part of the country in which they live. The question simply resolves itself into this: If we do not put into the Bill some such safeguard as this, all the big plums in the service will be taken by men or women from the Capital or from the large cities, and when it is not worth while to send any person from those places to fill a three or four hundred dollar job, the member will be told "You can have that for some person at home." The proposition of my hon. friend from New Westminster is absolutely reasonable, and while I generally agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce in all these matters, I certainly do think—even if it be construed as being narrow and provincial—

that the member for New Westminster has made out a very good case. I do not think any harm will be done because it simply says "as far as possible". If it is not possible the views the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has suggested will prevail, and the appointee will come in from the outside; were it is possible and practicable, appointments will be made from the province where the vacancy occurred. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I would in general agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because we do not want to be provincial, but it seems to me that the more settled provinces of the East are not wishing to have reciprocity with us, and it has been so in the past more than it is to-day. I might broaden my statement more by digression, and say that both political parties in the past have had in view the ignoring of the Western Provinces. As an illustration of my contention, let me say this: Two years ago, when I was proceeding by water to the extreme northern limits of my constituency, about four hundred miles from Edmonton, we found a chief fire ranger sent from Ottawa. Upon making inquiries it was found he had been sent there for certain reasons; the atmosphere in Ottawa was too warm, or something of that sort, and they sent him out where he would be removed from temptation. I found both sides of the river Athabaska, for a distance of three hundred miles, on fire, and if you want to look up the records you can go to the Department of the Interior and read where I made it imperative that a change should be made at once. They did make some changes. We also find homestead inspectors in Alberta that are sent from other provinces, and heads of departments that are sent from Ottawa and other cities. I will give a concrete instance showing that the folks in Ottawa are not willing to play the fair game with us. A young lady came from France not very long ago with her brother and sister. Her brother went to the United States, her sister got married, and she was left alone. She does not know the English language very well, and I tried to place her in some office in Calgary; she received temporary employment with the Belgian Consul. Since I have been here, trying to respect the spirit of the Order in Council which has been passed, I did not bother with any of the ministers, nor did I go to Dr. Roche and see if he could do anything for the young lady. I have endeavoured to secure an appointment for her as a French stenographer to one of the departments here, but there is nothing doing. They do not want this young lady here, it is too far to bring her, they would not have any use for her here; but officials here can send stenographers from Ottawa to New Westminster. We do not want to be provincial, but if you in Ottawa are going to be provincial, watch our smoke.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope that the remarks I am going to make will not grate upon the feelings of my hon. friend (Sir George Foster). I am as good a Canadian as he is, yet I believe the whole spirit of the British North America Act breathes provincialism. We have established provinces and there are local liberties and customs in these provinces, and a circumambient air which we must recognize. That is the case in every great confederation. Now it may be that I will be frowned upon as a narrow provincialist, but the case of British Columbia appeals to me just as the case of Nova Scotia would. I put the case before my good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce: "Suppose there is a vacancy in the postmastership at Halifax, Pictou, Sydney, or St. John, don't you think, Mr. Chairman, that it is only human that the people of those localities should think that the appointment should be made after competitive examination?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not after competitive examinations; I have no use for them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They should be made from that province at least, if not from that city or locality. It seems to me only fair and only human, and there is nothing narrow in the fact that a member should advocate respect for local rights and customs. Let me raise another point, and I hope that again I will not be labelled a parochialist or a narrow provincialist. Take the case of my own province of Quebec. I will not speak of Montreal, the metropolis of Canada, where there is a very large English-speaking population, and where almost every one speaks both languages. But outside of Montreal and a few other centres where the people at large speak both languages, suppose there are some positions open where it is absolutely necessary that the incumbent should speak both languages. If you open that position to competitors from one end of Canada to the other, both languages being official in federal matters,

you may have to appoint in some centres a gentleman or a lady, as the case may be, who speaks only one language. Why stir up the feelings of the people when by a commonsense application of this Act it can be prevented? I have been a minister of the Crown myself, and every now and then when I was in the Post Office Department and the Department of Labour I had difficulties of that kind to settle. It seems to me the amendment of my hon. friend should be supported to avoid trouble. Let us avoid trouble as much as possible by a sensible application of this Act. Personally, I do not object to gentlemen, if competent, from British Columbia occupying positions in Montreal, nor would hon. gentlemen from New Westminster or Vancouver object to a gentleman from another part of Canada occupying a position in their province. But that is not the point. You must respect local customs, and, as much as possible, avoid stirring up trouble through the drastic application of the Act. I wish it to be well understood, Mr. Chairman, that I am not a narrow provincialist or parochialist at all; but you are sure to cause trouble by making outside appointments. Take the case of Quebec City, or Trois Rivières, or Fraserville, would the Minister of Trade and Commerce tell me that it would be practicable and feasible to appoint some one from, say, Muskoka or Winnipeg to a position there? The amendment of my hon. friend is drafted in a proper spirit, and, for my part, to avoid troublesome racial and language questions in my province, let us adopt it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, I agree with all that the hon. member from Maisonneuve has said, but I go much further. In the first place, I do not believe in these so-called competitive examinations. They are a farce on the face of them, as any one who has ever had anything to do with educational work knows.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend qualify that statement by giving facts? I always thought that the competitive examinations under the system—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I remember an examination paper brought before the Cabinet which took office in 1911. I do not think there were three members of the Cabinet that could spell the words or answer the questions set on that paper for candidates to write on to fill a position in a little one-horse place. To ask candidates to spell the word "Bolsheviki," or to think up technicalities like that, is no way of testing their fitness to hold positions. As the hon. member for South Toronto said the other night, the men who stand foremost in all the walks of life, in law, medicine and other professions, are not those who pass highest in examinations, but men with some breadth and force of character, who would not waste time in getting up the little technicalities and prize puzzles set by these examiners. The point I want to make is this: there are two classes of servants: one Dominion servants, who deal with the offices here in Ottawa, and the other those in customs offices and post offices throughout the country, or what we may call constituency appointments. I have always taken the ground that constituency appointments should be made from the constituency.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I stand on that ground to-day. To say that the riding I have the honour to represent, or that some other member may represent, cannot supply the men or women to fill any jobs in that constituency is belittling, and this belittling of our own people is becoming too much the custom in Canada to-day. We have thousands of men and women in our constituencies able to fill any job. Why is it necessary for any one in British Columbia or Nova Scotia to be sent to fill a job in Northumberland, or vice versa? Every person required to fill a constituency job should be furnished by the constituency. If there is a position to be filled in a province, let it be filled from the province; or if the position is a federal office, let it then be advertised all over Canada and get the best man. So far as competitive examinations are concerned, I do not know whether the clause dealing with them is passed or not, but I trust that the committee will bear in mind what was said in this regard by the hon. member for South Toronto the other night: that a competitive examination is not a test of fitness at all. I have observed—and any minister or ex-minister who ever had anything to do with the Civil Service will agree—that those who have not passed examinations are the best officers in the department. I believe that every constituency should furnish its own local officers out of its own locality; and that every province should furnish its officers out of that province, except in the case of those positions applying to the general service of the whole Dominion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to recall a statement, prepared by one of the com-

missioners, from which I read on Friday night. It contains the following in reference to appointments within the locality where the position is to be filled:

> There is naturally a very strong feeling throughout the country that positions should, wherever possible, be filled by the appointment of local persons and that except in the case of transfers, which might occasionally become necessary, "outsiders" as they are regarded should not receive preferment.

That is a declaration of the policy of the commission. This principle, particularly as applied to post office appointments, has been recognized in the United States, where the eligibility of applicants is restricted to those living in the vicinity of the town, city or county where the appointment is to be made. Another portion of this statement says:

> Heretofore permanent appointment in the Inside Service was based solely on the result of an educational test (the candidate being otherwise suitable, of course, as to age, health, character and habits). This gave to the candidate fresh from the class room, and yet lacking in experience, a great advantage over the educated and altogether more suitable person who possessed business experience but might be a trifle rusty in some of the subjects written at the examination.

It would also appear from this statement that the commission are to give a rating on the business experience of applicants for appointment for any position in the Civil Service. A great deal may be said in favour of the amendment and a great deal against it; but I am disposed to accept it, with some slight alteration. This Act departs very radically from the present Civil Service Act and it is important that it be accepted by the people. If this provision is contained in the Bill, it will very materially assist in the administration of the new Act. I suggest that the amendment read as follows:

> Excepting as to the Inside Service, all appointments to any position in a province shall, so far as practicable, be made from bona fide residents of such province.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is the Inside Service all in Ottawa?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I understand that post office inspectors cannot be appointed without passing an examination and receiving the necessary authority from Ottawa. I submit that the Inside Service is not restricted to Ottawa.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is it possible to carry this amendment into effect? Many of the civil servants in Ottawa come from British Columbia, and many from Prince Edward Island. Some Ontario men are in the Government employ in Prince Edward Island—the appointment of some of these has been objected to. But the exchange of officers in certain departments is often very desirable. It may be a good thing to have an Ontario man in the Maritime Provinces, and vice versa, because they exchange ideas. This amendment may be valuable as a declaration of policy, but I do not see that it will carry much weight as a matter of law.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As a matter of principle, my hon. friend's criticism is sound. On the other hand, if such a provision would make the Act more acceptable to Canada it had better be accepted, and we may leave to future Parliaments whatever further amendment may be necessary. "Inside Service" is defined as follows:

> "Inside Service" means and includes that part of the Civil Service in or under the several departments of the Executive Government of Canada and in the offices of the Auditor General, the Clerk of the Privy Council, the Governor General's Secretary, the Public Archives, and the Commission of Conservation, employed at the city of Ottawa, or at the Experimental Farm Station or the Dominion Astronomical Observatory near Ottawa, and the staff of the Civil Service Commission employed at Ottawa.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Accepting as correct the minister's assertion that the Inside Service is confined to Ottawa, I am prepared to concur in his suggestion. I regret that this resolution has grated on the highly strung sensibilities of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I should be the last in the world to cause him the slightest feeling of discomfort, because I have the greatest respect for him. I regret that he looked upon my resolution in the way he did, because I did not intend it to be provincial; I merely considered it my duty to look after my constituency and my province. British Columbia has I think sent about ten per cent of her total population to the war, and the people of that province are entitled to some consideration. When it is said that we should be national, not provincial, may I point out that in this august legislature and departments connected with it, in responsible positions you will not find one person from British Columbia? The same condition prevails in a great many other departments. When appointments are made, some of the people in Ontario and Quebec forget that there is such a place as British Columbia.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It may be necessary further to amend the proposed provision by inserting after the words "Inside Service" the words "and Commissions and Boards at Ottawa." Otherwise, appointments to these boards would be restricted to the province in question, and I do not think that is the desire of any hon. gentleman.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move to amend the section further by inserting after the words "case of" in line five the words "commissioners and other members of any Royal or other commission or board and". The section will then read:

> Except as herein otherwise provided, and except in the case of commissioners and other members of any Royal or other commission or board and deputy heads, appointments to positions in the public service shall be by competitive examination.

The purpose of this amendment is to exempt from the provisions of the Act appointments of commissioners and other members of commissions or boards. Those, of course, should be directly appointed by the Government.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) moves further to amend section 41 by inserting after the word "practicable" in the twelfth line thereof, the words "advisable or expedient".

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see the force of that amendment. It would not improve the section very much to insert those words. The word "practicable" is wide enough to give the commission any discretion that may be necessary in the administration of the Act. It is a question of whether or not it is practicable to apply the Act. We want the Act to apply to all appointments, if it is practicable to do so. If it is not practicable, we do not want to apply it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: One of the objects of this amendment is to cover the case of returned soldiers who, perhaps will not be able to pass the necessary examination, although they will, in every respect, be competent to fill the position for which the examination is being held.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That ought to be considered under section 42, clause (a).

Mr. McQUARRIE: The Acting Minister of Finance has said that he thought "practicable" would be a suitable word, a word which would be large enough to include every occasion that might require it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When I was speaking, I had in mind the purpose of the particular part of the section which is now under discussion. This provision of section 41 was intended to give the commission power to make regulations providing for appointments to office in some other forms, when they thought it was not practicable to hold competitive examinations, but my hon. friend is raising another question altogether, which was not in my mind when I spoke, and I desire that his suggestion stand until we come to section 42.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I was endeavouring to point out the meaning of the word "practicable". I took occasion to look up the meaning of that word in the Standard Dictionary, and I found "practicable" meant "that can be put into practice, possible of execution or performance." I take it that almost every case is practicable, possible of execution or performance. On the other hand I found that "advis-

5 p.m.

able," according to the same authority, means "agreeing with sound advice," and that "expedient" means "seeming to promote a desired end or interest, suitable under the circumstances." So that we find that the last two words, "advisable" or "expedient," are much more extensive in their meaning than the word "practicable." I am not pressing this amendment because the acting minister thinks it should not be inserted. He has studied this Bill a great deal more than I have, and in matters of this kind I prefer to accept his judgment. But it would not hurt the Act, and it would be useful in this particular instance, to include the words "advisable or expedient" or perhaps one of them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would suggest that my hon. friend refrain from pressing his amendment to this section.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I accept the minister's advice, and I withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I move to amend section 41, paragraph 3, as follows: By striking out all the words after the word "with" in the thirteenth line to the word "any," where it appears for the first time in the fifteenth line, and also by striking out all the words after the words "His Majesty," in the fifteenth line, to the end

of the said section. That will put the Government Railway system under the Civil Service Act. I want to direct the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance to the Prime Minister's promise, and also to the Order in Council which bears upon this question and which reads:

> Pending the enactment of the necessary legislation hereinbefore alluded to, the following rules shall be observed in all departments of the Government in respect to appointments to the public service.

The capitalization of the word "all" is my point. The intention of the Order in Council was to include "all" services, including the Government railways, in the Civil Service. As I pointed out before, it is most important that the Government railways be brought under the Civil Service Act at this time, because, although the number of present employees runs into some thirty thousand, this is only small comparatively with the number of civil servants there will be in the employment of the Government railways when the Government has taken over what it now contemplates. The Government has already taken over a part of the Transcontinental from Quebec to Winnipeg, and when it shall have taken over the balance of the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific, and when it shall have taken charge of the Canadian Northern railroad, as I understand the Government is about to do, we shall have a tremendous army of civil servants who will make it difficult for any Government to pass a Civil Service Reform Bill that will apply to them. There will be such a large number of people engaged in one service that we will have a railroad despotism in this country. It must be remembered that Canada is a very narrow country, relatively to the way it is peopled, and when we have a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific with all its branches and ramifications we will have a condition of things that hon. gentlemen would be well advised to protect themselves against while they have the opportunity. Otherwise, these organizations will be a menace to any Government in this country They will be a dominating force in politics, unless they are eliminated entirely from politics, and the only way to eliminate them from politics is to eliminate patronage, and the only way to eliminate patronage is to put the railway employees under the Civil Service Commission, and the time to do it is now, before they get big enough to dominate any Government of this country. If any more amendments are necessary beyond the one I have submitted, to satisfy the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, or any other railway brotherhood we can incorporate them in the Bill.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR: I understood from the Acting Minister of Finance some days ago that steps had already been taken to place the railway employees in the Civil Service. I came to that conclusion by reason of a statement made by the minister in the House on April 12 as follows:

> Mr. A. K. Maclean: At the present time, and since the passage of the Order in Council, the management of the Canadian Government railways has been given absolute freedom to appoint such persons as he may see fit and to disregard any representations which may be made by any person to him.
>
> Mr. Bureau: By any member of Parliament?
>
> Mr. Copp: Has he been ordered to disregard representattions?
>
> Mr. A. K. Maclean: I do not know whether he has been ordered, he has authority to do so.

Can the minister produce the ruling that has been made in regard to this matter?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not in a position to say whether such instructions were in writing or not, but I shall inquire of the Minister of Railways and advise my hon. friend this evening.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If the ruling is in writing I presume the minister will bring it down after dinner.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I wish to support the amendment of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Read). I see no reason why railway employees should not be placed under the Civil Service Commission the same as any other branch of the public service. No good reason has been given why that should not be done. It is this department more than any other that has suffered from patronage in the province from which I come. The Intercolonial railway has been abused by the patronage system to a certain extent from the time it was first built, and I think it would be a great reform if we could get rid of the patronage evil in connection with the Government railways in Eastern Canada. The fact that every young man who applies for a position as telegraph operator, cleaner, brakesman, and what not, has to bring with him a certificate from a member of the patronage committee or from a member of Parliament shows that the whole system is permeated by patronage. The man who is selected in that way may not prove suitable.

Mr. NESBITT: How would my hon. friend get over the difficulty caused by the delay in the Civil Service Commission appointing a fireman, we will say, who was required immediately?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Regulations could be made to meet that case.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am not proposing that that class of employee should be put under the board. I am urging that the superintendents and shop foremen should have power to select their employees in the same way that the superintendent of an industry has power to select his men. Under the present patronage system a man may be sent into the round-house who will never make a cleaner or a driver, but the superintendent cannot dismiss him like the superintendent of an industry can dismiss any one whom he thinks will not prove suitable for the work. If the superintendents and foremen had this power they would be able to gather together a good staff, but when men are appointed promiscuously under the patronage system it is impossible to get a good staff, and that is one of the reasons why the Government railways have not been successful in the past. Here is the opportunity to get rid of that difficulty and to put the road under proper management. Employees of railways may be divided into two classes, the clerical staff, who could be selected on competitive examination by the Civil Service Commission, and the operating staff, who, of course, could not be selected by the Civil Service Commission, but could very well be appointed by the men in charge of the round-houses and the superintendents of the road. If we would give these men power to select their employees, and make them responsible for the character of the men they select, it would remove the difficulty at once. Announce that it is not necessary for applicants to get a recommendation from the patronage committee or from any member of Parliament; that the superintendents have a free hand in selecting the men they will train for engineers, conductors, and other posts in the railway service, and the whole difficulty will be solved as far as that branch of the railway is concerned. The Minister of Public Works has already accepted this system, and who will say there should be any difference in this respect between the Government railways and the Department of Public Works? The Department of Public Works consists of a large number of men

employed in manual labour and other kinds of work. They also have in that department engineers and men who ought to submit themselves to examination. I cannot see any material difference between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways and Canals as to the application of this Act. I trust that the minister will accept this amendment. This is one of the most important clauses in the Bill. If we are to have Civil Service reform in this country, it will only be a half measure unless it applies to the Government railways the same as to other departments.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think it would be a great mistake to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. J. Read). I presume that both the hon. member who proposed that amendment and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), who supports it, have read the report of the Drayton-Acworth Commission. The commission proposes that several of the most important railway systems in the country shall be placed under Government ownership. We now own the Canadian Northern, we have the Intercolonial, we shall have the Transcontinental and we cannot avoid taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific; so that we will have a great system of railways owned by the people. The Drayton-Acworth report which, I assume, is acceptable to the Government and to the country, proposes that all the Canadian Government railway systems shall be placed under the control and management of an independent commission composed of the best and most practical men that money can secure. These commissioners will be responsible, not to the Government but to Parliament, so that their independence may be absolutely guaranteed. If you are to place the employees of the Intercolonial railway under the Civil Service Commission you will be taking these people away from the control of the commission that it is proposed to establish. If the Government fails to appoint this commission after it has secured control of these railways it will make a mistake that the country will never recover from. That is the only possible way by which a national railway system can be made a success. If you are to place the employees of the Intercolonial under the control of the Civil Service Commission, you will deprive us of the opportunity of placing them under the control of the proposed railway commission that will be appointed to manage the national railway system.

Mr. J. READ: How would we be depriving ourselves of the right to put them under the railway commission afterwards? We would simply take them from this and put them under that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: You now place them under the control of the Civil Service Commission, whereas it must be clear to every logical mind that, in order to make a success of the Government owned railways, they must be under the control of a railway commission.

Mr. READ: You could do that by Act.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the Government fails in its clear duty to adopt the only possible method by which the national system of railways can be made a success, then in the next session it will be in order for our friends to move this amendment, and I shall be very glad to support it. But I do not see how any hon. member who has given any study to the railway situation can fail to realize that it is imperative upon the Government, in order to make a success of the railway system, to appoint a commission of experts independent of the Government and responsible only to Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) is aware that the Drayton-Acworth report has been before this House for two years and that it has not been acted upon. The Government appointed that commission at very great cost to the country; the commission travelled from one end of the country to the other and engaged specialists and technical experts to examine the railway situation. We then took cognizance of the report. It had been discussed day in and day out in this House, but the Government has discarded the report absolutely. There is a commission sitting in Toronto to-day because of the discarding of that report, and as a result of the legislation that was passed during last session. Therefore, my hon. friend may be quite sure that there is no hope that the Government will ever take any action based on that report which is a most excellent one. I have never read a report so complete and so sane as regards the Canadian railway question. Yet the Government has discarded it. My hon. friend says that the railway officials and employees of this country ought to be under the Canadian Railway Commission. Of course, that is nonsense, because the Government will never adopt any such system.

Mr. RICHARDSON: They must.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They must but they will not.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: How do you know?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The experience of the past teaches me that they will not. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) any promise from the Government that, acting on the Drayton-Acworth report, a commission would be appointed? If he has, he has been deceived as we have been deceived. There will be no such commission appointed. Meanwhile, what injury will it cause to the country if we put the railway employees under the Civil Service Commission as regards appointment as has been explained by my hon. friend from Guysborough? If, later on, the Government come to their senses, and accept the conclusions of the report, will the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) say that there is anything to prevent this Parliament saying by special Act that in future the railway employees will be put under the control of the railway commission, and that we cannot prepare any legislation that will meet the case?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Was my hon. friend and party with which he is associated in favour of adopting the Drayton-Acworth report?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Then, if that is true, and the influential and best elements of the old Liberal party are united on this side of the House, the Government has no choice. This is a Conservative-Liberal, or Union Government, and the strongest, the dominating element not only in this House but all over the country, that was identified with my hon. friends on the other side, being part and parcel of this Union Government, will insist on this repart being adopted. There is nothing else the Government can do; they must adopt it. I do not see how they can possibly avoid doing so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will make this bargain with my hon. friend; it is an open bargain and there is nothing mysterious about it: If he induces the Government during the present sesion to pass such legislation as he contemplates I will withdraw all objection and I will give him my best support.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Will my hon. friend repeat that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will induce the Government to pass during this session such legislation as he proposes I will give him my best support.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I shall certainly promise to do the best I can.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) are there; can my hon. friend extort from them even a qualified promise that in the distant future there will be such legislation? He cannot. He will not obtain such a promise.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will do my level best.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am serious in this. I do not believe that the Government intend to act under the Drayton-Acworth report but if they do my hon. friend will enlist me as one of his supporters.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If the subject of the Drayton-Acworth Report on the possibility of the Government taking over large systems of railway and putting them under the control of one commission were a matter for discussion, it would be very easy to answer the arguments which the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has addressed to the committee, particularly bearing in mind the attitude that the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and the party he supports, took with respect to the management and operation of Government railways during their regime. But that is not the question. The question is a practical one; it is whether we are going to put the railway employees on the Government railway system under the Civil Service Commission. I say that if you attempt to put the railway employees on any comprehensive system of Government railways under the Civil Service Commission, it will result in utter chaos. As an example of the methods followed by the Civil Service Commission let me read a question from an examination paper that was sent out through the country for men to pass who were called upon to take positions as egg candlers. This is it:

First Simplify: $(\frac{5}{7} \div \frac{4}{5}) - (\frac{3}{7}$ of $1\frac{1}{8}) + (\frac{5}{6}$ of $\frac{1\frac{3}{5}}{16}) \div (\frac{3}{8} + \frac{2}{3}) \times \frac{4}{5}$.

This illustrates the kind of examination paper that would be sent out to some man who was an applicant for a position as brakesman, if the Civil Service Commission had charge of the appointments.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is an easy question.

[Mr. Richardson.]

Mr. NICHOLSON: Does my hon. friend say that is an easy question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly, I will answer from memory.

Mr. NICHOLSON: My hon. friend may be able to do so, but I tell him that the class of men who are operating our railway trains in this country are not going to answer such questions as that.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: To whom was the question sent?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The examination paper from which I have quoted was sent out on the eighteenth of April to men seeking to be appointed as egg candlers. Let me ask what knowledge has the Civil Service Commission, sitting in Ottawa, of the qualifications for train despatcher, locomotive engineer, conductor, or any other class of men employed in the operation of railway trains? If the Government owned railways are ever going to be a success there is only one system of management that can be adopted, and that is to engage railway men who are competent to operate those railways—to put men of that kind at their head and give them authority to choose their employees just as do the leading officers of private owned railways. A superintendent, a master mechanic, a train-master, or a chief train despatcher on any of the private owned railways would not submit the class of men they employ to examinations of such a character as that to which I have referred. An hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island has said we are going to bring ourselves under the domination of a class of Government railway employees that will ultimately control this country. I tell the hon. gentleman that if the whole Civil Service of Canada was organized on the same system as the private owned railways of this country it would not be necessary for two hundred and thirty-five members of Parliament to be wasting their time in the city of Ottawa considering this Civil Service Bill at all, because each man would be in the place he was fitted for, and would be kept there so long as he did his work. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) says there is no possibility of the Government accepting the Drayton-Acworth report. My hon. friend knows nothing about it. The Drayton-Acworth report was presented to Parliament less than a year ago, and if we wanted to go into a little ancient history we might find that there were many things that it took the

hon. gentleman and his friends, when they were in office, very much more than a year to deal with, matters of much minor importance than are involved in the adoption of the report in question. But that is outside of the issue. The point I want to emphasize here is that the talk of bringing the railway employees of this country under the Civil Service Commission is nothing less than rot, because it is impossible.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How many questions are there on the examination paper from which you quoted?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: There are eight very similar questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Other hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the understanding that the Drayton-Acworth report will be adopted by the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Government is not making any such terms, but I might repeat what I have already said two or three times this session, namely: That during the recess the commission is going to give study and consideration to some method of bringing the employees of the Government railways under the operation of this Act. Now there are probably on the Government railway system twenty thousand employees, and it would require a special commission at Moncton, probably the year round, if the suggestion was to be acted on immediately. There are endless difficulties in the way; it is impossible and impracticable at the present time. Since the passing of the Order in Council the commission have been busy, the Government have been busy, and it is unfair to suggest we could deal with the question immediately.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many of the twenty thousand employees are on the clerical staff and how many on the operating staff?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We cannot deal with the subject piecemeal; it must be taken up and dealt with as a whole.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Cannot you eliminate the patronage system from the Government railways, or is it the intention of the Government to continue that system?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand the Government does not commit itself on the Drayton-Acworth report, and no action is going to be taken this session with reference to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) says that the Government will accept that report.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I certainly feel sure that they will. I do not see how they can do anything else. If the members of the Government are intelligent men, if they have intelligently studied the whole railway question, and have a due sense of responsibility to the country, I do not see how they can possibly avoid adopting the Drayton-Acworth report. Whether it should be adopted right off I am not prepared to say, but personally I propose to hold the Government responsible later on for its adoption. They have promised to take the matter up when the present Canadian Northern arbitration is ended—I do not think they ought to wait that long. I think no time should be lost in acting on that report, because the railway question is knocking at the door of Parliament in a manner such as no other issue in the country has ever done, and it is really second in importance only to the war. I believe the Government will realize that, and it is for the members on both sides to bring pressure to bear upon them so that they will solve this question and apply the solution as rapidly as possible.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Civil Service reform is one thing and patronage is another. Cannot the minister take steps immediately to abolish patronage on the Government railways?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: So far as I know it is abolished now.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Oh, no.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Materials required for the Canadian Government Railway system are now purchased by the War Purchasing Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Patronage in the case of the Government railways, if I understand the minister aright, has to do with purchases and contracts, whereas when my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) indicated that it was one of the things we should reach in this Bill, it was declared that appointments constituted patronage. There seems to be a clash in

the interpretation of what patronage is in the two cases. What about the appointments?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are made by the managing officials of the road.

Mr. BUREAU: On a recommendation, I suppose.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know. I never made any.

Mr. BUREAU: On the recommendation of the members, or those who have the pull, or the patronage committee.

Mr. DEVLIN: Can any member of the Government tell us how these appointments are made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are made by the managing officials of the road.

Mr. DEVLIN: Upon whose recommendations?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Upon nobody's recommendation.

Mr. DEVLIN: Upon nobody's recommendation? Then, a minister never recommends, or if he does recommend, his recommendation is not acted upon?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If he does make a recommendation it need not be acted upon.

Mr. DEVLIN: The reason I insist upon this point is because I hold in my hand a letter from the Union Government dated Ottawa, November 21, 1917, signed by every member of the Government, addressed to the soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the trenches, and I find in that letter this paragraph:

> This non-party Government has wiped out the patronage system in the purchase of supplies, the awarding of contracts and appointments to the public service. That is more than any party Government ever did or ever could do.

I presume that there are no appointments made in any Government service now under the old patronage system. Am I right in supposing that since November 21, 1917, there are no patronage appointments?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The management of the road have authority from the Government to appoint anybody they desire, and appointments are made without any interference on the part of the Government or any member of the Government; and the management has been instructed to exercise the greatest independence possible in selecting those whom they desire in the railway service.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What does the minister mean by the "management of the road?" Take for instance, the management of the roundhouse in a place like Stellarton, N. S. Is the superintendent of that roundhouse at liberty to receive the application of any young fellow who comes to him without reference to a recommendation by a member of Parliament or a patronage committee on anybody else? If he does receive it, will he be backed up by the Government, and will any appointment that he may make under those circumstances be ratified by the head of the department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot answer that question, because I do not know what the rules of the management of that railway are in respect to appointments.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I want to assure the hon. acting minister that patronage is as rampant on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways as it has ever been.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I know it, as a matter of fact. I wrote to the minister long since the election and put it straight up to him, that at the new Port Borden, named after the right hon. leader of the Government, where the new car ferry lands, a large number of men were required to take up the various new positions, and I told him: "Now, I suppose since the Union Government has been returned, that you will implement the promises made to the people and do away with patronage; I want to know whether in the appointment of the men there will be any preference given to one or other because of his political colour." I received a letter from him in which he said that, of course,—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member is out of order. The question of abolition of patronage after the last general election has nothing to do with the clause under discussion. It may have had something to do with the amendment which was proposed by the hon. member in so far as it had relation to railways, but that amendment has been disposed of, and I must rule that the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Is it not a fact that the hon. member had a son appointed as ferry keeper—

The CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely out of order. The question of the appointment of any particular person is out of order.

On section 42—Computation of number of probable vacancies—soldiers to have preference:

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is one point to which I would like to direct the attention of the minister. This section speaks of overseas soldiers and does not discriminate. There are soldiers in Canada, as I pointed out in this House not very long ago, who from the very outset have been anxious to go to the front, and who could not possibly be permitted to go. This section would militate against these men, and would put a premium upon a class of men who are no more deserving than are they, although all may be deserving. I should like to see the soldiers classified into combatants, or those who faced the foe in the field, and those who have been in Britain in offices since the beginning of the war. That is the distinction which I wish to direct the attention of the minister to, and I hope he will take it into consideration. There are men by the hundred in Britain —good fellows, I am not saying one word against them; they are doing very useful work—who have not been to the front or in the firing line at all, and who are not as much entitled to consideration as are many of the boys who were desirous of going to the front but who have remained in Canada occupying positions against their own wishes. The minister is doing an injustice, unintentionally, of course, to that class of soldier, and he is hardly putting the premium on the combatant fellow that I would like to see put on him. My heart always warms up to the fellow who faces the music in the trenches.

Mr. McQUARRIE: At the suggestion of the Acting Finance Minister, I withdrew the second amendment to section 41, and I now move it as an amendment to section 42. It is as follows:

That section 42 be amended by adding at the end of paragraph (a) of subsection 2 the following words:

Provided also that the Commission may, in the case of any such person, decide that it is not expedient to require such person to pass the said examination and may, without such examination, place such person on the said list of successful candidates in such order of merit as they may deem advisable.

"Person" herein referred to is set out in paragraph (a) of this section as meaning any person who has been on active service overseas on the military or naval forces of His Majesty or of any of the Allies of His Majesty during the present war. Men who have served in the overseas forces should be placed in a different position from that occupied by ordinary individuals so far as examinations are concerned. In proper cases—of which the commission will be the judges—it is only right that returned soldiers should be so placed on the list without being required to take the examination. There is nothing unusual about that. In British Columbia in my own profession it has been decided in a great many cases by the Benchers to dispense altogether with intermediate and even with final examinations in the case of men who have served overseas. Such men are given their degrees without examination. The Civil Service Commission should give every consideration to the men who have fought our battles at the front. If, therefore, we place returned soldiers in a more favourable position than we place civilians, it will not be doing too much for them.

Mr. TURRIFF: Thousands of men have gone from Canada, have used the uniform to enable them to keep from getting within sound of the guns, have remained in England and through political influence have secured high positions there. If this amendment is passed as it is worded, these men, when they return, will be able to use the same political influence that kept their skins safe when they were in England in order to get high positions here in the Service without passing an examination. I object most strongly to that. If my hon. friend will make his amendment apply only to men who have gone across the channel and fought in the trenches, I will support it, but I protest against these political soldiers who took good care not to get in line with the bullets, being given any special advantage over anybody else when they come home.

Mr. NESBITT: While we have all respect for the men who have served at the front, it would not be in the interests of the country to appoint men to the Civil Service who are not capable of filling the positions. As it is, the clause provides exceptional treatment for returned soldiers. It says that all persons who have been on active service overseas and who obtain sufficient marks to pass the examinations shall, irrespective of the marks they have obtained, be placed on the list of successful candidates above all others.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And age does not count against them.

Mr. NESBITT: That is so. It is dangerous to suggest to the commission that we want them to appoint men without regard to merit or qualifications. The use of the

word "may" suggests that the commission "shall;" I think that we should not adopt an amendment of this kind. I agree with the Acting Minister of Finance that any favouritism which is shown should be extended to those who have seen actual service at the front. I should not like to say anything against the men who have gone to England with the intention of fighting. As the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) says, some of them may have exercised political influence to keep them from danger, but I am not saying anything about that; I am not making any insinuations. As the section is worded, it gives returned soldiers a distinct preference. The examination will not be a serious matter to these men; besides, as I have said, it would be dangerous for us to suggest to the commission that they select for appointment men without merit—I mean, not individual merit, not the merit of having served overseas, but the merit which qualifies them for a Civil Service position. If, therefore, the section is so worded as to give preference to the men who have seen actual service in the trenches, I think it will be all right.

Mr. ANDREWS: I am very much interested in this soldier problem, and I wish to tell hon. members that I never saw a soldier who went overseas for the money that was in it or who came back with the idea of getting a job which he was not fit to hold. I am very strongly opposed to the amendment. If returned soldiers are not competent to hold the positions, they do not want to take them, and we do not want to put them into those positions. We do not want to make paupers of them. If we have to take care of the returned soldiers, we shall do it in some other way.

Mr. BUREAU: This amendment is one which might lead a person who opposes it, and who is not in the position of my hon. friend (Mr. Andrews), to be criticised and sniped at hereafter. This Bill is brought down for the purpose of rendering the Civil Service more effective and improving conditions as they now exist. I see a number of difficulties if we are going to begin to create classes by exceptions, as is suggested by the amendment of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie). In presenting his amendment he cites a precedent; he says that in his province—I conclude he is a lawyer—the bench in the case of men who have served overseas exempts from examination students or those who are preparing to practice the legal profession. I do not see the connection between exempting a lawyer from examination and exempting from examination a man who has gone into the Civil Service. After a man receives his diploma or his certificate to practice as a lawyer, he hangs out his shingle; and if he can make good, that is all right. If he cannot, he has to suffer for the favour which was intended to be done to him and which did not turn out as he expected. In this case, I think the amendment as moved by the Acting Minister of Finance goes the limit. We say: You shall pass qualifying examinations. For the protection of the service, we all admit that they are necessary. We tell the soldier: "You deserve consideration at the hands of the people, and we are willing to give it to you; supposing there are fifteen candidates, and by marks there are fourteen ahead of you, you are qualified to hold a position, but the superior qualification which you get for having risked your life for your country gives you the preference over the fourteen others who, under ordinary circumstances, would have been ahead of you and would have set you back." Let us take the argument of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Supposing we are going to make differences between those who went across the channel and those who did not, and between those who went into the trenches and those who did not, there may be men who went overseas for the purpose of going into the trenches, but who, from circumstances beyond their control, were unable to reach the trenches. They may have been sick; they may have been under conditions which prevented them from reaching the trenches. It may have been decided that their services on one side of the channel were of more benfit than on the other. The same thing may apply to a man across the channel ready to go into the trenches. He may become sick, or, on account of circumstances beyond his control, he may not be able to reach the trenches. An injustice would be worked to such a man. Those are some of the objections and difficulties which we may have to meet if we accept the amendment according to the suggestion of the hon member for Assiniboia. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. G. W. Andrews) that we ought not to jeopardise in any way the Bill that is now before us and which we are going to make law. We might render a bad service to the soldier himself. Supposing by mishap a man unqualified should be put into a position, that would create a certain feeling against that man. It would

tend to take away from that particular man the sympathy to which he is entitled, and we ought not to expose any one to that condition.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree with the remarks that have been made by some hon. gentlemen to the effect that we must take the greatest interest in the welfare of the returned soldier. Nobody, I imagine, would dispute that. This country must see to it that the soldier who has performed services across the seas is properly cared for, but when it is proposed to empower the commission to appoint returned soldiers to competitive posts without examination I must say I am not prepared to agree. Section 41 enables the commission to declare that the Act shall not apply to certain positions where its application would not be practicable, and positions of that class will be open to returned soldiers. Section 42 also gives preference to returned soldiers by enabling the commission to put them ahead—if they pass the examination—of all other candidates qualifying. That is a distinct preference. The age limit has also been removed in the case of returned soldiers, so I think hon. gentlemen will agree that some preference has been shown to this class of the community. It is rather a serious thing to suggest that appointments should be made to the Civil Service without examination of any kind. We must have a Civil Service in this country; it should be an efficient one, and I should not like to see power placed in the hands of the commission or any other body to wholly eliminate examinations for any one class. I hope this view will prevail with the committee, and particularly with the hon. member for New Westminster, who I hope will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BURNHAM: From what I have gathered since coming into the House I certainly disagree with the minister. I strongly hope that every preference will be given to the returned soldier outside of examinations altogether. I have been through many examinations myself, and from first to last I have never found that they fitted me for anything. Anyone who has taken examinations himself or knows those who have, knows that it by no means follows that the person who passes an examination is fit for the position he is seeking. This Bill is founded on the assumption that where recommendations are required the members of this House are not fit to make recommendations. That is one of the most extraordinary assumptions that could well be made. For my part, I most heartily disapprove of the Bill and everything in it, since a very important portion of it takes out of the hands of the people's representatives that which they should retain. We all know that candidates at examinations are graded according to the number of marks they obtain; we all know that a very large portion of the Civil Service is within the control and jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Well and good. But outside of all that, there are many cases where recommendations must be made, and if recommendations are to be made, surely they ought to be made by the people most concerned, and the people most concerned are the people in the constituencies where these appointments are to be made, and the person who should be called on to make the recommendation is the man, or woman it may be, who represents that constituency for the time being. That is logical and decent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Very frequently the defeated candidate has the power of recommendation.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am not complaining about that. I am not speaking of the defeated candidate, but of the man who represents the people. Do not let me be misunderstood. I am not talking of cases where recommendations are not to be made, but I say that where a recommendation has to be made, and the power to make that recommendation is taken out of the hands of the people, it is a direct insult to the people's representative for one thing, and a violation of the constitution for another. There is no guarantee whatever that the appointment will be worth the paper it is written on. Furthermore—I do not wish to be insulting—it looks to me as if the deputy ministers, being amenable to nobody except the minister and having all power in their hands, will hand that power over to the minister so that the power of recommendation will be taken out of the hands of the people where it rests now with more or less satisfactory results, and will be centralized in the hands of the Government. And pray, since when has the Government had a greater moral right to say who shall be recommended than the members of this House? If the members here are not gentlemen of common decency, fit to bear the

responsibility cast upon them, or if they fancy for one minute that they can sidestep that responsibility or are not capable of making an honest recommendation, then for Heaven's sake let them resign and let some decent men take their places. But to suppose that the standard of representative life in this country has fallen so low that some person or persons unknown may recommend appointments in a constituency, avoiding as if he were the plague the representative of that constituency, is to suppose something that the House and the country will not accept. You may pass this Bill, but the House and the people will not pass it and it never will go.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In view of the statement made by the acting minister a few days ago, that this Bill was considered to a certain extent more or less as a temporary measure, and that amendments would probably be brought down after it had been tried out, I think I can safely withdraw the proposed amendment. I hope, however, that next session the minister, and some other hon. gentlemen, will have changed their ideas and that they will finally decide to support this amendment. I feel that it is only a proper one and although I must agree with the remarks of hon. gentlemen to the effect that we do not want to have anyone in the Civil Service who is not capable of carrying out the duties of his office, I still think that men from the front should be given different consideration from others. I would, therefore, if the committee agrees, withdraw this amendment.

Amendment (Mr. McQuarrie) withdrawn.

Mr. BUREAU: I desire to direct the attention of the committee to subsection 3. Last year I asked the acting minister where the appointing power rested in the Act and the answer I got, as recorded in Hansard, was a reference to subsection 3 of section 42, which reads:

> From the list of successful competitors, the Commission, on the application of the deputy head, shall supply the required officers, clerks and employees.

I think that is not the appointing power. Glancing through the remainder of the Act, I cannot find any place where the appointing power rests. Of course, the commission designates the man who is to occupy the position and under the present system he is required to serve on probation for six months. Then he may be either retired, denied the privilege of continuing in his office, or kept on. But there is no appointing power. There is a distinct provision in clause 30 about the dismissing power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The appointing power in the commission?

Mr. BUREAU: The appointing power of the commission itself.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the word "supply" were struck out and the word "appoint" put in, would that not cover it?

Mr. BUREAU: That might be better. If the amendment I proposed this morning is carried, the appointing and dismissing power would rest with the same body.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I beg to move:

> That the word "supply" in the second line of sub-clause 3, in the 12th line of page 15, be struck out and the word "appoint" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like the minister to explain the meaning of the words "successful competitors." Suppose there are five or six successful competitors, under what form of selection will the commission decide as to which one shall be appointed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The commission would select the one whom they thought best qualified from the list of successful competitors.

Mr. MORPHY: A candidate writes on the examination and has 100 per cent, a perfect paper, and 70 per cent is sufficient to pass. The candidate having 70 marks out of 100 might be preferred to the one who has a perfect paper?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are put in the order of their marks.

Mr. MORPHY: That is what I want to get at. Is it understood that the highest-marked candidate shall have the preference in the selection?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: That will be arbitrary and imperative?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Sub-section 2 of section 42 says that:

> Immediately after each examination, a list of the successful competitors in the case of a competitive examination, and of the successful candidates in order of merit in other examinations shall be made out, and the list of succesful competitors and candidates shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. BUREAU: Subsection 4 of section 42 says:

The selection shall be, so far as practicable, in the order of the names on the list, but the Commission may select any person who in his examination shows special qualifications for any qualifications for any particular subject.

Mr. MORPHY: That is what I want to get at.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose, as my hon. friend has suggested, that 70 points are required and there was a man who had 80; the man who had 80 should have a preference over the one who had 70 unless he was a returned soldier.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Also unless he had special qualifications.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a different thing. I would understand that provision that the selection shall be so far as practicable in the order of the names on the list to mean according to the number of marks obtained at the examination.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the same thing.

Mr. SHEARD: Is it intended to determine the qualifications of candidates by examination and that alone? It appears to me that if that is the idea the provision is going to be too narrow and that we are going to get those who are more distinguished for their scholastic attainments than their practical efficiency. I could name a great many instances where a man might fall down on a written examination and yet be the best man for the position because he would probably have more practical experience and ability. I do not think that a written examination can qualify a man for a practical position in any walk of life.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I stated on Friday evening, and again to-day, the practice which is now being followed by the commission. It is outlined in the statement which I read on Friday night, and which was prepared by a member of the commission:

Heretofore permanent appointment in the Inside Service was based solely on the result of an educational test (the candidate being otherwise suitable, of course, as to age, health, character, and habits). This gave to the candidate fresh from the class room, and yet lacking in experience, a great advantage over the educated and altogether more suitable person who possessed business experience, but might be a trifle rusty in some of the subjects written at the examination.

A little later the statement proceeds to set forth:

In rating applications for such positions the business experience of the applicants would be considered, together with their educational standing, as evidenced by school or collegiate record, while satisfactory information as to character and habits would also be required.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have nine provinces and a different standard of education in each province. I presume that whoever will examine the papers will do so according to some one standard, and I would like to have an understanding as to how this is to be arranged. Take the question of English composition, there is possibly a difference as to that in each province in Canada. Doubtless when the questions on that subject are set they will be set according to the standard of composition that obtains in Ontario. Therefore, a Nova Scotian answering that standard would give an answer that would not be regarded as satisfactory. I am simply taking that as an illustration. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary, in order that justice be done to all the candidates, that there should be some uniform standard of test—whether it be in English composition, arithmetic, algebra, or geography, the same standard should prevail throughout.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The questions that are prepared are applicable to all parts of Canada, there is no variation whatever.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister does not grasp my point. There are certain questions set in composition and English grammar, and they are answered, probably, according to the definitions given in the Ontario English grammar, and the Ontario standard work on English composition, which are entirely different from those in use in Nova Scotia. A man from Nova Scotia answering according to that standard will get no value at all for his answers.

Mr. BUREAU: With respect to subsection 6 I would suggest that the word "appointed" be substituted for the word "supplied" in line 26. I would also suggest that in subsection 8, "the commission may select for any office," the word "appoint" be used.

Mr. BUTTS: Is there any intention to provide a substitute examination? For instance, speaking of the Maritime Provinces, the matriculation examinations in Mount Allison, St. François Xavier and Dalhousie universities, are taken as the equivalent of the primary examination in law and medicine.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No other examination is accepted as the equivalent for the Civil Service examination. In answer to

the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), I may say that I am willing to accept his suggestion, and accordingly move that the word "appointed" be substituted for the word "supplied" in the subsection.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the minister tell me what distinction there will be between examination and test? For example, take the position of stenographer. I am informed that the practice now is for the applicant to appear before the necessary committee of the Civil Service Commission and undergo a test. Are these examinations all subject to being held at the one time, or is there an easy way of getting through without waiting for a definite period? What is the present practice, and what is likely to be the practice in the future?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For the purpose of securing an employee of the class described by my hon. friend the Civil Service Commission would hold an examination at any time.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 43—Notices and examination to be in both languages:

Mr. BUREAU: I do not remember anything in the Act providing that those who hold the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Letters of the several universities of the Dominion can be admitted to certain positions without examination. Might I ask the minister if there is such a provision?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no such provision.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the minister not think there should be?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would be giving an unfair advantage. Some other person might possibly defeat the college graduate in a competitive examination.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the good of publishing notices of examination in the Canada Gazette? The minister might just as well put them in the cellar as in that publication. Very few people see the Gazette, and there should be plenty of notice of these examinations in some local paper. I do not know for how long the notice should appear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Notices are published in the local papers as well.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Why not provide for that under the law?

Section agreed to.

On section 44—Appointees must be British subjects unless special exemption—age limits—age limits for civil servants competing at examinations:

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the acting minister why there is a restriction that persons not British subjects can be admitted to the Civil Service? The other night the question was raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) about having the oath of allegiance included in the oath to be taken by a civil servant. I understood the purpose was to make it impossible for a man to apply for a position unless he was a British subject. In this section it is provided that a man not a British subject can be appointed on the authority of the Governor in Council. I do not see how any case may arise, unless that of an interpreter, or under very extraordinary circumstances, in which a person who is not a British subject will be required to fill a position in the Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of this section is to enable the Governor in Council, under special circumstances, to employ the services of one not a British subject because he possesses some special knowledge upon a certain subject. For instance, two or three years ago the services of a distinguished Norwegian were secured by the Government in connection with our fisheries, and he remained in the service for a year or more. He has since ceased his connection with the Civil Service. I understand that a little difficulty would have been experienced in employing such a person were it not for this section, which is intended to cover cases of that kind.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is there any age limit at the present time for examination for the Inside Service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It varies from 18 to 35 years. It is different in the Post Office from other departments; and then in respect of some positions it is different from others.

Section agreed to.

On section 45—Classification:

Mr. BUREAU: This section says that in the classification of the second division, grade A shall consist of clerks and other employees working under supervision; grade B shall consist of clerks and em-

ployees working under supervision, and of stenographers and typewriters; and that grade C shall consist of clerks and employees, and of stenographers and typewriters whose duties are copying and routine work under supervision. I do not see that there is much use for a stenographer in doing copying, or what particular work they can perform.

Mr. SHEARD: I think that draftsmen and architects' assistants should not be classed with clerks and stenographers; they are a higher grade of skilled workmen. Many of them have training. In Toronto, many have degrees as Bachelors of Science and have taken their course in the School of Practical Science. They have technical knowledge, and although they work more or less under supervision and direction, it appears to me that they should be put in a higher class, possibly in the first division. I suggest that to the minister.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am proposing,—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before the minister proceeds, I wish to endorse what my hon. friend says. I think architects should be in a higher category.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose striking out those four lines altogether so that these classes will be located in the grade that appears suitable. It is rather a mistake that the words occur there. I move to strike out the following lines: In these last three grades shall also be included photographers, engrossers, draftsmen, architect's assistants, technical assistants and such other employees as the Governor in Council may direct;

Mr. McMASTER: Before the amendment carries, may I ask the minister where he proposes to put these technical folk? I suppose they will have to be in some grade.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will apply to some grade in either of the divisions, whichever appears to be the proper grade. I wish also to strike out lines three and four of section 45, "Technical officers and persons possessing professional or other special technical knowledge and experience." As the Bill now stands, these are put immediately under "Deputy Heads." I propose that they shall go under the First Division where they were before.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move that the words "deputy ministers" in the 23rd line, page 16, be changed to "deputy heads", and that the words "professional, technical" be inserted after the word "administrative" in the 24th line.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Translators, I understand, are classified in the First Division, Grade D. Translators are technical officers, requiring expert knowledge and experience, and they should be put in Class C.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They would not be put there by legislation. It would be a matter of proper classification to put them there if their services should be considered professional or technical.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I remind my hon. friend that in a memorandum submitted by Sir Allen Aylesworth some years ago, the conclusion was reached that translators should be considered as technical experts.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should think so.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 46—Salaries:

Mr. MURPHY: Is the word "technical" defined in the Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. We discussed that matter the other evening. I said that I did not think the word was capable of definition and that if we attemped to define it we might get into difficuly. The words "professional and technical" are used in the Civil Service Acts of most other countries; apparently they have been unable to improve upon them.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not agree that it is impossible to define it. Some difficulty may be encountered if a definition is made, but there has been a great deal of abuse of the provision for the appointment of professional and technical officers. Appointments have been made under that head of people who possess absolutely no technical qualifications.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The old Act has the words "or otherwise peculiar"; consequently there was opportunity of abusing the powers under the Act. These words have been struck out, and the section now applies only to purely professional and technical officers.

Mr. MURPHY: I assure my hon. friend that several appointments which I have in mind were "otherwise peculiar." If difficulty be experienced in defining the word "technical," I suggest, through my hon. friend, to the commission that in the regula-

tions which they will draft, and which may make the Act more practical in its application and more flexible in its use, this matter be not lost sight of, because undoubtedly there has been great abuse of appointments under this head. I cited the other night the famous case that held up the business of the country for a week or two, when the question was discussed whether a military tailor should be considered as a technical officer.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Technical officers should be in Grade A; that would remedy the difficulty. We dispense with examination in these cases because the officers in question are of high standing as professional experts.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some technical men have higher ranks in the service than others; it would hardly do to put them all in one grade.

Mr. DAVIS: In what grade will the man be classified who gets $3,450?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In Grade A, First Division.

Mr. DAVIS: Should the classification of the grades not read: "$2,900 and under $3,500;" "$2,200 and under $2,900," and so on? Would that not make it plainer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 45 establishes the divisions and the grades, and describes the class of work assigned to each; this section prescribes the salary in each division and grade. I do not see how we could improve on the present arrangement. An increase of $100 is provided in the case of promotion from one grade to another.

Mr. MORPHY: How does the acting minister justify the provision of only $600 a year for messengers, porters, sorters and packers? This is another case where the under dog is being neglected. I have talked with the messengers about here from time to time, and I find that a quiet feeling of—

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Unrest.

Mr. MORPHY: My hon. friend calls it "unrest." At any rate, in these days, when we talk of billions with a glib tongue, and with the price of bacon running up to 50 cents and 60 cents per pound, it is hard to understand how a messenger who has a wife and five, six, or seven children to support can get along on $600, $700, or $800 a year. Let us get a little democracy into this enactment. How can the Government justify paying a messenger who is married and has four or five children, $600 a year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As a matter of fact, I would think that messengers who had been married and been in the Service for a number of years would probably be getting the higher salaries. The salary of $600 would be paid to the young boy or young man, most likely unmarried, on entering the service.

Mr. MORPHY: And the returned soldier. I see some of the recently appointed employees are returned soldiers. Are you going to start men who have fought for their country at $600? What I protest against is that the rule should be hard-and-fast. When there are so many positions to be filled, a man who has fought the battles of his country is going to ask for a decent job at a decent wage, and the country wants to give that to him. If a man has been in the service for some time and has not fought for his country, he gets $1,200; but a man from the front, crippled, perhaps gassed, but still fit to do an honest year's service, should be given $1,000 a year, and you should not let him wait for the period of his death to reach up from $600 to $1,000 by the grace of somebody. The point I wish to impress is this: If you do not do it in any other way, do not fix the minimum at $600, but start at $900.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We can start at $800.

Mr. MORPHY: This is a difficult Bill to understand, but I see $600 set as the minimum. I see some of these returned soldiers upstairs. They are bright young men; they have gone through the agonies of war, and yet they are employed by a grateful country at a salary—unless the commission has its attention drawn to the matter—of $600. It is not fair. Far too much attention is paid in this country to the fellows getting $5,000, $7,000, $10,000 a year and too little to the man who has fought for his country.

Mr. MURPHY: Without joining issue with my hon. friend in any respect, I may say that under section 12 there is a possibility of appointing a man in that grade at an increase of $200 above the minimum.

Mr. COWAN: I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy). I do not think Canada is so nearly dead broke that we need ask any man to work for less than $800 a year, and a man who works for less than $800 a year is not worth very much, unless, he is driven to take such a position. Some

years ago I had the handling of what is called the "patronage" in the constituency of Regina, and in that connection it was my duty to recommend many men for positions in the post office and other places. There are quite a number of those officers who start at $725 a year, and I have never yet succeeded in getting a good man at that salary. Those men would quickly tell me that they could make more money than that by working on the streets of Regina, and that is true. We had to accept a poor class of men, and we endeavoured to make good men by taking a poor class and gradually working them up into permanent positions. I would like to see a minimum salary fixed of not less than $800 a year to start with in all the services in the Dominion.

Mr. NESBITT: It is not necessary for those men to start at $600. In grade C, $600 to $1,000, it is in the discretion of the commission to say what the salary shall be. There are in the Service certain branches in which young men may be employed who might very well be started at $600, and then they would be receiving more money than they could earn in other walks of life. For instance, boys in the banks do not start at $600. Boys who go into the retail mercantile service or even the wholesale mercantile service do not start at $600; they have to work up. As my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) has said, he has often recommended people to take positions, and they would rather work at some other job than take those positions. There is nothing to compel any of those persons to accept positions in the Civil Service. This leaves it optional with the commission to say what salary shall be paid, and I have no doubt, in the case of men who have been overseas, no commission will ask them, if they are capable of filling the position to which they are appointed, to start at $600 a year. There are in the Civil Service many positions in which people are well paid,—and think they are well paid—at $600. I remember at one time a very young man, who was drawing $800 a year in one of the departments, applying to me to see if I could not get him a raise. In answer to a question he told me he had held his position for a year. I knew for a fact that, although he was a capable young man, he could not possibly command that salary in the banking or mercantile service anywhere in Canada. He was being better paid than he would be in any other walk of life that I knew of. He was anxious enough, when he first got the position, to accept it at $800 a year. If it was necessary for everybody to start at $600, I would quite agree with my hon. friends that the minimum should be increased, but $600 might be quite acceptable in regard to certain positions in the service.

Mr. COWAN: That is all right, but the service itself is suffering. There are in the Regina post office some sixteen vacancies, and men cannot be got to fill them, and girls will not accept the salaries paid by the Government. The result is that business is not being done, and that unless we are prepared to start those
9 p.m. young men at higher salaries we shall not get them at all, with the cost of living and everything else increasing as it is. The minimum salary should be much higher than it is.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who advocated making the minimum salary more than $600. Such a salary is a shame. There has been some sacrifice entailed in the education of any young man, however young he may be, and in large centres, such as the city of Montreal, any labouring man receives more than $600,—it is not even the wage of an apprentice at the present time. The Government should reconsider the matter so far as the big centres are concerned, where it costs so much to live. Generally speaking, those young men are supporting their mothers or fathers. Why say that a young man should not, because he is young, be paid just as much as a man of middle age? Sometimes he is doing as much work, and perhaps more, than older people. The minimum salary should be $800. In the city of Montreal you cannot secure help unless you pay $2.50, $3 or $4 a day, and yet the Government starts those young men at $600.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I heartily support the suggestion of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy). The whole class should be increased very materially, and so far as the soldiers are concerned, the language used was very moderate. It is a shame that we should start them at such a low salary. There cannot be any salary paid commensurate with the sacrifices they have made. In whatever class they are put, it is the duty of this country to see that they commence at a proper salary.

Mr. BLAKE: Evidently those gentlemen are talking for Hansard. As the Acting Minister of Finance has pointed out, an extra $200 may be added to the $600, and

that is more than many of the school teachers in this country are getting to-day. There are very few school teachers in the rural schools of Ontario, and they pay bigger salaries than the city schools, who are drawing more than $650 to-day.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Is the hon. gentleman talking for Hansard?

Mr. BLAKE: These stenographers who start in after a three month's business course do not stop at $600. They are getting much better salaries than the school teachers of this country. The Toronto Globe, for instance, two or three months before last midsummer, carried two or three columns every day of advertisements for teachers, with a second class certificate, at a salary of $500 to $700. I think we should leave it to the commission to decide each case on its merits and if they think a man's training justifies them in granting an extra $200 he will receive it. A school teacher has to spend a much longer time in study than a stenographer, and paying her way during all that time.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not put the returned soldier on the same basis as the civilian school teacher, and I do not think it is right for the hon. gentleman to do so. When these men left this country to fight the battles of the Empire the whole country in an ebullition of popular feeling bade them Godspeed and a safe return, and promised that the country's last dollar would be spent in making them comfortable when they came home. Talk about school teachers! Why, one commission connected with the Trade Department of this Government got an Order in Council put through the other day to employ thirty-eight stenographers in Ottawa at $1,200 a year each. I think the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) is a military man himself and did some good service, and surely he should stand up for his brother soldier and see that he gets treated in a decent way—I do not say in a generous way, but we should at least provide him with what a man ordinarily requires to live on. I am prepared to move that a special clause be inserted on page 17 limiting grade "C" of the second division to the returned soldier who has seen active service in France.

Mr. STEVENS: What about other fronts?

Mr. MORPHY: And on other fronts. I would not apply this provision to soldiers who have only been to England, although many of them may be deserving. I beg to move that a special clause be inserted limiting grade "C" of the second division to returned soldiers who have done duty overseas, except those who have remained in England, and that the minimum salary be $900 and the maximum $1,500, instead of $600 and $1,000 respectively.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would point out that by section 46 the maximum of this grade is increased by $200, compared with the salary under the old Act. I would also call attention to section 12.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not think that is doing much for the soldier, when we remember that there is now a tax on tea and coffee and that the price of bacon and all other articles of food has gone up. I am rather surprised that the Acting Minister of Finance takes that view. Section 12 does not grant an increase of $200; it only gives the commission power to grant it if they see fit. Now, I do not wish to see the returned soldier at the mercy even of the Civil Service Commission, or of the minister or the deputy head. I would like to see this Parliament bold enough to toe the mark and say that the soldier has earned a decent wage, and we should make provision for him here in the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I rather like the idea of embodying the suggestion in the statute, because we all remember that at the outbreak of the war, with a view to inducing civil servants to join the colours, an Order in Council was passed promising civil servants who enlisted both their military and civil pay; but only a few weeks ago the Government cancelled that Order in Council and went back on the solemn pledge they gave to the men who left Canada. I say it was a shame and dishonourable to break a solemn pledge in that way.

Mr. WIGMORE: It is true the commission have power to give an additional $200, but I do not like leaving it to the commission or even to the minister. I think Parliament should have courage enough to come forward boldly and say, "We want this thing arranged in this very way." The amount we are offering to the returned soldier is not large enough. The only positions that are open to him are messengerships and positions of that sort carrying only a small salary. Many of these returned soldiers were earning very much bigger salaries before they left Canada, but now through wounds or disablement they have to take these lower-salaried positions with $600 or $800 to start with. I would support an amendment that the minimum salary for the returned soldier be $1,000,

and that would only be carrying out to a very small extent the pledge we gave to these boys when they left our shores. Many of them to-day are walking the streets of our towns and cities because there are not enough positions to go around. I think we should redeem our pledge to them at least to the extent of giving them a minimum salary of $1,000, and I beg to move accordingly.

Mr. MANION: I would like to make a couple of points. One is in regard to what the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) said. I notice in the House that whenever an hon. member takes a stand in regard to keeping down expenses somebody stands up and says that he is taking a whack at the returned soldier. I do not think that is playing the game. I do not think that the hon. member for North Winnipeg took any whack in any shape or form at the returned soldier. I did not hear him say anything that reflected in any way upon the returned soldier. I happen to be a returned soldier myself and if he had said anything at which I could have taken offence I would have done so. This thing is being carried to an excess in this country. I believe we are getting hysterical about people taking whacks at returned soldiers. That is one point that I desire to make. The other point is this: I have sat in this House and heard a good many hon. members hitting at the soldier who has not got beyond England. I may speak upon that because I got beyond England myself. I wish to say, in justice to the man who has not got beyond England, that many good men have not got beyond England because they could not help themselves. After a man gets to England he is turned over to the overseas military authorities and he cannot say where he shall go. It took me seven months of hard work, breaking orders and ignoring rules in order to make myself so useless in England that I would be sent to France. If I had not done that I would have stayed in England and been one of those despised men who stay in England. A great many of the men who stay in England do just as hard work as the majority of those who go to France. There are a great many men in France who are sixty miles behind the firing line and they are just as safe as if they were sitting in this House of Parliament.

Mr. NESBITT: What about the long-range guns?

Mr. MANION: They could shoot to England just as well as they could shoot to the bases in France. I think there should be a little more justice done by hon. members to the man who goes to England and who probably does his best to get to France but does not succeed in getting across.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is a Civil Service Act and we are basing the salaries in the Act upon the theory that we are merely creating a Civil Service. It is quite true that many of these positions should go to returned soldiers. But inevitably a great many of these positions will be filled by persons who are not returned soldiers. I would think that a boy of fourteen or fifteen who happened to be a messenger, packer or sorter and was getting $700 or $800, was doing very well indeed. True, that sum may not be a fair reward to the returned soldier of older age, and perhaps with a family. However, I do not say that the suggestion is not worthy of consideration, but I want to point out that an amendment is not possible now to increase the minimum or maximum in that division. That would require a fresh resolution to be placed on the Order Paper, and it would have to be assented to by His Excellency the Governor General. I have no doubt that all these matters in reference to the returned soldiers will have to receive due consideration by the Government in the early future.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is no compulsion to force people into the Civil Service, and consequently I would not be in favour of having the minimum salary too low. But I do think that the amendment that was moved in regard to the returned soldier has something to justify it. We have heard a great deal about the returned soldier, the generous treatment that he has received, and should receive. We discussed that question earlier in connection with this Bill. The fact that the returned soldiers are not represented in the personnel of the commission justifies the criticism that is offered of this measure and the endeavour to provide all the safeguards that are necessary to ensure that they shall receive the treatment that they are entitled to. The hon. member for St. James (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) pointed out the difficulties that people living in large cities, such as Montreal, experienced in trying to live on less than $1,000 a year. When I heard the hon. gentleman make those remarks I could not help but think of all the people in this country who never see $1,000 from one year's end to the other, and who are labouring

hard in order to secure a living for themselves and their families. That is particularly true of a certain class who are engaged in the public service. I refer to the rural mail carriers. These people have been taking contracts and delivering the mail year after year at a salary such as is not mentioned in the Civil Service list at all. I would just like to contrast the position of these public servants with that of the people who have a wall of protection all around them, whose hours of labour are regulated, who are superannuated in their old age and who receive much more generous treatment than those who are engaged in this branch of the public service to which I refer.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I recognize very fully the unpopularity that one is likely to invite if he says one word that might be construed as not boosting the returned soldier. Yet the Government have a solemn duty to perform in a matter of this kind. I will not take backwater from any member of this House in my persistent devotion to the cause of the returned soldier. I recognize quite as much as the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) what this country owes to the men who have gone to the trenches thousands and tens of thousands of whom have laid down their lives and hundreds of thousands of whom have fought for the liberty that I enjoy. We all recognize that. But, I know how easy it is to be a demagogue in reference to this question. I want to say a word in reference to my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) who had the temerity to stand up and plead for a fair deal in the interest of the country. He gets the retort that he is going back on the returned soldier. I have known my hon. friend from North Winnipeg a great many years, and I can tell those who wish to reflect upon him that there is no physician in the city of Winnipeg, and I believe no physician in the Dominion of Canada, who has done more than he has in his way for the returned soldier and the returned soldier's child and family. But he does not talk about it. He is too decent a man to refer to that in this House. He is willing to stand up and face the danger of the cry "You are not fair to the returned soldier" in pleading that this country has some interest that must be kept in mind. The Government is doing the best it can in reference to these salaries. It is not necessary for returned soldiers to be given just $600. The commission has the option of giving them more.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Up to $1,200.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Up to $1,200. Probably there will be very few returned soldiers who would care to accept a menial position at $800. But some soldiers with a pension of $600 or $700 or $800, might do very well with that amount of money. But if you throw the throttle open wide and say that the returned soldier must start in at $1,000 or $1,200, this country is going to feel it in the long run. We have got the taxes piling up at an enormous rate, and while I intend to see that justice is done to the returned soldier the representatives in this House have some other duties to perform. They have to see that this country is protected. I appeal to hon. gentlemen. Sometimes I have said that I am pleased that I am growing old and will soon pass off this stage.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would ask hon. members to hear my reason. It is that I fear that we will have the cry dinned into us for the next fifteen, twenty or thirty years, nothing but the returned soldier. God bless the returned soldier, we will try to do justice to him, but let us be fair to the country itself, and let us not be swept off our feet by the voice of the demagogue constantly crying out, "The returned soldier!"

Mr. MORPHY: I cannot quite appreciate the minister's position in saying that we must have a special resolution before we can do what is proposed. I apprehend that the whole of section 46 is subject to amendment. If it is not so, I do not know where parliamentary practice comes in. Does the minister say we cannot knock out the whole clause if we like?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A motion may be made to reduce expenditure, but a proposal which involves an increase must be initiated by a resolution, accompanied by the consent of the Governor General. My hon. friend will remember that this very Bill was introduced by a resolution, solely because it involved an expenditure of money.

Mr. MORPHY: Very well, there is a very simple remedy. Let us take $1,000 off Grade A and another $500 off Grade B. Then we can raise the pay of the returned soldier from $900 to $1,500. Then we will not commit a breach of the constitution.

My hon. friend is specious in his arguments, and if I may be allowed to use the expression, there appears to be subterfuge, to which my hon. friend is not prone. In regard to the hon. member for Springfie'd (Mr. Richardson) seeking to impugn other people's motives, I want to tell him, and tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I never was more earnest in anything in my life than when I rose to-night to try to do something if I could that would compel the Government to make decent provision for men who are back from the front. I know of men that are back here who, to use a slang phrase, are on their uppers. Many of them have not got the means to come to Ottawa, others who are here are out of employment, knocking at the door of the Government, and yet grumbling at the fact that the Government have nothing to offer them. I am no demagogue, Mr. Chairman, I want you to understand that when I take up a case of this kind I take it up from conscientious conviction. What I said on a previous occasion is true, this Government has always been very prolific in its salaries to the "big guns" of the country. There is Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, who has drawn the sum of $17,500. There is Professor Macallum of Toronto University, the chairman of some scientific research committee, whom nobody has ever heard of, nobody knows what he has ever done, or what benefit he has been to the country, and yet he is getting the sum of $10,000. I read a list of salaries here the other night which ranged from $10,000 down to $6,000. Never a kick about that; but the moment a man stands up to make an ordinary plea, free from demagogism, for the returned soldier, he is met by a gentleman who shouts, "wolf, wolf!" I want to give the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) the credit for having done good service, and if that hon. gentleman had something said to him it was because he impugned other members' motives, and accused them of talking for Hansard. I do not have to talk for Hansard, Mr. Chairman, and I resent that sort of talk. I am going to move my amendment, and I am going to put it to the vote of the committee. I am going to move that the higher grade be reduced and that we raise grade C in the Third Division so that instead of being from $600 to $1,200, it shall be from $1,000 to $1,500.

Mr. KEEFER: The trouble with the Civil Service, as I understand the matter, is not the amount at which we start anybody, but the amount that we are paying those who have been rendering efficient service to the public but are carried off into other avenues of employment. The difficulty has been the leakage from the Service of the good men at the top. It would be a terrible mistake, in my judgment, to attempt to reduce the salaries that are paid to those in the Civil Service, who, by their experience, their talents and by their faithful service, have earned higher and better stipends. Those are the men that we want to keep, but, unfortunately, they are continually leaving the public service, to be promptly engaged by private corporations. What inducement have you got to offer to a clever young university man? Is it the $600 salary at the bottom, or the $5,000 salary at the top. Never dream for a moment of reducing higher salaries, but rather increase them if possible so as to hold your good men. A salary of $600 is quite ample for messengers, porters, and employees of that class to start with, and they can climb to the $1,200 as in proposed clause. Some reference has been made to the Food Control Office, with which I happen to be connected, and some persons have talked about stenographers being paid $1,200 a year in that department. I think there is only one stenographer who is getting $1,200 a year, our practice being to start them at $50 or $60 a month, and as they progress and show their worth to increase their salaries. I agree that we should not play fast and loose with the public money. We should not start the minor officials at high salaries; if they prove their worth they will rapidly rise. I do not want to say anything about the question of the returned soldier, a subject which has been harped on too much, although I may say I have been elected by the returned soldier, and I believe in him. It is not necessary for us to say anything for the returned soldier here, because we all know and appreciate his worth.

Mr. DEVLIN: How much does the hon. gentleman say the stenographers in the food control office are getting?

Mr. KEEFER: It has been said several times that the stenographers are paid $1,200. To my knowledge there is but one, who, for good reasons, is being paid $100 per month, the best one in the office.

Mr. DEVLIN: What about the others?

Mr. KEEFER: The others start from $50 to $60 a month. There have been a lot of misstatements indulged in with respect to the food control office, but we have not

thought it worth while to refer to them. We are endeavouring to run that office on a business basis, promoting from time to time those of the employees who have served efficiently and faithfully. Some of the officials that have come in from the outside have been referred to. My hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) spoke of a gentleman coming in from Eaton's who is being paid $2,400 a year. Quite true, the gentleman was brought from Eaton's. We had to establish regulations with respect to the export and import licenses, and six men were sent to us as volunteers. One of them was getting $2,400, and we kept him on in the license department. However, this is not dealing with the subject matter under discussion. As I have already said, I think that $600 is ample for persons to start with in the minor positions, such as messengers.

Mr. DEVLIN: I find in a return brought down that there is a page full of stenographers who are not paid at the rate of $50 or $60 a month. I will take the very first page I come to, I do not care to give the names.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: In what office?

Mr. DEVLIN: The food control office. The first is a stenographer getting $950; the next a young lady getting $1,000; the next one, a married woman, getting $1,100; the next a young lady stenographer getting $950, another at $950; and another at $1,000.

Mr. MORPHY: In what department?

Mr. DEVLIN: The food control office, to which my hon. friend alluded. I see the following amounts also, all to young ladies $1,000, $950, $1,000 and $1,000. Would my hon. friend like me to go on?

Mr. KEEFER: Are any of them paid $1,200? That is the statement that was challenged.

Mr. MORPHY: If the hon. gentleman will permit me what I said was not that. What I said was that an Order in Council had recently been passed permitting that board to employ 38 stenographers up to a maximum of $1,200.

Mr. KEEFER: That is quite correct.

Mr. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEVLIN: I have not finished.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You have a long list.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is too long to read tonight; I would not take the time to read it in committee. I find in this return that there is a chairman——

Mr. KEEFER: Are there any $1,200 stenographers?

Mr. DEVLIN: Do you want me to look over the whole list again?

Mr. KEEFER: See if there are.

Mr. DEVLIN: Yes, I see one right away. My eye falls upon one; she gets $1,200.

Mr. KEEFER: Are there any more?

Mr. DEVLIN: But I must add, in justice to my hon. friend, that her appointment is only temporary, and that she is also a cartoonist. Would my hon. friend now like me to read the salaries of the $5,000, $4,500 and $3,500 men in that return

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am sorry, but I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to accommodate his hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE: Before we leave this clause—

Mr. DEVLIN: I have not finished. I did not want to give my hon. friend any more information, Mr. Chairman, though I have bushels of it here. What I did really want to say, if my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) will allow me—and it will prevent my having to take the floor again,—is this: I find that the big salaries are paid to those who are appointed by Order in Council, and do not fall under the Civil Service at all. They are paid, I have no doubt, in proportion to the service they render, and I do not want to find fault with any of these appointments; I do not know them; I do not know the personnel; neither do I want to underestimate the personnel. But the salaries of those who come under the second division, and in fact the salaries of a good many of those in the first division, seem to me away below the mark. The cost of living has been going up so rapidly for so many years that I think the acting minister might try to put the poor people in the service on a little bit better footing to earn a living. He will remember that Sir George Murray, in his report to the Government some years ago, recommended that the maximum salary of the class which is now styled grade A of the second division was to be $1,800. It is still $1,500, although years have elapsed and the cost of living has gone on increasing. I would be the last man in the House wishing to burden the list of expenditures, but we must be just in all cases. And the poor man who is forced to work for his living, whether within or without the Government, should be alloted a salary that

will permit him to live. I have had men come to me, who had worked in the service for sixteen years, with their overcoats practically threadbare. Men have come to me who had married on the assumption that they would be able to live on the increase of $50 a year, but who found themselves very much in debt. I want to say to the minister again this year, as I have done in years gone by, that I strongly recommend an increase.

Mr. BLAKE: Before we leave this section, under that rule which was put through some time ago and which was placed on Hansard, I would beg to retract what I said in my first sentence, that nothing may go out derogatory to any hon. gentleman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Nobody misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BUREAU: In section 45 the divisions are established and in these divisions there are stenographers, typewriters, etc. In section 46 salaries are determined for the same divisions. In the Department of Justice and other departments I know men employed as stenographers who are now getting $1,600 a year. That salary would put them in the first division, but according to the position they occupy, under section 45, they would be placed in the Second Division. I may be anticipating, but for the purpose of the answer which I want to get, I must read section 48, subsection (2), which says:

> There shall be no promotion from the second division to the first division and there shall be no promotion from the third division.

According to section 45, stenographers are placed in the Second Division, where the maximum salary under section 46 is $1,500. These men drawing $1,600 would be placed in the First Division according to section 46, but according to their classification as stenographers they apparently are not entitled to be placed in that division and under section 48 there are to be no promotions. I want to know how these men would be classified and where they will be put. Will their salaries be reduced or will they be put in the First Division?

Mr. TWEEDIE: In regard to the matter of salaries of the lower grade employees, I agree to a certain extent with the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), and with that made by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). Of course, the suggestion made by the hon. member for Perth is open to this difficulty. If we limit the payment of increased wages to the men who have returned from overseas then we shall have two members of the same class of civil servants working side by side performing the same duties, one receiving a salary of $300 a year higher than the other. If we follow that suggestion out to its logical conclusion, we would have the wives of men who had been killed at the front entering the Civil Service; they would not come under the class of returned men. The wife of a soldier who has been killed at the front would be obliged to work at a salary $300 less than that paid to a soldier who had been spared his life and had returned. The son or daughter of a man who had been killed at the front would be compelled to work side by side with the returned man at a much lower salary than the returned man was receiving. If we base this legislation on purely sympathetic grounds, the sympathy should be extended to the widows and orphans of the men who have been killed overseas, and following out the argument of the member for North Perth, such persons as I have mentioned should receive higher wages than men who return from the front. The Dominion Government should not employ men at a lower wage than they are entitled to receive. The Government is the largest corporation in Canada and cannot afford to treat its employees any less generously than any private corporation treats its employees. No married man, no woman with children to support, should be employed in the service of this or any other corporation at a wage on which it is impossible properly to maintain himself or herself and family. We should have great consideration for the younger generation; we should see that children are brought up in good surroundings and are given a good education. We should not ask men to perform a service for the country at a low wage in order that taxes may be kept down; we should adjust our scale of wages as do the large railway corporations and manufacturing industries. Unless these people enter the Service in the capacity of apprentices, we should give them a sufficient wage to enable them to live decently and comfortably, and if our doing so makes additional taxation necessary, then that taxation should be imposed. Without supporting his resolution, I join the member for North Perth in his suggestion that the Government endeavour to provide that the minimum salaries of these lower-grade employees be higher than is provided in this section of the Bill, and that no able-bodied married man be asked to work for the Government at less than $750 a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to know more of the facts before I pass an opinion on the particular case referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau). I think he will find that rather than being merely a stenographer, the person to whom he referred had been promoted to some higher grade. However, the latter part of section 46 protects that person, at least for the present. It says:

Provided, however, that, until the Inside Service is re-organized under the provisions of section ten of this Act, the classification and salaries heretofore prescribed and paid shall continue in force with respect to all officers, clerks and employees appointed before the date of this Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose a man entered a department as a stenographer and worked up to $1,600 a year. Section 45 says that he shall come under the Second Division. Section 48 says that there shall be no promotion from the Second to the First Division. Section 46 provides that the maximum salary of the Second Division shall be $1,500. My hon. friend says that this official will get $1,600 until the reorganization is effected, but nothing in the Act says that when the reorganization is effected he will be given any higher classification than that of stenographer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What division was this person in?

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know, but he had reached the maximum of his class, $1,600.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He may be promoted to the next division.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 48 says that there shall be no promotion from the Second to the First Division.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The old Second Division is now the Third.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 45 provides that the Second Division, Grade B, shall consist of clerks and employees who work under supervision, and of stenographers and typewriters. This means that by statute the official to whom I have referred is classified in the Second Division, Grade B, the maximum salary of which is fixed by section 46 at $1,500. Where is this man to stand when the reorganization is effected?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 10, subsection 5 provides that this Act shall not prejudically affect the status of any officer now in the service.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If hon. members who are supporting the proposal for an increase in the minimum salaries to civil servants can suggest a way by which that proposal can be properly carried out, it will have my support. When the estimates are before the House, I shall be ready to urge upon the minister to grant increases to all those poorly paid officials, but I am ready to take the risk of saying that I do not think it is in the interest of the Civil Service or the returned soldier that the amendment of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) should be adopted. For us to set two scales of remuneration all through the different classes of the Civil Service or the public service, one scale for the civilian who has not been overseas and another scale for the soldier who returns from overseas, will create a condition that will not be for the good of the returned soldier. I am ready to go further and say, with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), that we are devoting too much of our time to a consideration of what the returned soldier is going to get when he enters the Civil Service. There will be four or five hundred thousand returned soldiers, and we cannot jam them all into the Civil Service. My opinion is that we shall be doing what is ultimately in the best interest of the returned soldier if we direct our attention more to getting him back into civil life in some position into which he can fit, and, if possible, in the work which he was doing before he went overseas. If we get into our mind that the Government have to find positions for all the returned soldiers, it is inevitable that we shall be trying to drive a lot of square plugs into round holes and vice versa, and we shall ultimately get the returned soldier into a position for which he will curse us. I am not afraid of being classed amongst those who are,—if you will permit me to use the term—batting the returned soldier. I am not advertising my feelings towards the returned soldier. They are just as genuine as those of any other hon. member, and I am just as intensely interested in the men who are overseas. But I repeat: We are placing the returned soldier in a false and invidious position when we are constantly harping on the necessity of the Government putting him into some position for which he is not fitted. Let us, if we can, devote our attention to getting the returned soldiers back into the class of work for which they are fitted, getting it into their minds that the whole four or five hundred thousand soldiers cannot be put into this class of positions, and that if the country is to carry on, there must be a levelling up and getting the returned soldiers into the class

of work they can do. Any returned soldier in whom I am interested will never be urged by me to take a position under this or any other Government. I shall try to get him into a position for which he is fitted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the hon. member think a returned soldier could discharge the duties of a member of the commission?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I have not the slightest doubt that a returned soldier could be found who could discharge the duties of any man on this commission or any other commission, of any man in this country. That is not the point at all, and the hon. member has not put me the least little bit up a tree when he asks me that question. There are returned soldiers capable of doing anything that can be done in this country, but we are not going to assist in getting them into those positions by discussing whether we shall set one scale of wages for the returned soldier and another for the civilian, with the idea that we are going to force returned soldiers into positions for which they are not fitted. We shall be doing the best thing in the interest of the returned soldier if we devote our attention to finding out what he is capable of doing and getting him into that position, whether it be in the Civil Service or in some other walk of life. If possible, we should get him into the position in which he was before he went overseas, and we should get it into the heart and mind of the returned soldier that that is going to be his ultimate destiny and in his own interest. The worst thing that can happen to the returned soldier is the idea that we are going to pauperise them, and everything contained in the discussion that takes place in regard to the Government taking care of the returned soldier simply means that we are going to make wards or paupers of them as if they were not independent men.

10 p.m.

Mr. CURRIE: I cannot let the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) pass without a word of protest. I am a returned soldier and a member of the Returned Soldiers' Association. I refrained from saying a word on the debate with reference to the returned soldier, because I thought the discussion was reaching limits that perhaps some of the hon. members who spoke would regret later on. Most of the hon. gentlemen who have opposed anything with respect to the returned soldier owe their seats in this House to the returned soldier and to the soldier, and they should have regard to their electorate. Let us look at this question candidly and clearly. About a year ago the Government passed an Order in Council whereby all positions in the Civil Service were to go to returned soldiers, except in the case of men who were unfit for military service. At that time military service was for men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five. Since then there has been a change in the regulations, and only men in the first category are excluded from positions. The Government has settled that. Eighty or ninety per cent of the returned soldiers, after the war, will have just as sound and clear brains and will be physically as sound as my hon. friend, if not much more so. They will not be looking for Government jobs. They will not be and are not the parties that we can put into the Civil Service. The men who desire to be put into the Civil Service are those poor unfortunates who have been disabled, many of whom have left situations carrying salaries of four or five thousand dollars a year—and I know a number who are older than the hon. gentleman, who left good positions and went to the war, and many of whom are still serving in the war. I know men of sixty years of age who left good positions in which they were drawing $3,000 or $4,000 a year, and who have been serving in the trenches constantly day and night since they went overseas. In many cases those men come home wounded, and their wounds and injuries are of such a character that they are unable on their return to take up the positions that they previously occupied. I know one man, for instance, who used to earn a large salary as a moulder. He has only about one-quarter of a lung left owing to German gas. I know a man who was a surveyor on railway construction work, a man of high attainments. One of his legs is now one and one-half inches shorter than it formerly was and the other is two and one-half inches shorter, so that he is lame and unable to go around. This man must seek some other occupation because he could not take the same place as he had before. The idea of the Government, and that of anyone who has in his heart a soft spot for the returned soldier, is that the Civil Service shall be for those men whose efficiency has been impaired. Hon. members say that a civil servant should be one hundred per cent efficient. This returned soldier is unable to take up his old posi-

tion and he is only efficient to the extent of forty or fifty per cent. A returned soldier may have lost an arm, but still he may be capable of filling a position at a desk in the Civil Service and doing his duties just as well as a man who has all his limbs and faculties. It is those men for whom we want positions, not for returned soldiers like my robust hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion), who has just returned from the front.

We must get the injured man a position, and his wife and family must be looked after, and no man to-day can look after himself, let alone a family, on much less than $1,000 a year. I think it is only right that we should raise the minimum salary for the soldier. I do not want to give details, but I know of sad cases of soldiers with large families to look after who have been disabled by service at the front and have had to take positions in the Civil Service at $600 a year, and that is the limit that pretty nearly all of them are getting. To that is added a pension of $150 or $200 a year, or $600 if the man is totally disabled. No matter what a man's attainments might be, if he has served as a private he only gets a portion of a private's full pay when he is disabled. I say he must have something beyond that pension, and while I do not want to be considered as making a raid upon the treasury on behalf of the returned soldier, when the next election comes they may be able to look after themselves and possibly attend to those who have looked after them, but in the meantime when we are dealing with an Act that is supposed to do something for the returned soldier we should see to it that he gets the first call for the higher-salaried positions as well as the lower. If you are going to give the returned soldier a position, give him a salary that he can live on and bring up his family, a salary that will not keep him in a state of continuous poverty. This country ought to be ashamed of itself. I saw a list to-night of about two hundred names of men who have been in the public service for years, many of them in the city of Toronto in the Customs, Inland Revenue, and other departments, none of whom had ever got more than $800 or $900 a year. That used to be a fortune thirty years ago, and it was a large sum before the war, but things have moved very swiftly since and everything has gone up in price; wheat is now three and four times the price it was before the war. We must meet the situation in some way. I repeat, I do not want to raid the treasury; I do not want more than is fair and right for the returned soldier; but I do not want to hear the returned soldier reviled in this House and told he has no more rights than the ordinary member of a labour union. I say that he has more than the member of a labour union. I know where the attack on the returned soldier comes from and we will attend to that when the proper time comes. I say it ill becomes any man who sits in this House as a returned soldier's candidate, a man who has received the votes of returned soldiers, to stand up and say they have no rights and should have no privileges, that they should be pauperized, and that they have no special privileges coming to them more than to the ordinary individual. I trust we have heard enough on this subject, and I almost feel inclined to say to the minister, let us pass on to the next order of business, and by the time the Bill is ready for its third reading the minister may have thought out a way of meeting the situation.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I am not going to permit the hon. member to insinuate that I reviled the returned soldier or that I said he was not worthy of the same treatment as a member of a labour union. I can tell the hon. member and all other members of this House that I am quite willing to have the returned soldiers and the soldiers overseas judge me by the manner in which I have treated them. I have stood on the floor of this House and said what I have said because I feel we are not doing the best for the returned soldier or for any other soldier when we undertake to set up such a standard as the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) would set up by his amendment, whereby the returned soldier would be given a position at a higher rate of wages than the man who is working alongside of him. The returned soldier does not want that. If the salary of the civil servant is not sufficiently high for the returned soldier, that is an entirely different question.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) after dealing with this question to his own satisfaction, suggested the advisability of passing on to another item. This is not the first time he has thought in this House that everything had been said on a question when he had concluded his speech. There are others, however, who hold views on this matter, and while I was not privileged to be in the House this afternoon when this matter was being discussed, I have been

here since eight o'clock and I have heard nothing said that could be construed by any person whose brain was in normal condition of health to be an attack on the returned soldier. As a member of this House who recognizes his responsibility to his constituents, I believe that every member of this House, whether or not it has been his privilege to tread the soil of France and do his part overseas—and that is a great privilege in my estimation—and whether sitting to the right or the left of the Chair, is desirous of doing his duty to the returned soldier and giving him more than a fair share. I had understood, since the Government made their announcement that the returned soldier was to get the preference in appointments to the Civil Service, that we had to take into consideration the man's fitness for the position that was vacant. I had understood that if the returned soldier was qualified for the position, he unquestionably would have the preference over every other person, and I have not heard any person in this House or outside question the wisdom and correctness of that view. I believe the judgment of hon. members of this House is that the returned soldier shall be given the preference for the higher-salaried positions as well as the lower if he possesses the necessary qualifications. But how can any person logically maintain that we must leave out of consideration the qualifications of the applicant for the position? How can any man who recognizes his responsibility to the people—and we must certainly recognize that responsibility when we appoint a man to a position in the Civil Service—agree to the appointment of a man to the Civil Service just because he is a returned soldier, regardless of his fitness for the position? The proposal strikes me as absolutely illogical and indefensible. First of all, the returned soldier must possess the qualifications necessary to fill the position that is vacant, and if he possesses those qualifications I am in the judgment of every member of this House when I say that he should be given preference over any man who has not been overseas. I did not understand the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) to say anything different from that, nor do I believe the hon. member for North Simcoe was justified in the attack he made on the hon. member for East Algoma.

In regard to this question of salaries, last session when the question of salaries in a certain department of the Government was up for consideration the principle was laid down, by the granting of a bonus of a certain amount, that this bonus should apply to men whose salaries were under $1,000 a year and not to men whose salaries were over $1,000 a year. If that was a correct principle last session why should it not be a correct principle this session? It meant that the Government recognized that men cannot maintain their families on less than $1,000 a year. If that was true last year it is just as true this year. I agree with much that has been said with regard to the salaries of the higher officers in the Civil Service. A man who has been for years in the service of the Government, who has shown his fitness for the position that he occupies, I believe, is entitled to look forward to a gradual increase in his salary, according to his years of service, always having regard to his fitness to discharge the duties of the office he holds. I cannot understand the justice or fairness of telling a man who happens to be in one division that he is thereby excluded, notwithstanding his merit, from passing up to another division.

There is another feature of this salary question that properly comes in here. I do not know whether it is because there are several thousand civil servants in Ottawa or not, but ever since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, that is since 1908, periodically the question of salaries affecting people in the Civil Service in Ottawa has come before the House and it has always been just a little before an election. But there has been no consideration given—and I want the full emphasis to be placed upon the word "no"—to the salaries of the people in the Outside Service. Not only has there been no consideration given to the salaries of the people in the Outside Service but in many places it is impossible to get the least bit of encouragement when the matter is brought to the attention of the various departments of the Government. Let us take the case of the country postmaster; all his time is taken up by his duties, which begin at half past six in the morning and continue until nine o'clock and often till ten in the evening. He can not engage in any other occupation as he is in the service of the Government or the service of the country. If he is in the service of the country, why should he not receive consideration for the service which he renders? In a village in my own county there is a postmaster whose total remuneration, allowing for rent and everything, amounted last year to $870. That means that he is expected to give faithful service to the people of this country in the

position he occupies and maintain his family on $800. Members come here year after year and session after session and consider the rights of the civil servants in the city of Ottawa. Why? Because the civil servants of the city of Ottawa number several thousand and they can back up their demands with their solid vote. That is the reason why. Because these people in outlying country districts are only scattered voters here and there and have no particular voting strength when the election comes on, their claim is ignored. In considering this matter I want to tell you another thing. While every hon. member of this House has a right to state what he considers is a proper salary for a civil servant, is it not right that every member should protest against men in high places deliberately stealing from the treasury of this country and putting the money in their own pockets? Deliberately stealing—what else do you call it? A specific vote of $2,500 is granted to him for the purpose of paying his expenses when he goes over to Great Britain to attend the sessions of the Privy Council. He does not go over to attend this session but he continues to draw this $2,500 a year. If a man took $2,500—yes, $25—wrongfully from a neighbour he would be brought before the court and put behind the bars, but when a Chief Justice of Canada takes $2,500 a year—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Of course you will rise to a point of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly I do. Unless you move to impeach a judge you cannot attack him as you are attacking this one in the present instance.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is never an occasion when anything can be said in this House with respect to the judiciary of this country and I have as much respect for the judiciary as the hon gentleman . . . .

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Who is out of order now?

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. gentleman to refrain from casting any reflection on the judiciary of the country. It is contrary to the rules and usages of the House with which my hon. friend is certainly conversant. The only rule we have on the subject is the following:

> No member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family; nor of the Governor or person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof; nor speak beside the question in debate.

but I will remind my hon. friend that Bourinot in his work on Parliamentary procedure says that—

Mr. EDWARDS: May I go on while you, Mr. Chairman, are looking up the rule?

The CHAIRMAN: You asked me to read the rule and I propose to read the holding by Bourinot.

Mr. EDWARDS: Just rule, Mr. Chairman. I asked for the rule.

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that the hon. gentleman cannot, according to the rules and usages of the House of Commons, make the statement which he has made concerning the judiciary of Canada. If the hon. gentleman wishes to appeal from that ruling he has a perfect right to do so.

Mr. CURRIE: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. We are getting a little fed up on a few of these regulations. When the Speaker is asked to rule on a question it is necessary that he shall produce the rule and explain it to the House so that we will understand it. This idea of immediately appealing to the House without due regard to the ancient precedents and to the old rules and customs of this House is contrary to the practice.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CURRIE: I am in order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I ask for the rule which I have violated. If you will kindly refer me to it I shall be very much obliged.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will consult Bourinot, at page 358, he will find:

> All references to judges and to courts of justice and to personages of high official station, of the nature of personal attacks and censure have always been considered unparliamentary and the Speakers of the British and Canadian Houses have always treated them as breaches of order. They have always insisted that, "such expressions should be withdrawn."

Mr. EDWARDS: For the convenience of members of Parliament, we are provided with a copy of the rules of the House, a little volume which is easily slipped into the pocket. We are not provided with a ten or fifteen-pound volume of Bourinot, a volume which we are supposed to read from cover to cover, but which cannot be carried round in the hip-pocket. I was told that I had violated one of the rules of the House. I have asked for that rule, but

as yet it has not been mentioned. You have informed me, Mr. Chairman, that according to Bourinot, a member must not refer in disrespectful terms to the judiciary. Am I to understand that a man must refrain from telling the truth in this House with regard to the judiciary or any person else? If that truth when told casts a reflection upon the judiciary, who shows the disrespect to the Bench, he who tells the truth about the acts of the judiciary, or the judicial personage who has violated the well-understood rules, usages and customs of this country? Is there any rule in Bourinot which places a censorship on the conduct of judges to see that they walk the straight and narrow path in which they make others walk? If there is, we would like to have it? I shall not break any rule of Bourinot in referring disrespectfully to judges. May I then be permitted to leave the judges out of the question and call attention to certain acts which have been performed in this House, to call attention to certain votes which have been passed in this House, with the sanction of the Government, whereby $2,500 a year was voted to a certain gentleman, whom I am not permitted to mention, for a specific purpose, which that gentleman did not carry out. The money was voted and taken. The next year the money was again voted and taken for that specific purpose, although that specific purpose was not carried out. The third year the money was voted for the same specific purpose, which purpose again was not carried out, but the money was taken. That, Sir, I would characterize if it was not any person other than a judge, as a species of profiteering. If John Wesley Allison—Colonel John Wesley Allison, at one time Honorary Colonel John Wesley Allison—had got away with that $2,500, I would be permitted as a member of the House, without any violation of Bourinot or any other authority, to call him a scoundrel. I would be permitted to say he was a thief, I would be permitted to say that he had taken money from the treasury of the country that he was not entitled to; but if the party concerned is a member of the Royal Family, one of the knights of the realm, a baron or lord it may be in this country some person of that kind, the rules of Bourinot conveniently come to his rescue and between him and the just punishment which he merits for his acts. That is the present situation in this country.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Do the rules permit us to think?

Mr. EDWARDS: Not out loud. However, my purpose in discussing the salary question was to say this: As one member of the House who is responsible to a certain section of the community, I want to enter my protest against that sort of thing, and I have a right to do so while we are discussing the salaries of other men who are working long hours and trying hard to earn those salaries. Now, I think I have made my position clear with regard to that. It is all right enough to talk profiteering. We have got profiteering in this country. We have men in Canada who have squeezed water into pork in order to make eighty per cent out of it. I do not know whether I dare mention any particular name. I do not know whether according to Bourinot one has a right to mention a knight of the realm. Am I out of order, Mr. Chairman, possibly I am?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman is out of order. And this time I will cite, not a usage, but a rule of the House. Rule 13 provides that:

> Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have much pleasure in submitting to your ruling, or rather I have much pleasure in acknowledging the correctness of it. At least, upon this occasion I think you are right, therefore, I shall not follow that subject any further.

There are some other matters I would like to refer to in connection with salaries, and to point out how salaries are augmented in this country. We have a man who has been appointed to the Civil Service. Let me say that he is not a judge, neither is he a lord, nor baronet, nor knight of the realm. He is not a member of the Royal Family, so I imagine I can refer to him by name without violating any rule of Bourinot. He held the position of purchasing agent for the penitentiary, and he bore, and still bears, the euphonious name of Dillon. He was drawing a salary of $3,300, but, Mr. Chairman, it was not necessary to follow the classification of Class A in the First Division or Second Division in this case, in order to augment his salary. How was it done? They put a uniform on him and called him captain, and let him draw the pay of that rank in addition to his regular pay in the Civil Service. I want to protest against that method of increasing salaries in this country. It is a roundabout way of doing things which does not appeal to me as being exactly square and proper. Other

men have had their salaries increased by roundabout methods, which I equally condemn. As far as it is possible, this country should provide for the returned soldier and give him a fair salary, and we will be able to deal more generously with the returned soldier, having regard to the financial condition of the country, if the finances of Canada are not allowed to be looted by men occupying positions which render them immune to criticism on the floor of this House.

The CHAIRMAN: There are before the committee two amendments, one of them, moved by Mr. Wigmore, of St. John City and counties of St. John and Albert, reads as follows:

Provided that the minimum amount in the third division for any returned soldier who has seen active service at the front shall be $1,000.

There is also an amendment moved by Mr. Morphy, which I have accepted as a sub-amendment for the time being, which says:

That returned soldiers in the third division shall be paid from $1,000 to $1,500.

I did not wish to rule immediately that the amendment and the sub-amendment were out of order because the subject matter of both could very properly form the basis of a suggestion to the minister. I cannot accept them as an amendment and sub-amendment owing to clause 54 of the British North America Act which says:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill for the Appropriation of any Part of the Public Revenue, or of any Tax or Impost, to any Purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by Message of the Governor General in the Session in which such Vote, Resolution, Address or Bill is proposed.

This Bill was preceded by a resolution approved by the Governor General, and therefore no amendment increasing the amounts in this Bill can be moved by a member or even by a minister without first being preceded by resolution also approved by the Governor General. May, in his Parliamentary Practice, at page 460, says:

Contingent or prospective charges upon the public revenue.....come within the purview of these standing orders; therefore before clauses in a Bill can be considered, which apply the Consolidated Fund, money to be voted by Parliament.....as a guarantee for sums to be raised, paid, or borrowed for any purpose, such clauses must receive the preliminary authority of a committee resolution, founded upon the recommendation of the Crown.

It is clear that what cannot be done by a minister cannot be done by a private member, and I must therefore declare both the amendment and sub-amendment to be out of order.

Mr. MORPHY: I have another amendment on the subject which I will read presently. But before doing so, speaking to the clause, some question was raised tonight about the salaries paid stenographers in a certain department, and the argument was advanced to show that the poorer-paid workingmen in the Third Division had not received and do not receive the same kind of treatment as other favoured individuals in the country. I have before me Hansard of April 4, and find there that there are a large number of barristers and stenographers employed on the staff of the Central Appeal Judge. One stenographer receives $180 a month, a pretty fair salary; another gets $150 a month. There are five stenographers at $110 per month; one at $96, one at $90, six at $55, eight at $80; three at $80, three at $75, one at $70, one at $65, and so on. Then there is an agricultural examiner there at $105 per week. Mr. Chairman, just get that idea into your head—an agricultural examiner at $105 per week in the office of the Central Appeal Judge! I don't wonder members of the House stand aghast at the way in which men in high places get their money, while the lower branches of the service have to fight their way through against rules, orders and factious objections. The list is long, and I won't read it; but I have given enough to show that when we are considering a clause of this kind, when the cost of living is taken into consideration, in an attempt to get $1,000 as a minimum for a man with a family of three or four children it is shameful that it has to be fought for in the face of records bristling with the prodigality of expenditure in regard to people higher up. What I have here is a motion as follows:—

That clause 46 be not concurred in, and that it be resolved that a special clause be inserted to provide for payment to the returned soldier in the third division from $1,000 to $1,500.

In that way, if this motion is carried, it does not increase the expenditure; it is open to this House, I believe, not to concur in the whole clause but to vote this one clause, and let us put the House to the test of its sincerity as to whether or not we really believe that the returned soldier entering the Civil Service should have a decent start because of the generosity we profess to extend to him.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to say that I consider this motion to be of the same

nature as that formerly moved by my hon. friend from North Perth. The hon. member by proposing to pay $1,000 to $1,500 to all returned soldiers in the Third Division is requesting the committee to vote an amount which is not based on a resolution approved in advance by the Governor General and I fear I must also declare this motion out of order for the reasons given in the previous ruling.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have been discussing for the last twenty years, I suppose, or longer the question of Civil Service reform. I agree at once that the salaries of civil servants are too small. But some eight or ten years ago the hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden), who was then leader of the Opposition and is now Prime Minister, put the position of the Civil Service in a very laconic and precise sentence. He stated in this House that the Civil Service was overmanned and underpaid. I think that impresssion is abroad yet, and I would suggest to the Government and to the commission that they would be doing justice to the Civil Service if, at the earliest possible moment, they were able to say that the Civil Service contained only the number of men requisite to carry on the country's business. When that is done we will all be in a happy mood to deal properly with the question of salaries. There is a notion abroad that we have, perhaps, three times the number employed that are necessary. This notion may be all wrong. But this question can be settled once for all by a report from the Civil Service Commission or from the department of Government responsible for the Civil Service, at the next session, that we have exactly the number required, and I, for one, will be glad then to start in and give them the proper salaries.

Section agreed to.

On section 47—Annual increases.

Mr. MURPHY: Might I suggest to my hon. friend, in view of the increased cost of living and changed conditions, the propriety of a uniform increase of $100 a year, and not discriminate, as was done in this section, by giving the larger increase to the officers receiving the larger salary and the smaller increase to those receiving the smaller salary. Those who receive the smaller salaries are much more in need of the larger increase than those who receive the larger salaries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall be pleased to submit the matter to my colleagues for consideration. It is being considered with a view to accomplishing the same end in another way.

Section agreed to.

On section 48—Promotions:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This section provides that there shall be no promotion from the Second Division to the First or from the Third Division to the Second. That provision was always in the Act, and it was fair, because the examination varied according to the division. It would not be fair to allow a person who had passed merely the examination to the Third Division to be promoted right up to the First Division. It has always been provided that by passing the necessary examination a candidate was eligible for appointment to the First and Second Divisions. But in order to make clear the exact meaning of that section I propose amending it by adding at the end of subsection 2 the following words:

But any person in either of these divisions may enter for examination for appointment to a higher division.

Mr. PEDLOW: I suggest that the minister add to subsection 3 the words "Or on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission". Often a clerk or employee in a minor position qualifies, after long service, for promotion, in which case a special examination would appear to be unnecessary. I see no reason why a man so qualified for a position in the higher division should not be promoted forthwith on the recommendation of the deputy or with the approval of the commission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Any appointment from a lower to a higher division must be made by the commission. I do not see the necessity, therefore, of adding such words as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. PEDLOW: But my point is that the promotion should be made without examination, on the recommendation of the deputy.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think that would be fair.

Mr. PEDLOW: If the man was qualified it would be fair.

Mr. McCREA: The acting minister was financial critic of the Opposition during the last five or six years. If my memory serves me correctly, he criticised very severely the extravagance of the late Government, and

among other things he contended—and, I think, rightly so; I hope he has not forgotten it—that every department of the Government was overmanned. I believe that condition still exists, and I suggest that the minister deal with this matter in an intelligent and businesslike way by reducing the staffs to a number sufficient actually to carry on the work, and then proposing increases of salary which are really in keeping with the increased cost of living. An increase of $100 to a salary of $800 or $900 is not at all in keeping with the increase of the cost of the necessities of life. At this time there is a shortage of labour in every direction, and if those whose services are not required are dismissed, they can get positions without the least difficulty. But this condition may not prevail after the war is over, and it is clear that this is the proper time to cut the staffs down and to provide reasonable increases to those whose services are necessary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is one of the purposes of the Act.

Mr. PEDLOW: Section 17 provides that promotions or increases of salary shall be made for merit by the commission on the recommendation of the deputy head. I do not see why that principle should not obtain in respect of promotions from one grade to another, in cases where special qualifications or abilities are shown.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In a case of that kind the official can take the examination for the higher division. Those who are in the higher division were obliged to take a much more severe examination than was taken by those who went into the lower divisions. Moreover, no one in a lower division is debarred because of advanced age from taking examination for a higher division.

Mr. DEVLIN: A great many civil servants have asked me this question: A man receiving the maximum in the Second Division of $1,500 passes a promotion examination which brings him into the First Division; at what salary would he be classed in the First Division? Would he be classed at the minimum salary grade F, or would he begin at a salary equal to that which he was in receipt of when he left the Second Division?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He would start at $1,600.

Mr. BUREAU: The question which I put under section 46 comes again under this section. The case that I submitted is not like the one my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) has just submitted. Supposing the civil servant has reached a salary of $1,600 and the maximum in the second division is $1,500. My hon. friend referred me to subsection 5 of section 10, which reads:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prejudicially affect the status or the present salaries—

—and so on. But the subsection does not later on say that a man who is receiving $1,600, and who, on account of the position he occupies, is classified under section 45 in the Second Division, shall receive an increase; it only says that he shall be eligible for increases. There ought to be a provision that those who have reached the maximum in such a case as I have mentioned shall be put into the higher division.

Mr. PEDLOW: I find that the point I raised is covered in subsection 3, section 48.

> Any person may be promoted from the second division to the first division under the provisions of section 17.

Section 17 says:

> Promotions or increases of salaries in the public service shall be made for merit by the Commission on the recommendation of the deputy head.

You have to incorporate subsection 3 of section 48 with section 17. That is my point.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That covers promotions made prior to 1908. That is for a different purpose.

Mr. BUREAU: The reason I rise again is that the minister said just now that a person to be promoted from one division to another must pass a new exam-

11 p.m. ination. In the case of which I spoke the salary enjoyed is higher than the salary of the division in which he is classified under section 45. Will he automatically go into Division 1 if he receives $1,600 to-day?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think so.

Mr. BUREAU: Then he will remain in Division 2?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Except that section 10 provides that his status shall not be prejudicially affected by this Act.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the prejudice—that he shall be eligible?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You cannot affect his salary.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 10 says that he shall be eligible, but there is nothing to guarantee that he is going to get the $1,600. If it is not considered desirable to promote such a man, he will remain in Division 2, the maximum of which is $1,500.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think my hon. friend is wrong. I move to strike out the words "had theretofore" at the end of the third line of subsection 3 of section 48, and to substitute instead the word "have." That will make the reading clearer.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. PEDLOW: Before we leave this section, there is a matter of unfinished business from Saturday night. The Acting Minister of Finance will remember that we were discussing a matter of transfers. I refer to section 18, subsection 2.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot revert to section 18 unless he has the unanimous consent of the committee. There was an understanding with the Acting Minister of Finance that two or three clauses should be reverted to when we had concluded the discussion on the Bill, but I do not think I could allow the hon. member to revert to them at this stage.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will consent to that when we have reached the end of the Bill.

Mr. PEDLOW: Very well.

Section agreed to.

On section 51—who to act in absence of deputy head:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move to amend subsection 1 of section 51 by striking out the word "minister" wherever it occurs in the said subsection and inserting instead the word "head." It means the deputy head.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is subsection 2 of section 51 new? I see it is marked as an amendment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The only change in that subsection is that the term "an Assistant Auditor General" is used instead of "chief clerk."

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister assure us that this does not in any way conflict with or weaken the clause in the Revenue and Audit Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would not think so.

Section agreed to.

On section 52—Private secretaries, appointment and salaries:

Mr. MURPHY: I observe that one of these clauses is new. Would my hon. friend explain the difference between it and the old section?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the present Act any person chosen to be a minister's private secretary may, without examination and irrespective of age, be appointed a clerk in Subdivision A of the First Division or Subdivision A of the Second, and he may be appointed permanently to that position when the minister retires. The result of that rule was to throw periodically a large number of private secretaries into the higher Subdivisions of the service, and frequently there was not employment for them. The purpose of this new clause is to prevent that practice. Of course, the minister may select as his private secretary some one already in the Civil Service. If he brings some one in from outside, Parliament must vote the salary, and in that event I assume it would be necessary to give a larger sum than is now being paid private secretaries.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: But the appointment would not be permanent in that case?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it the intention to make a distinction in the annual vote for private secretaries? Heretofore, and at present, the estimates provide in addition to the salary for the private secretary, a sum of $600. In future, I take it, that rule will obtain only where the private secretary is a member of the Civil Service, and that if a new man is brought in, not a member of the service, he will not be voted the $600, but will get his salary in one sum and his appointment will not necessarily be permanent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He goes out with the minister.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not like the English of clause 2. It says "no salary shall be payable." The amount will be payable the moment the man earns it. I think "no salary shall be paid" would be better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have used the same wording as in the present Act.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the purpose of that clause?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose the idea was to circumvent any attempts to pay the

ministers' secretary in any other way, by Order in Council, for instance.

Section agreed to.

On section 54—Census and election audit temporaries, appointment of and duration of service:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move to amend this section by striking out the word "decennial," in line 18, and again in line 26. The reason for this is that a quinquennial census is held in the West. The wording of the section, of course, restricts the provision to a decennial census.

Mr. MURPHY: If a quinquennial census is held why not restrict the term of employment to less than three years?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You could not make it less than that.

Mr. MURPHY: Two years would do for a quinquennial census. It was the large amount of work connected with a decennial census that was responsible for three years being specified. A quinquennial census will take less time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In addition to the quinquennial census in the West we still have the decennial census.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 55—organization, classification and salaries of Outside Service:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of this section is just the same as that of section 10 with respect to the Inside Service. This will empower the commissioners to investigate and study the conditions of the Outside Service in all its details and make a general report to the Governor in Council in respect to it. Upon the adoption of that report by the Governor in Council, the reorganization of the Outside Service will take place. The section is intended to give power to the commission to carry on that work.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the minister in a position to tell us when this classification and reorganization is likely to take place?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The commission purpose to do it during the year if it is at all possible to overtake the work. They hope, however, to do it during the summer.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it expected that this classification will better the condition of any parties in the Outside Service? Are they likely to get more salary by reason of this classification than they now receive?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is hoped that the position of the Outside Service will be improved. A portion of it is now classified but a great deal is not. It is very desirable to have a classification of the service and I submit that it would be in the interest of the members of the Service.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad that one of the commissioners is here. I bring to his notice a condition of things that he will find in the country. He will find some men, say, in the Customs Department, who have been appointed for nearly twenty years, doing first-class work and getting $1,000 a year, while others who have been appointed within the last two or three years are getting $1,200 or $1,300 and doing an inferior grade of work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We hope to remove those inequalities and injustices through this investigation.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope they will be entirely removed. I am not saying that the fellow who is getting $1,300 is getting too much, but I say that the other fellow is getting too little.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain why this section is not made applicable to the railway employees? The question is brought to our attention again by an item in to-day's paper stating that the Government has purchased three new lines of railway in New Brunswick. There will be such an army of employees connected with the Government railways that patronage will be more rampant than heretofore unless these organizations are brought under the Act. What is the objection to bringing the railway employees under the Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: So many difficulties would be encountered in applying the Act to this service that we did not feel we could do it without a special study and investigation of that service. We hope during the year to have a special report from the commission upon the railway service.

Mr. MURPHY: But this Act is specially drawn so that it will not apply to that service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Until it is brought into force.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Did the minister make any inquiry as to whether the instructions sent out to the railway management were printed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not had an opportunity of making the inquiry, but I will get that information.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps the question that I am about to ask has already been answered in the course of the discussion but I think it is desirable that the committee should have a clear understanding as to the application of this Bill. Am I correct in assuming that this will cover all classes of appointments to the public service of any kind in the Dominion of Canada except those specially excepted under section 41?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: All classes of the service in the Dominion of Canada except employees on railways and ships as already mentioned?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Deputy heads, members of commissions, and boards, especially appointed for particular work by the Government.

Mr. FIELDING: Would a returning officer be appointed under this Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I think the Elections Act would cover that.

Mr. FIELDING: This is a later Act, and the later Act governs.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I think not.

Mr. FIELDING: Will it take in the lighthouse service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The lighthouse service would come within the Act.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Would the officials and staff of the High Commissioner in Great Britain and also the commission lately appointed at Washington come under the Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The staff of the High Commissioner's office in London would come under the provisions of this Act. The Canadian War Commission office in Washington would not, I think, come under the Act. It is a temporary war organization, and I hardly think it would come under the Act, though possibly it might.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It might continue for some years. If one is under the Act the other should be; it is a part of the public service.

Mr. MURPHY: The answer that the minister gave me about railway employees being brought under the operation of this Act cannot be correct, taking it in conjunction with the reply which my hon. friend gave to the question asked by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), that they might be brought in under the Act, but by this Act they are specially exempted and excepted. Therefore, no work done by the Civil Service Commission during the recess could possibly bring the railway employees under this Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Except that we could base legislation upon that report. If the commissioners were able to devise some practical method of putting the railway employees under the Act we could amend this Act next session.

Mr. MURPHY: My point is that under this Bill the railway employees are excepted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Certainly.

Mr. MURPHY: And I am asking my hon. friend why?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have explained that very many times.

Mr. MURPHY: By merely saying that there are difficulties in the way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are fifteen or twenty thousand Government railway employees in this country.

Mr. MURPHY: Which means fifteen or twenty thousand cases of patronage.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Which means that it would be necessary, as I stated this afternoon, to have the Civil Service Commission sitting at Moncton practically all the time, because employees are entering the service pretty nearly daily, and it would be impossible to administer the Act without having some branch of the commission located at that point. There are many other difficulties to be surmounted, and the Government concluded that it was not practicable to apply the Order in Council to that branch of the public service at the present time, but we purpose giving the matter consideration in the future.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I draw the attention of the minister to the Order in Council which says:

> The following rules shall be observed in all departments of the Government with respect to appointments to the public service.
>
> In any case where the knowledge and ability requisite for any position in the Outside Service are wholly or in part professional or technical, a person shall only be appointed to such position in the manner prescribed by section twenty-one of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, for similar appointments to the Inside Service.

and no appointments shall be made under the rule to the Outside Service, or under section twenty-one of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, to the Inside Service, unless the Civil Service Commission determines that the position is wholly or in part professional or technical.

Will that rule apply to railroad employees under the Order in Council which abolishes patronage?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Order in Council includes the canal employees of the Railway Department, but does not include the railway employees. I have left it entirely with the general managers to take on whoever they require in case a vacancy occurs. Since I have been in charge of the department I do not know of one appointment that I have recommended, or one appointment that I have asked the general manager of either road to make. Therefore, the procedure following is practically the same as if the Civil Service Act were in force with respect to the employees of Government railways. It would hardly be possible to apply the present Bill in the operation of the Government railway system. As hon. gentlemen doubtless know, there are organizations of almost every kind of employees on the Government railways. For instance, the engine drivers have their organization, and in case of a vacancy the next man in order of seniority must get the promotion, and there is no way in which the manager can interfere with that arrangement. There is an agreement with all of the different organizations. The conductors, the brakemen, and the baggagemen, all have their several unions, and we could not possibly promote the members of those unions in accordance with the terms of the present Bill. The only exception might be where new appointees came in and started their services under the Railways Department. I have felt that appointments should be left entirely to the head of whatever portion of the railway system it came under, and that system has been working well, and I shall continue it so far as I am concerned.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Will the minister give us his assurance that he will instruct the general manager that he is not to use political patronage? That will be quite satisfactory to hon. gentlemen on this side as well as to the general public.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have given him those instructions.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the minister say that he has given instructions to the general manager and the superintendents of the road in regard to the question of patronage?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have had the general managers here and have told them to use their own judgment in the taking on of employees wherever it is necessary, and to eliminate patronage of any kind. My instructions were to use their own judgment, and so far as I can see everything in that regard has been working very satisfactorily, and I have not heard of any complaint.

Mr. J. D. SINCLAIR: Then it is open to the foremen of the roundhouses and the different shops to take on any young man who applies for a position without any recommendation from a member of Parliament, or from any patronage committee? Will the minister say that is now the position of affairs—that the foremen are at liberty to make a selection without any recommendation whatever?

Mr. J. D. REID: All I can say is that I have left the matter to the general manager. I gave instructions to the general manager, and I judge that is the policy he is pursuing. Whatever he thinks is the right policy to follow in the best interests of the railway he is carrying out, and that system must be working very satisfactorily because I have received no complaints whatever. The same thing applies to the vessels that are owned by, or under the control of the Government Railway system. We have several steamships in connection with our railway system, and I have not interfered in any way, shape, or form with the employees that the general manager may think best to engage in connection with them. I feel that on the proper operation of the railway system, as well as of the vessels under our control, "safety first" should be the policy of the general manager and his staff.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Were the instructions given in writing or were they verbal?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think the instructions were verbal, but I will make search and see if any letter was written on the subject. If so, I would have no objection to producing it when the railway estimates are considered. I can look up and see if there was any letter written. If there was I will have no objection to producing it when I am on my estimates. But I know that I have told them that they were to use their own judgment, and I hold them responsible for the operating of the road and for the employees on the road.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand that you told them that they were to eliminate patronage entirely, not only told them to carry on the business to the best of their ability, but that they are distinctly to eliminate the old patronage system.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I would like to know whether the various officers of the railroad, the superintendents, roadmasters and master mechanics, have been made aware of those instructions which the hon. gentleman says he gave the general manager?

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps it would be better to deal with that when we come to my estimates. I will give all the information in connection with the operation of the road at that time. I do not want to raise a discussion on railway matters when we are dealing with the Civil Service.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Yes, but we must eliminate patronage on the railway as well as in other departments.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know how much plainer I can make the matter. All I can say is that I have left entirely in the hands of the general manager the engaging of employees in connection with the Government railway system. I have not gone any further than the general manager in issuing any orders. Any orders from the general manager to those under him must be on his own responsibility. It is to him, and to him alone, they are responsible.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Of course, but we cannot speak to the general manager here, and we can speak to the minister. I would like the various officers of the railway to be made aware of these instructions so that they need not take into consideration the recommendations given by the hon. gentleman's political friends in the various constituencies along the line, to men who desire employment on the railway system.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I would suggest to the minister that he put his instructions in writing to the general manager, and that will settle the whole matter. It will only take a few minutes to write the letter.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the statement made by the Acting Minister of Finance that the Civil Service Commission will carry out an investigation during the recess with a view to the reorganization and classification of the service, and for the purpose of removing any inequalities, I desire to express my pleasure that a member of the commission is here this evening. There are two glaring inequalities which require to be removed. One of them is in connection with the salary of $10,000 paid to a gentleman referred to earlier in the evening by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy). His appointment and continuance in office is nothing less than a public scandal. This man is paid $10,000 a year for doing absolutely nothing of benefit to the people. My information is that the desire to get rid of him was so strong in Toronto University that they were at their wits' end to know where to dump him, and they finally dumped him upon this Government. I have been trying since the beginning of the session to ascertain what this gentleman does, and I can now tell this committee that he does nothing of any public benefit. I would suggest to the minister, and through him to the commission, that one of the first acts of the commission should be to put an end both to the job and to the salary. That is one inequality. Another inequality, just as farcical as showing the way public business is conducted in this country, will be found in another department of the Government. The commission will find a man in charge of 150 employees; they will find that man disbursing $12,000 per month as the pay-roll in that branch; they will find this man and these 150 employees handling and controlling, if my memory serves me correctly, over $30,000,000 in a year. Yet the man in charge of that branch gets the munificent salary of $1,800 per annum. That is as big a farce and as great a scandal as is the case of the ten-thousand-dollar-a-year man at the other end of the line. These are two inequalities to which I direct the attention of my hon. friend.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Who is the man last mentioned, and in what department is he?

Mr. MURPHY: There will be no trouble about locating him. I do not want to make the matter more plain at the moment.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to ask the Minister of Railways one question if he will permit me.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not on a railway matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know, but I draw the line. I do not want to ask the minister to write any letter, but will he permit me to write a letter to my friends saying that there is no patronage in employing section

men and trackmen generally, that the section foremen—

Mr. J. D. REID: I will permit the hon. member to write and say that I have given instructions to Mr. Hayes that he is to employ whomever he wishes, that there is no patronage so far as I am concerned. There is no one writing me to have employees put on, and if there were it would be entirely on their own responsibility. There is no patronage list that Mr. Hayes is to go by. He must use his own judgment and I hold him responsible.

Mr. MOWAT: I would not like the remarks of my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) to pass without some comment. Though I have a very slight acquaintance with the scientific gentleman he speaks of, and have no knowledge of how he came to be appointed, I have some knowledge of what he is supposed to do. The trouble with us always has been that in regard to scientific research we have been distinctly behind other countries. All countries were behind Germany in that respect. Germany was so expert and so secretive of her methods that she was able to take a place in mercantile affairs that was the envy of the world. We are now overcoming the secrets of Germany. If you leave scientific questions to business men alone, the outcome is that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. Professor MacCallum—there is no reason why his name should not be mentioned—has done in a short time work of almost incalculable benefit to certain businesses, and he proposes to have his laboratories here in Ottawa open to the employees of the different manufacturers so that they can come and experiment under direction and with certain apparatus. In all the big manufactories of the United States now, I am told, scientific men are employed to advantage for experimental and research work, and that is what is attempted to be done by this gentleman. I think my hon. friend is mistaken about his position, and he spoke with some heat. But I am sure that Professor MacCallum stood very high in the university, and they were very sorry indeed to lose his services.

Mr. MURPHY: I am much obliged to my hon. friend. If he thinks I spoke before with some heat, he will not think so now. If there is any doubt in the minds of the commission as to whether or not this gentleman should be displaced and returned to Toronto, that doubt has been removed by the explanation of my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat).

Section agreed to.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

On section 56—Repeal:

Mr. FIELDING: Ministers of the Crown have sometimes evaded the law by introducing into their estimates appropriations for some particular officers—possibly for just cause—adding to them the words: "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act." That had been the subject of criticism, and a clause was inserted in the Act declaring that such words in any appropriation Act should have no force or effect. I am not quite sure that the object was fully accomplished; I rather think that in some cases ministers were still able to evade the Act. So far as I can see, that provision has been dropped from this Bill. Has my hon. friend's attention been directed to it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The object was not accomplished by that provision in the Civil Service Act and it did not appear desirable that it should longer remain. It seemed peculiar that Parliament should in one Act say that salaries could not be voted in the estimates and then, in the same session, proceed to vote salaries in the estimates. However, during the present session an effort has been made to minimize the making of increases or providing of promotions through the estimates. It may have been done in one or two cases, but this year there are less than there ever were before.

Mr. BUREAU: At page 92 of the estimates there appears an item of $600,000, at the end of which I find the words: "appointments for the purpose may be made without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act."

Mr. MURPHY: Has any provision been substituted for the one which my hon. friend says has been dropped?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Section agreed to.

On schedule A:

Mr. BUREAU: Has the agreement which was made on Saturday, that these oaths should be changed, been carried out?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not understand that there was an agreement to change the schedules. It was understood that when we reached them my hon. friend might make his suggestions.

Mr. SIFTON: It was suggested that the oath of allegiance should be put in.

Mr. BUREAU: The old oath read as follows:

I.....solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfil the duties which devolve upon me as.....and that I will not ask or receive any sum of money, services, recompense or matter or thing whatsoever, directly or indirectly in return for what I have done or may do in the discharge of any of the duties of my said office, except my salary or what may be allowed me by law or by an order of the Governor in Council.

It was suggested by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that the oath of allegiance should be included there.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend does not suggest that the oath of allegiance should be put in the schedule? I do not see why that should be done. The oath of allegiance is not in the present Act; there is no reason why it should appear in any Act. The present oath, which my hon. friend has just read, is quite lengthy, and seems rather offensive in its phraseology. As given in the Bill the oath reads:

I (A. B.) solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfil the duties which devolve upon me as * * * So help me God.

The oath might very well end there, but the old form proceeded as my hon. friend has given it. I think the abridged affidavit in the schedule is preferable.

Mr. BUREAU: This is what took place Saturday night. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) was sitting where the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) is now, and the question arose of amending the form. Hansard reads:

Mr. Sifton: You can put in any conditions you like.

Mr. Bureau: But schedules A and B are part of the clause. If you pass the clause you cannot change them.

Mr. Sifton: My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance says he is going to make new sections.

Section agreed to.

That has reference to the schedule.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If it is the judgment of the committee that the oath should be restored to its old form, I have no objection. Personally I do not think it should.

Mr. BUREAU: All right.

Schedule A agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I move that section 32 of the Bill be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: By consent of the committee we revert to section 30. The member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has moved that the following be substituted as section 30:

30. Subject to the provisions of section three of this Act, the power to remove or dismiss any deputy head, officer, clerk or employee, shall vest in the Commission.

Before exercising such power, the Commission shall require a statement in writing, from the minister in the case of a deputy head, and from the deputy head in all other cases, giving the causes, reasons and facts invoked for such dismissal.

Upon receipt of such statement in writing the Commission shall forthwith communicate a copy of same to the deputy head or other employee whose dismissal is sought.

The deputy head or employee shall within three days after the receipt of copy of said statement file with the Commission a statement in writing in answer to such charges in default of which Commission may proceed on the statement submitted asking for dismissal.

Mr. BUREAU: I have already explained what I intend by this amendment. The power of appointment is, by the change that we made this afternoon, now vested in the commission. In section 42, subsection 3, we inserted the word "appoint" instead of the word "supply." We have, therefore, vested the appointing power in the commission, and I do not see why we should not vest the dismissing power in the commission. I do not desire to see an employee dismissed summarily; neither do I wish to see a man subject to any arbitrary action from any superior, and that is the reason why I have put in my amendment that he whose dismissal is sought shall have the right to know the reasons why the charges are made against him and the facts that are brought to justify his dismissal, and that he shall have the right within three days to file a statement in writing. My attention was called to the fact that three days was too short a time, because some Civil Service employees are quite a distance from here, say at the Coast. I am, therefore, willing that "three weeks" or "twenty days" should be inserted instead of three days. Within that period the employee has a right to answer the charges or justify himself in writing. Should the employee fail to write within the time limit, the commission, to whom the file is sent, may proceed ex parte and take into consideration the report and act upon it. If the object of this Bill is to do away with patronage, this amendment should carry. Patronage is exercised not in appointments only; the worst kind of patronage is exercised in dismissals. This Act has for its purpose to make the service efficient, to employ the best men and to make them feel they are going to be treated in the proper way by Parliament and by the commissioners, this amendment is just to protect them from any idea they may have that they may be

arbitrarily dealt with by deputy heads, or heads of departments, or any other party under whose control they may be. It is only fair that a man who is going to lose his bread and butter, who is charged with an offence or misconduct for which he is subject to dismissal, should at the very least have an opportunity of stating his case, so that hereafter if anybody should desire to look into the matter, there will not be only one side of it, but we shall be able to judge the case on its merits having heard both sides. I put this as a test whether the Government are really in earnest in bringing down this measure. If they want to do away with patronage, so far as positions are concerned, leaving aside the other part of patronage which has been called to the attention of the committee by my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), the power of appointment and the power of dismissal ought to rest with the same authority, and he who is to be dismissed ought at least to have the right to put his case before the body which is to decide as to his fate.

12 m.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Does the hon. member desire that such an official should be in charge of his office during the twenty days? I quite agree that he should be given twenty days in which to state his case, but when does the dismissal take effect? Is he continued in office and paid his salary during the twenty days?

Mr. BUREAU: I think there is a provision by which the head of the department has the right to suspend the man and the payment of his salary. Under that provision, I take it that the head of the department, or whoever is vested with the authority, has the power, if he thinks the offence is serious enough, to suspend from the day he writes the report the man whose dismissal is sought. In that case, the man would not be paid his salary and would not have any authority in his office.

An hon. MEMBER: Section 31.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, section 31 says:

> The head of a department, and in his absence the deputy head, may suspend from the performance of his duty or from the receipt of his salary any officer—

—and so on. The case is covered by that section.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The amendment of my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) ought to be accepted. The power of dismissal is just as important, indeed, I think it is more important and more dangerous, than the power of appointment so far as political interference or patronage is concerned. Parliament has always considered that to be so. In fact, when this Parliament wants to place a public official or servant above political patronage and to be sure of his impartiality, it enacts that the official cannot be dismissed by the Governor in Council, and that only a vote of the two Houses of Parliament can dismiss him. It so enacts in the case of judges, the Auditor General, the Civil Service Commissioners and other officers. It happens that the Governor in Council is entitled to appoint gentlemen to certain offices, but that the authority which makes the appointment has no power to dismiss those officers. Under the Bill as it stands, we are legislating in the opposite direction. The Governor in Council would be deprived of the power of making appointments, but would have the right to dismiss the officers it has not right to appoint. If the Government wants to do away altogether with the plague of patronage and political interference it should accept the amendment of my hon. friend; the Civil Service Commission should be empowered to make the dismissals as well as the appointments, and the Governor in Council should not interfere.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can only repeat what I have said two or three times in the earlier stages of the Bill, namely, that, in my opinion, the power of dismissal of its servants should rest with the Crown, and that power should not be bestowed upon any other body. It would, I think, be rather peculiar if the Crown delegated that power to any other body.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It delegates the power to appoint.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By a method of selection established by an Act of Parliament, the commission does select appointees to the Civil Service, but once they are appointed they are the servants and employees of the Crown, and the Crown should reserve the right of dismissal. There is no doubt that in the past, in the case of political appointments, the power of dismissal was abused by governments, but hon. gentlemen know that related almost entirely to the Outside Service. I never heard anybody complain about improper dismissals by the Government so far as the Inside Service is concerned, where appointments are made upon competitive ex-

amination and promotion depends upon merit. If dismissals have been improperly made from the Inside Service by the Crown in the past I do not know of any such case. Dismissals have been made, however, for cause. I hope that when the same principle which obtains in the Inside Service is applied to the Outside Service—appointment after competitive examination, and promotion upon merit—there will be no dismissals by the Government except for cause. I do not feel that the amendment should be accepted, and I trust that my hon. friend will not press it.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 21; nays, 38.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood that section 35 was left over for consideration.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I dropped that.

Mr. SHEARD: I understood from my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) before six o'clock that a clause was to be introduced copied from the United States Act limiting the number of members of the same family in different grades of the Service. I should like an expression of opinion from the minister on the advisability of inserting such a provision.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will give consideration to the matter, and if it seems a desirable thing to do, I shall submit it to the minister in charge of the Bill in the Senate. The section in the United States Act reads as follows:

> Whenever there are already two or more members of a family in the public service in the grades covered by this Act, no other mem- of such family shall be eligible to appointments to any of said grades.

Mr. MOWAT: The Toronto police force, under Chief Grassett, is supposed to be a highly efficient force. One of the principal objects of Chief Grassett in looking for men is to get members of the same family, if possible, as he says it works out much better. The men support each other better, there is loyalty between them, and altogether they make the best officers.

Mr. SHEARD: The Toronto police force is not under the control of a political body, so the chief's reasons would not apply in this case. I dwell upon the value of such a clause if it can be worked advantageously in the Civil Service Bill, because whatever we may say to the contrary, instances such as those to which attention has been drawn on the floor of the House are interpreted by the public, whether rightly or wrongly, as due to some influence being brought to bear in the securing of appointments, and influence which ought not to prevail; that is the general impression, and members of the House are called upon to explain why these things happen. I do not affirm that it is even true, but if some provision could be included in the Act that would enable members of Parliament to be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion, it ought to be included.

Mr. CURRIE: When section 3 was under discussion I suggested that the commission should consist of five members, two of whom should be returned soldiers, and I beg to move that amendment now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will make a statement on that point on the third reading of the Bill. Perhaps my hon. friend will withdraw his amendment in the meantime.

Amendment withdrawn.

Bill as amended reported, and amendments concurred in.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order being called for the second reading of Bill No. 70, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act—(Hon. J. D. Reid):

Mr. BUREAU: Surely the second reading is not going to be pressed on the House now. I was told in the lobby this evening that my hon. friends opposite had prepared for an all-night session by organizing relief squads.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. BUREAU: Why "Order"? We are not going to be treated like slaves. That is what I was told, and I have reason to believe it is true.

Mr. REID: I have no desire to go on with the Bill to-night if there is any objection.

Mr. BUREAU: There is objection.

Mr. J. D. REID: I thought we might get into committee and make a start on the Bill, but if there is objection I will not press the second reading.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no objection. I object to the principle of certain clauses.

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to state here that my hon. friend is entirely in error in stating there was any organization on this side of the House to keep this thing going all night by relief squads. Whoever told my hon. friend that was drawing on his imagination, because no such thing was planned.

Mr. BUREAU: If I am in error, I am glad to acknowledge it. I hope I shall not have again to refer to the same point.

Mr. CARVELL: Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

RELEASE OF HON. DR. BELAND, M.P.

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE BY HON. MR. LEMIEUX AND SIR ROBERT BORDEN.

During the consideration of the Civil Service Bill in the Committee of the Whole:

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I may perhaps be out of order but I cannot resist the temptation of informing the committee that a press despatch has been received stating that Hon. Dr. Beland has been released and is coming home.

Mr. BUREAU: Three cheers for Dr. Beland.

Hon. members rose, gave three cheers for Dr. Beland, and sang "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have received a cablegram from Sir George Perley with respect to Hon. Dr. Beland's release, which reads:

London, May 13th, 1918.

The Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Have telegram from Beland at Rotterdam saying he has been released from Germany Am personally delighted, and am sure this news will be most welcome to you and all other Canadians.

Perley.

Following the reading of the cablegram, hon. members rose in their seats and cheered.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I might add that I communicated to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, three days ago, I think, the news that Dr. Beland's release was likely to take place, but we were under injunction to say nothing about it in public. I am very glad that the anticipation then conveyed to us has now been fulfilled. All of us who know Dr. Beland have the very highest appreciation of his character, of his ability and of his services as a public man. We have all been greatly distressed by the fact that he has been detained so long in Germany and has endured such hardships, and there is none who will not join, as we have joined just now, in the most warm recognition of the fact that he has been set at liberty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In justice to the right hon. the Prime Minister and to Sir George Perley, I might add that since the internment of our dear colleague, Dr. Beland, the Prime Minister and the Government have done their utmost to have him released.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 12.17 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, May 14, 1918.

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

CENSORSHIP REGULATIONS.

OPINION OF MR. SPEAKER ON QUESTION RAISED BY MR. J. A. CURRIE.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the question asked of me yesterday by the hon. member for North Simcoe, I beg to state that the proper manner for the House to express its disapproval with regard to any order passed by the Governor General in Council is to move a humble address to the Crown. The authorities are as follows:

"The subjects upon which addresses are presented are too varied to admit of enumeration. They have comprised every matter of foreign or domestic policy; the administration of justice; the confidence of Parliament in the ministers of the Crown; the expression of congratulation or condolence, and in short, representations upon all points connected with the government and welfare of the country." (May, p. 546).

Bourinot is to the same effect, as follows:

"It is now the usage to move for addresses only with respect to matters affecting Imperial interests, the regal prerogative, or the Governor in Council." (Bourinot, p. 2456).

"The subjects on which the two houses may address the sovereign or his representative in this country are too numerous to be detailed at length. They may relate to every matter of public interest, to the administration of justice, to commercial relations, or to the political state of the country; in short, to all subjects connected with the Government and the welfare of the dominions." (Bourinot, p. 259).

PRIVILEGE— MR. McQUARRIE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the privilege of the House to refer to a report which appears in the two Ottawa papers this morning in reference to the debate on the Civil Service Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member rise to a question of privilege?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes. I find in the Journal-Press of to-day, an article reading as follows:

Appointments Within Province.

W. G. McQuarrie, New Westminister, moved an amendment providing that, except as to the city of Ottawa, appointments in any province should, in so far as possible, be made from residents of that province. He said that, within the last few days, application had been made for an additional stenographer in the Government offices at New Westminster. He had been informed that one would have to be sent from Ottawa. He thought his amendment a reasonable one. It would not be advisable, of course, to have all the appointments made in Ottawa from Ontario.

Sir George Foster opposed the amendment on the score that its tendency would be to cultivate provincialism. The country, he said, should not be cut up into sections. There was no valid reason why a man from British Columbia should not have an opportunity of serving in any part of Canada.

H. H. Stevens (Vancouver Center) said that residents of British Columbia were not afforded proper opportunity to take part in competitive examinations. Owing to the short notice given it was impossible to compete and there were no examinations held in British Columbia at all.

Sir George Foster agreed that there should be equal opportunity given to residents of all the provinces.

Unless there were some safeguards provided, Mr. Cockshutt remarked, all the plums would go to residents of Ottawa and the large cities.

This is the particular part:

Sir Sam Hughes stated that when positions in the Civil Service were vacant they should whenever possible, be filled by men residing in the constituencies in which the vacancy occurs.

An amendment to this effect was moved by Mr. Maclean and carried by the House. It had no reference to the inside service.

Mr. McQuarrie's amendment stood over.

As a matter of fact, the last part of that report to the effect that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) was accepted is not correct. I have in Hansard of yesterday the amendment which was finally proposed by the hon. the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean) and adopted. It is this:

Excepting as to the Inside Service, all appointments to any position in a province shall, so far as practicable, be made from bona fide residents of such province.

The point being in regard to the province and not to the constituency as had been suggested by the hon. member for Victoria. The remarkable part of this is that the other paper, the Ottawa Citizen, publishes an exactly similar report in almost the same words. It seems to me a most remarkable thing that two papers of such standing as the Citizen and the Journal Press——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is not in order for the hon. member to discuss the why and wherefore of the publication of certain articles in newspapers. If the hon. member wishes to take exception to any statement published in the press it is competent for him to do so.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In another part of the Citizen of yesterday, on the front page, there is a statement to this effect:

Mr. McQuarrie of New Westminster wanted soldiers to be exempt from examination, but Hon. A. K. Maclean, who is piloting the Bill through the House, thought that this would not be in the best interest of the service, although declaring that the returned soldier must be looked after. In withdrawing his amendment, Mr. McQuarrie expressed the belief that the House would be willing to adopt it next session.

I wish to deny that I made a proposal of that kind. What I suggested was in the form of an amendment to the effect that the Civil Service Commission should be given the power in certain cases, at their discretion, to exempt soldiers from taking this examination. I might also point out in this connection that this morning's edition of The Journal-Press has exactly the same paragraph, also on the front page.

DELEGATION OF CANADIAN FARMERS.

REQUEST TO BE RECEIVED BY THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. T. VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the conference of farmers now assembled in Ottawa have communicated with you requesting the favour of being received by this House. I would like to know whether my information is correct, and if so, whether it is your intention to communicate that information to the House for immediate consideration, as the conference is likely to conclude its work during the day, and if the House intends to appoint an hour to receive the farmers it must be done right away.

Mr. SPEAKER: In answer to the hon. member, I may say that I have just received a communication from the Chairman of the meeting at the Russell Theatre.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the gentleman's name?

Mr. SPEAKER: R. H. Halbert. It would perhaps be in order for me to communicate the letter to the House.

Russell Theatre,
Ottawa, Ont., May 14th, 1918.

The Honourable
E. N. Rhodes,
Speaker, House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir:

On behalf of several thousand Ontario farmers, I beg to transmit to you the following resolution just passed, and to say that, encouraged by the reception recently accorded the President of the American Federation of Labour, we are confident the request will be granted.

"That this meeting instruct the chairman respectfully to ask the House of Commons to receive him and two delegates he shall name, at the sitting of the House this afternoon, to hear their address upon the situation in the country and asking that democracy be honoured in the prosecution of the war and all other matters of Government."

The messenger who brings this will respectfully await an answer.

I am,
Most respectfully,
(Signed) R. H. Halbert,
Chairman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, did you say the letter is from the Ontario farmers?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Ontario farmers. It is, of course, for the House to determine as to what its desire may be in the premises, but so far as I am aware there has not been a case where the course asked for in this communication has been followed. The reference to the presence in this Chamber of the President of the American Federation of Labour is hardly in point, because he was the representative of a great organization in another country. The right Hon. Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Viviani, were also received by this House. In all three cases the privilege was accorded to gentlemen from outside Canada, and it seems to me, with all deference to this organization, that it is a precedent which it may be somewhat dangerous to establish. If I may venture to say so, the receiving of one organization in this country will open the door for similar cases in great numbers to follow. However, I leave the question to the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Do I understand the communication comes from the farmers of Ontario, or from the farmers of the whole of Canada?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) It comes from the President of the Ontario farmers.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: My understanding is that the request was to come, and did come, from all the farmers assembled in this city representing not only the farmers of Ontario but those of other provinces.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That makes the case all the stronger. There can be no doubt that Mr. Speaker, having given communication to the House of the request made this morning by the farmers who are assembled in the city, has discharged his duty. Mr. Speaker has no further power in this matter. If action is to be taken it must come from the House itself, and that action, of course, is expected to be directed by the leader of the House for the time being.

Your statement, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labour, belonged to another country, does not constitute a good precedent. I imagine that the representatives of a Canadian association should have as much privilege here as the representative of an association of another country. I would further point out that in 1910 the Canadian House of Commons received a delegation of farmers from the West who presented a petition on the subject of reciprocity with the United States. It is true that delegation was not received with the Speaker in the Chair, but they were received in the Chamber of the House, the Government and their supporters, and members of the Opposition, being present, But, of course, the matter is in the hands of the Government for them to take action.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to the delegation of farmers from the West, I was a member of the House at the time and I distinctly recall that they were not received by the House in session. The delegation merely had the privilege of entrée to the House of Commons Chamber, and there they addressed the Government. That is an entirely different matter. However, we cannot dispose of the matter on the Orders of the Day.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think at the time the delegation came from the West they were given full control of the Chamber, and the ministers and members of the House were merely there for the time being as visitors.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is that the House was not in session.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Speaker was not in the Chair, that is all the difference there was.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite concur with the remarks made by the Speaker

with reference to this matter. The leader of the Government is at the present time engaged with the same delegation at another place, and whatever action is taken should not, I think, be taken in his absence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will communicate this request—or if not I, the Speaker of the House will communicate it— to the leader of the Government, and an intimation will be made at the opening of this afternoon's session as to what action will be taken. For myself, I would have no objection at all to the delegation being allowed, with the Speaker's concurrence, the opportunity of addressing the members of the House for a time after the House rises at six o'clock. That would place the present privilege on a parity with that granted on the occasion of the western delegation (which I remember perfectly well), of addressing members of the Government and members of the House.

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, Bill No. 86, to amend the Daylight Saving Act, 1918, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon. Bill considered in committee, reported and read the third time.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

RENEWAL OR POSTPONEMENT OF PAYMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMPANY.

On the order to resume the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) for the second reading of Bill No. 87, an Act supplementary to chapter twenty-four of the Statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At the conclusion of last night's sitting it was announced that we would proceed to-day with the Railway Bill, which was to be the first Order of the day. We were prepared to discuss that Bill this morning.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: May we not advance this Bill a bit?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection at all, but that was not the Order which was set down. Yesterday we inquired what was to be taken up to-day, and were told the Railway Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was the intention to take up the Railway Bill, but the Acting Minister of Finance thought it well to advance the Canadian Northern Railway Bill before we proceeded with the Railway Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: All right.

On motion of Mr. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 87 was read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—Guarantee on renewal or postponement of payments.

Mr. CAHILL: Before this clause carries, I think the country is entitled to further information on the subject of the Canadian Northern railway. From the statement furnished by the Acting Minister of Finance on May 10th, as of September 30, 1917, the total liabilities are shown in round figures as $592,000,000. After deducting from that amount the total capital stock of $100,000,000; the stock of subsidiary companies, some $5,900,000; the reserves of $4,900,000; the affiliated companies advance account of $9,000,000, and the surplus of $34,000,000, there is a balance remaining to be assumed by the country of $437,000,000. According to the statement submitted to the Government by the Drayton-Acworth Commission appointed by the Government to investigate the value and assets of the Canadian Northern railroad, the maximum possible cost of the road would be $370,000,000. From this amount should be deducted the cash subsidies of $38,000,000, the land grant on which cash has been received to the amount of $16,000,000 and land on hand, making a total of $75,000,000. If we deduct this $75,000,000 from $370,000,000, it leaves a balance of $295,000,000 as the total investment in the road, exclusive of the cash subsidies and the land grant. Deducting that amount from $437,000,000 would leave a profit to the promoters of $142,000,000. This road comprises some 9,600 miles, which, divided into the total amount of $437,000,000, would make the cost $46,000 per mile. According to the Drayton-Acworth report, the cost should be $31,000 per mile. In other words, there is a profit to the promoters of $15,000 a mile. Sessional Paper 237, giving a statement of the Canadian Northern railway as of June 30, 1916, shows unguaranteed securities at $147,000,000, and from these reports, both the report submitted a few days ago and last year's report, it is apparent that there is a matter of $142,000,000 of promoters' profits.

It may be interesting to the committee and to the country to know if this $147,000,000 of unguaranteed securities represents the amount of water which has been injected into this capital of $142,000,000. The statement last year showed total liabilities of $578,000,000; the statement submitted on May 10 shows liabilities of $592,000,000. The property investment has also been written up $16,000,000 since the last statement was submitted to the House—from $494,000,000, to $510,000,000. No explanation has been offered of what these amounts represent. The committee is entitled to know what are the total assets of the Canadian Northern Railway company, the total assets and liabilities of the subsidiary companies, and the names of the stockholders and holders of securities. Apparently $140,000,000 of the country's money is going to somebody—the people would like to know to whom. We should also be informed who are the holders of the other $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 of common stock. This information has been asked for repeatedly in the House but has never been submitted. In their statement of May 1, 1918, the Canadian Pacific Railway company say:

> The total capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's transportation system, comprising 13,400 miles of railway in Canada operated directly by the company, with the rolling stock equipment and steamboat craft on inland waters, its splendid terminal stations and facilities, and other accessories, is $623,000,000.

If you divide 13,400 into the amount of capitalization of this company, you find that $46,000 a mile is the cost of the Canadian Pacific railway, containing over one thousand miles of double track, and including terminal facilities, hotels and steamships. We are asked to pay for the Canadian Northern Railway system an amount equal to the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway company. It may be asked how the promoters of the Canadian Northern got this amount of money or these securities above the actual cost of the road. The answer is quite simple. The Government auditors, investigating whether Mackenzie and Mann made any money out of the Canadian Northern, come to the conclusion that they did not. But the auditors did not go as far as the Northern Construction company, which is another Mackenzie and Mann organization. This is the procedure. The Canadian Northern made a contract with Mackenzie and Mann at a certain amount per mile. Mackenzie and Mann let a contract to the Northern Construction company at the same price, and the Northern Construction company, in turn do some of the work and let contracts to sub-contractors. The Mackenzie and Mann Northern Construction Company get the profits; the Mackenzie and Mann Construction Company get the common stock—but the Mackenzie and Mann Northern Construction Company and the Mackenzie and Mann Construction Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company are one and the same people. According to statements furnished by the Government and by the Canadian Northern, they have loaded this enterprise to the extent of $15,000 a mile, practically the cost of the road through the whole prairie section. We are told by the Prime Minister that the Government have safeguarded the interests of the people by appointing their own directors on the directorate of the Canadian Northern. Let me call attention to the names of these Government directors. There is Mr. William K. George, of Toronto, who has been in the Standard Silver Plating business, and I believe, is somewhat of a political acrobat. Then there is Mr. Graham Bell, an accountant, I understand, in the Civil Service, under the title of financial comptroller—a glorified name for bookkeeper. Then there is Mr. Edward Rogers Wood of Toronto, who is president of the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company, vice-president of the National Trust Company, vice-president of the Brazilian Traction Light and Power Company, director of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, director of the Toronto Street Railway Company.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He is not a Government director.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend has stated that he is.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Christie, Mr. George and Mr. Bell.

Mr. CAHILL: That is not the information given on Hansard.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Hansard may be wrong.

Mr. CAHILL: It should be correct.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The difference is not very serious, anyway.

Mr. CAHILL: The difference is not serious, because all the directors now on the directorate of the Canadian Northern Railway Company might be put in a bag and shaken up—and it would not matter which

one the Government put their hand on and named as their director, for they are practically all the same. The information as to the Government directors was given by the Acting Minister of Finance during the course of his statement a few days ago in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway system. If we have no further interest in this enterprise than to appoint such men as these on the board of directors, at least we should, before we vote any further moneys, have a complete statement from the Government as to where these moneys are going and where we expect to end up in connection with this Canadian Northern Railway system. We seem to be getting in deeper all the time. Our liabilities have gone up $13,000,000 to $16,000,000 since last year, on account of this railway system—and the end is not yet. We have not taken over the road; we have not appointed directors who are taking an active part in its management. We are still handing millions to Mackenzie and Mann, and unless we can shake Mackenzie and Mann loose of this proposal the country will not stand for the payment of any further money to it. We should eliminate Mackenzie and Mann from the board of directors, lock stock and barrel, and put in charge men who can manage and operate the road in a businesslike way. You may say that Mackenzie and Mann are in a better position to manage the road than any new persons coming in. I submit that Mackenzie and Mann built the road for the profits that they made out of its construction, and the figures given by the Acting Minister of Finance prove this. Before any further money is voted, the committee should have full information on this subject. The Government have made no statement about what they intend to do in the matter. The question was raised yesterday whether the Government were going to appoint a commission to manage the road, and it was stated that they had formed no plan. Before we make further investment in the enterprise we should form some definite plan of management of the road.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I explained to the House on a previous occasion the purpose of this resolution and of the legislation which is to be based on it. Securities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company mature this year, which they desire to renew, with as small a payment upon principal as possible. That is a businesslike request, and I cannot understand why there should be any objection to it. Legislation was passed last year enabling us to make advances to the Canadian Northern Railway Company to an amount not exceeding $25,000,000.

That amount was disbursed largely in maturity and interest payments. A detailed statement of the expenditures was placed on the table of the House at an early date in the session. Hon. gentlemen will understand that, if the Government can assist the railway in renewing notes or securities maturing during the year, it is in the interest of the road and of the country. My hon. friend wants some more information. I thought I gave him all the information he could possibly require, and I really do not know of any other information I can give him.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister can give the names of the owners of the $9,000,000 worth of stock.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I purpose doing that.

Mr. CAHILL: He can also give the names of the owners or pledgees of the securities. He can give the names of the people to whom this money is to be paid, and he can give the whole policy of the Government in regard to this railroad.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not understand what my hon. friend means when he says I might give information as to whom the money was paid.

Mr. CAHILL: The graft money, $25,000,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The information with reference to the $25,000,000 is to be found in a return submitted to Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: The return simply gives the name of the subsidiary companies on account of whom it was paid, but not to whom it was paid.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We could get that also.

Mr. CAHILL: The return says: Canadian Northern Railway Company, $9,000,000; Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, $2,000,000, and so on. It is Canadian Northern right through. The total is $25,000,000, and the dates on which it was paid are November 19, 1917, $12,500,000; November 28, 1917, $2,000,000, and so on down until February 4, 1918, making a total of $25,000,000. Where did this money go to? Who stands between the treasury

and the people who are getting this money, if it is not the minister?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The authority for the payment of the amount referred to by the hon. member is to be found in an Act of Parliament of last year, and the amount was largely expended in respect to securities of the Canadian Northern railway which matured last year.

Mr. CAHILL: To whom was it paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: One cannot tell that. I suppose it is possible to tell who were the holders of the securities and who presented them, but that would be of little information to the House. If my hon. friend thinks it is important to him to have that information, I suppose we can get it for him. But these payments were made by the Government, of course, after investigation and audit, and the Government was satisfied that they were obligations which they had authority to pay.

Mr. VIEN: The minister said that the amount was expended largely in the payment of securities maturing. Did it cover them entirely or only in part?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was expended in paying bonds maturing, interest, equipment notes and some construction work.

Mr. VIEN: We should like to have information in detail in regard to that, how much was for bonds maturing, how much for equipment, how much for interest, how much to banks for commissions.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall endeavour to have that on the second reading of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have passed the second reading of the Bill. When shall we have the information?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This afternoon. I was asked to give the names of the holders of the share capital of the company as held to-day. They are as follows:

	No. of Shares.
Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada in trust for His Majesty	910,000
Lazard Brothers & Co.	22,500
Mackenzie Mann & Co., Ltd., transferred in blank and deposited with province of British Columbia, Order deposited with Minister of Finance	16,000
Z. A. Lash	13,020
Mackenzie Mann & Company, Limited, in trust	12,660
Sir John Aird & H. V. F. Jones, in trust	10,000

	No. of shares.
The British Empire Trust Company, Limited	3,240
D. B. Hanna	2,600
R. M. Horne-Payne	2,520
Bank of Scotland	2,000
Lewis Lukes	2,000
D. C. Rea and E. B. McInery, in trust	1,000
W. H. Moore	1,000
A. J. Mitchell	1,000
William Mackenzie	100
D. D. Mann	100
R. J. Mackenzie	100
E. R. Wood	100
W. J. Christie	20
W. K. George	20
G. A. Bell	20
Total	1,000,000

The last three are the Government directors who have shares allotted to them for qualification purposes, and, of course, those shares are held in trust for the Government. That accounts for the total issue of capital of 1,000,000 shares.

Mr. BUREAU: How many shares has each of the three last named on the list?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Twenty shares each.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that what is required by the by-laws?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I assume so.

Mr. BUREAU: When was this stock transferred to the Government? When did the Government become the owner of the stock by transfer? That question has been on the Order Paper in various forms, and the date has never been given.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: $40,000,000 worth of the capital of the Canadian Northern was in the hands of the Government some two or three years ago. On October 1, 1917, the balance of its holdings was transferred to the Minister of Finance in trust for His Majesty.

Mr. CAHILL: Can the minister tell me the standing of the $40,000,000 worth of stock, whether we have acquired that completely, or whether it is still the property of Mackenzie and Mann?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We hold it completely, and have held it for several years.

Mr. CAHILL: As security.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, as proprietors.

Mr. CAHILL: Out and out?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: That is under the old Act.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Will the minister give us an idea as to how much money will be required to renew certain of those obligations and on what dates he expects they should be renewed? That would be very important to know.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the present year?

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We estimate an amount not greater than $6,028,000. That was contained in the statement I gave to the House on Friday last. It is, however, possible that the Canadian Northern railway may be able to renew in full the obligations maturing this year.

Mr. VIEN: Has the Government paid to the Canadian Northern or any of the shareholders thereof any amount on account of the price to be paid for the expropriation of their shares?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. CAHILL: In reading the names of the holders of the $9,000,000 worth of shares, I see that they all sound familiar, as being among the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The names of Mr. Lash, Mr. Christie, and Mr. Horne-Payne were mentioned among others, as being the owners of the balance of the stock. Why is this $9,000,000 worth of stock not being taken over with the rest?

Mr. A .K. MACLEAN: The Government have authority to acquire it at any time. Section 2 of chapter 24 of the statutes of last year says:

> Upon the making of said agreement, at least five-sixths of the said six hundred thousand shares shall be transferred to the Minister of Finance in trust for His Majesty, and if there be any of the said six hundred shares not transferred as aforesaid, the Governor in Council may declare the said shares to be the property of the Minister of Finance in trust for His Majesty, and the same shall thereupon become the property of His Majesty and shall be paid for pro rata with the shares so transferred.

Mr. CAHILL: On what basis would that be?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would depend upon the award made by the arbitrators.

Mr. CAHILL: Why should we let Mackenzie and Mann hold out any of the stock?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are not holding it out. My hon. friend forgets that this country owns the road. Parliament practically unanimously decided last year to take the road over; I do not think more than two members of Parliament were opposed to it. The only difference of opinion was as to the amount which should be paid for the equity. The road belongs to the people of this country.

Mr. CAHILL: The debts.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are assuming the liabilities. As Parliament almost unanimously adopted last year the policy of taking over the road, we must, of course, assume the obligations of the road.

Mr. ROBB: Does the minister claim that the Canadian Northern Railway legislation was put through unanimously last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I speak subject to correction, but I think the policy of taking over the road was almost unanimously adopted by Parliament, the only difference being as to the amount paid for the equity.

Mr. ROBB: My recollection is that the legislation was put through by closure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not that part.

Mr. MURPHY: The whole thing.

Mr. CAHILL: If we own the road, why should we not manage it? Why should we leave Mackenzie and Mann and that ring still in control and coming to Parliament for further money? Apparently we own only the liabilities, and we have the privilege of handing out more money. The management of the road is a big business proposition and we should handle it ourselves. The management should have been taken over when the stock was acquired.

Mr. BUREAU: They run the country so they might as well run the road.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Finance last year, speaking about the appointment of a commission or a board to manage the road instead of the present board, said that the Government thought it advisable to leave the management as it was until the arbitrators made their award. In any event it will not be long before the Government will have full control of the road. It is undoubtedly a very important matter for deliberation as to how the road shall be managed. I do not know that the interests of the country have suffered by reason of the old directors remaining on the board up to the present time. We have representatives on that board.

Mr. CAHILL: Is that a statement of the Government's policy, that this same bunch

shall operate the road? The minister says the road is not losing any money.

Mr. MACLEAN: No. I said that possibly the country's interests were not suffering by reason of the old board continuing to manage the road. However, it is the intention of the Government to select its own board very shortly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does not my hon. friend believe that it was the intention of the Government last year to select their own board? Does he not believe that this is the time for the Government to make a statement as to their policy on this very question? We shall have a statement as to their policy in a very few days, so why not now? If we cannot have it now, why not postpone the Bill? Why put off from day to day the statement of the Government's policy in this matter? These are supposed to be the last days of the session. The Government expects to prorogue this week or next, and in a matter of this importance we are told that we shall have the information some time later. What is the objection to giving the information to the House now? I must say the Government is not treating the House with proper respect. They are not giving us the information which is due to Parliament on this very Bill. We were to have the information, but we have not got it. We were to be informed how this $25,000,000 had been spent, but we have not got that information. This sheet the minister has prepared is not satisfactory; it is not such a statement as we should have. The Government last year determined to acquire the stock of the company, and that stock is ours to-day. The only thing that remains to be done in connection with it is the fixing of the price, and that matter is now in the hands of the arbitrators. Until the arbitrators have made their award the Government, after acquiring five-sixths of the stock, may make advances to the company. Here is the law:

Upon the making of said agreement, at least five-sixths of the said six hundred thousand shares shall be transferred to the Minister of Finance.

That stock has already been transferred. Then what takes place?

So soon as the said five-sixths of the said shares have been transferred as aforesaid, the Governor in Council may assist—

Mark the words:

—may assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System, in paying and settling any indebtedness of such company or postponing the payment thereof on such terms as may be agreed upon, and for such purposes may make advances out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; Provided, however, that until authorized by Parliament, the total of such advances shall not exceed the sum of twenty-five million dollars.

Mark those words: The Government may make advances to settle any indebtedness of the company or to postpone the payment thereof. Under that section the Government have advanced to the road $25,000,000. The section continues:

A statement of any such advances, showing in detail the purposes for which they were applied, shall be presented to Parliament by the Minister of Finance within twenty days after the opening of the next ensuing session thereof.

There has been advanced to the road under that section $25,000,000, and a statement has been furnished to the House. What should have been in that statement? We should have been informed of the transactions which took place, and how much money was expended on each by the Government for the benefit of the country. All we know is that the company has received $25,000,000, as follows:

Nov. 19, 1917	$12,500,000 00
Nov. 28, 1917	2,540,421 97
Dec. 10, 1917	54,750 00
Dec. 27, 1917	1,983,503 47
Jan. 9, 1918	1,250,000 00
Jan. 18, 1918	2,000,000 00
Jan. 24, 1918	2,000,000 00
Jan. 30, 1918	2,017,460 77
Feb. 4, 1918	653,863 79
	$25,000,000 00

That statement shows the payments that have been made, out we want to know for what purpose those payments were made. Were they made to extinguish liabilities or simply to pay accounts. Were they made, as specified in the statute, in order that the money might be used.

—in paying and settling any indebtedness of such company or postponing the payment thereof on such terms as may be agreed upon.

What have we now? We have made them a loan of $25,000,000. Has that been used for the further construction of lines? No, it has been used to meet the following payments:

Principal of Construction Loans:	
Central Trust, Co., New York, Loan repaid..	$1,750,000 00
Guaranty Trust Co., New York, payment in reduction of loan..	300,000 00
Columbia Trust Co., New York, payment in reduction of loan..	1,500,000 00

We have a right to know upon what terms this reduction of loans has been made. Was

it upon the terms of the statute? There is not a word about that here. Is that treating the House with respect?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that the return gives the right hon. gentleman a good deal of information. That return has been on the table of the House for two months and if it were not satisfactory it would have been easy for him to have moved for more detailed information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On the contrary, we should know how this money was applied. We should know whether it was used in payment for the redemption of securities?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The statement shows that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, the statement does not show upon what terms the payment was made. Was it for increased interest? We have a right to know all this. There is no information upon these matters. Then we have:

Payment of principal of equipment bonds	$ 4,976,500 00
Payment of interest on equipment bonds	1,075,002 50
Interest and sinking fund on mortgage securities ranking prior to Canadian Northern Railway 4 per cent debenture stock guarantee by Dominion Government and interest on loans, etc.	
Canadian Northern Railway	$ 9,136,083 18
Canadian Northern Pacific Railway	2,117,301 76
Canadian Northern Alberta Railway	165,374 91
Canadian Northern Western Railway	622,619 83
Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway	202,056 00
Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway	570,552 87
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway	1,028,063 80
Central Ontario Railway	57,012 99
Bay of Quinte Railway	90,500 00
Mount Royal Tunnel & Terminal Co. Ltd.	582,741 58
Canadian Northern Quebec Railway	420,359 76
Quebec and Lake St. John Railway	172,363 32
Halifax and South Western Railway	233,467 50
Total	$25,000,000 00

Were all these securities extinguished?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Certainly; that is what the statement shows, in part at least.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not what the statement says.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does my right hon. friend mean to say that we should present the name of the holder of every bond which was retired?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I say that you should give a full statement of the transaction showing how you applied that $25,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I submit to my right hon. friend that if this statement is not entirely satisfactory a request should have been made two months ago for further information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No board of directors of any private corporation would be satisfied with such a statement as you have here. You should give full particulars of this whole transaction before you come and ask Parliament for further favours. I repeat that the Government is not treating the House with that respect to which it is entitled and is not giving it the information that it has a right to obtain.

Mr. BUREAU: The acting minister says that we have all the information that we require in this statement. I would like to ask him how much of the debenture stock has been transferred by the holders to the Government? Can he give us that information?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How much of the debenture stock?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What debenture stock?

Mr. BUREAU: The debenture stock you mention in your return, page 2, you say that the money is being used to pay "interest and sinking fund on mortgage securities ranking prior to Canadian Northern Railway 4 per cent debenture stock guaranteed by Dominion Government." Has this debenture stock been assigned?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When you pay debenture stock that has matured, it becomes extinguished.

Mr. BUREAU: When did this debenture stock mature?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A certain amount matured last year.

Mr. BUREAU: Of the debenture stock?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not understand that. In our part of the country debenture stock

is regarded as stock. It carries a certain rate of interest, but it does not depend on the fluctuations of the market.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, that is right, I had in mind bonds.

Mr. BUREAU: How much of that stock has been assigned to the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: None of it has been assigned to the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: Where is it? That is not a mortgage or a bond?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is held by the public.

Mr. BUREAU: It is perpetual?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Certainly

Mr. BUREAU: And the Government has no assignment of it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, and we do not expect to have.

Mr. BUREAU: And it is going to be outstanding?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Certainly.

Mr. BUREAU: Supposing under the by-laws of the Canadian Northern Railway Company the holders of this debenture stock are considered as stockholders instead of being considered as bond holders and should have a say in the administration of the railway.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It has no voting power.

Mr. BUREAU: That is information that this House ought to have. If the minister says it has no voting power I am willing to believe it, but there is nothing before the House to show the position of the ten or twelve railways which are subsidiary to the Canadian Northern or what special charters they may have. I have seen charters under which people holding debenture stock were entitled to have a say in the administration of the affairs of the company the same as those holding common or preferred shares. We know nothing about these companies. I submit, as has been said by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), this statement is absolutely incomplete and unless the person who made it thought we were better informed than he was, he must have come to the conclusion that we were such ignoramuses or know-nothings, that we did not deserve the information that is being sought. The comment made by my right hon. leader with reference to this statement is perfectly justified. May I be permitted to make a suggestion to the minister? This is one of the few Bills which I have seen which has come before the House without a preamble. I should like to have the date inserted in the Bill showing when the last amount of stock, making up the five-sixths, which was transferred to the Government. I would suggest that the following preamble be inserted in the Bill:

Whereas the five-sixths of the shares mentioned in section 3 of chapter 24 of the Statutes of Canada for the year 1917 having been transferred under agreement on the first day of October, 1917, as required by the said Act; therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

I think that would be better and would show the object of the Bill in addition to which we would have the distinct date of the transfer something that we have been seeking to get for such a long while.

Mr. J. D. REID: The date was given to the House in answer to a question some little time ago. The stock certificates for the five-sixths of the stock were transferred to the Minister of Finance on October 1, 1917. I witnessed the transfer myself; in fact, I accepted it on behalf of the Government. The stock certificates were then transferred by letter officially to the Department of Finance and they have those stock certificates for five-sixths of the stock in their own vault in the Eastern block together with the stock certificates for the $40,000,000 of stock which was transferred to the Minister of Finance some two or three years ago.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there a subsequent agreement?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not going to offer any remarks on this Bill at the present time because my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Hon. J. D. Reid) has promised, when he introduces his estimates—and I understand he is going to do it this afternoon—to make a statement to the House which I trust will cover the ground referred to by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I want to say to my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance that I think he slipped a cog. He is usually very cautious, moderate, and careful in his statements. A moment or two ago he said the country, or at least Parliament, seemed to be anxious and practically unanimous in its desire to acquire the Canadian Northern railway. I did

not understand that that was the position at all. The Canadian Northern and, in fact, all the railways of Canada have been indulging in an orgy for the past twenty or twenty-five years and the people of Canada have been blind to the fact. And now we find the Canadian Northern dumping on the people of Canada against, I think, the will of the people, this appalling mess—I have thought the words over and I think they are moderate—a load of $400,000,000 of liabilities that the people have got to shoulder. It is only fair to say that one party is no more responsible for this mess than the other. Both parties have been to blame, and the people themselves have been to blame, but we have got to nurse the baby now, and we might just as well at the start face the issue, which has been dumped upon us.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no more milk; we cannot nurse the baby without milk.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The milk may be thoroughly exhausted, but here we are with the system on our hands, and we have got to make the best of it, although one hon. gentleman suggests that we should wean the baby. There is no object in one side of the House indulging in criticism of the other side, because all politicians in the Dominion have been equally responsible for this railway mess, and I repeat that we may just as well make the best of it. I intend to wait until the Government makes its statement before indulging in some comments that I want to make to the House. In the meantime I have some sympathy with those who think that this railway should not be left in the hands of Mackenzie and Mann and the Canadian Northern directors. Why, all hon. gentlemen need do is to read the press for the last two or three months, and we find that practically the entire board have overlooked the operation of the road, and they are consumed with eagerness over the arbitration in order that they may bleed the country for the last dollar they can get out of it. After unloading liabilities on this country to the extent of $400,000,000, they are awaiting results of the arbitration to see whether we cannot give them some more money. The situation is an appalling one, as the Dominion will find very soon, when it undertakes to deal with these enormous liabilities.

Mr. VIEN: An amazing statement has been made to this House by the Acting Minister of Finance, who says that the policy of the Government cannot be given now, but that it is advisable to withhold it until the arbitration board now sitting to adjudicate upon the compensation to be paid to the shareholders, has given out its award. Why is this delay taking place? What is the connection between the award of the court now sitting and the administration of the road? And if the gentlemen interested are not satisfied with the judgment which may be rendered by the board, and take appeal to the Supreme Court, and from that court to the Privy Council, will we leave these thieves to administer this railway and bleed it in the way they expect to bleed the Canadian treasury by getting the big award that they anticipate? Will we leave them to bleed the railway and bleed this country until the Privy Council has given its judgment? I think that the hon. member who asked the Government for a definite statement of its policy before entering upon the consideration of this Bill, was justified in his question. The members of the House should not permit the Government to shunt their policy and sidetrack hon. gentlemen and refuse to give them that proper information which we should have before we are asked to give them a blanket authorization to spend money and to renew the liabilities. Before we give such a blanket authorization we should be told what the policy of the Government is to be, and I repeat it, there is no connection whatever between the award of the board of arbitration now sitting and the administration of the road; and if, as the Acting Minister of Finance has just said, the country owns the road, it should manage it, and not leave the management in the hands of those people who have wrecked the railway after having received from Canada more money than was required to build and operate the system.

Mr. MORPHY: I cannot conceive it possible that the remarks made by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) can possibly have any effect at this juncture in the history of this railway proposition. If I thought that the great Canadian Northern Railway system, which the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) calls an abominable mess, was to be left in any uncertain position as to its management, I would certainly feel like withholding this Bill until the Government's policy was declared. I look upon this road as the people's road. It has got to be the people's road and to run independently of the Canadian Pacific railway, or any other large interest. Just here I would like to put a query to the Government,

which they can answer when they like. —whether or not they propose to handle the Canadian Northern system, with its ten or twelve thousand miles of railway, running through a beautiful country in the West and having good connections, a road which brought forty per cent of the grain grown in the West out to the seaports last year, and thirty-three per cent for the last two years; whether they are going to run that system as an entity and run it independently, or whether they are going to link it up with the existing Government Railway systems? I think the country ought to know that. I think the country ought also to know the principle upon which the Government intend to operate the Canadian Northern system, which, to my mind, should be operated in the meantime independently of other Government roads, until it is put into the position where the public will be able to ascertain the facts, both as to the condition of the roadbed, and the value of the holdings, and determine what the future policy ought to be. Personally, I am not a pessimist in regard to this great railway. There may have been mistakes made in its administration in the past, but I believe it will yet be a great asset to the country. I have been over the system, I have looked at it with independent eyes, and have ascertained from personal observation that the most fertile country in the world, from an agricultural point of view, is served by this road. The Canadian Northern system has built up large sections of the West, and I look upon it with a great deal of hope in connection with the development of the country. It will be a great asset, and I am not going to deny to Mackenzie and Mann the courage and the vision they had—and the courage and vision of those who assisted them—when this road was built. I believe that there has been a mistake made in our railway policy. That mistake, however, did not lie in the Canadian Northern, but in the duplication of railways by the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. I want to ask the Government whether this railway is going to be really a people's road, and whether their policy will have the effect of eliminating political influence from it? Will there be an independent board—which I submit there should be; an independent entity from the Railway Commission, presided over by either a strong railway man, or a man who has had to do largely with railway legislation, litigation, operation and work, whether in a real operative capacity, or as having had to do with large affairs through parliamentary life? Because herein lies the principle that can safeguard the situation. And in speaking of that, I come right back to the place which the road occupies: the Canadian Northern will be a competitor in the public interest with every other large railway corporation, both on this side of the international boundary line and on the other. This road will be a competitor to the Canadian Pacific railway. I hope the Government will not in any way relax their view of the people's interest by appointing a board which will be subservient to pressure from the Canadian Pacific railway. I think the safety valve for the future public interest in railway matters will be an absolutely non-political and independent board of administration. May I suggest to the Government what I think would be the proper basis? We have asked—I have not myself, but I have heard it asked four or five times this morning—if the Government have a policy and what is their policy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have all asked that.

Mr. MORPHY: I have heard it asked. We have had no answer. If the Government were prepared to say that they had not framed a policy, that would be an answer, and the natural reply to that would be that this Bill should not pass until the Government gave the House some idea of its policy. My idea of the way to run this road—and it seems probably presumptuous that a man should set up his idea, but I think that constructive criticism is fair criticism—would be to adopt the principle applied on the Suez canal. That principle was international, and was based on what ought to be the charge for tonnage passing through it. The charge at first was ten francs per net ton. In 1869 there were three million dollars collected in tolls on tonnage passing through the Suez canal; in 1916 there was over sixteen million dollars in tolls. The object in running that canal has always been to reduce rates. From 10 francs, the rate came down to 7¾ francs at one time; then it went back to 8½. But the law—it is the French company law that administers the canal—provides that if the percentage of profit reaches 25 per cent, the surtax on rates which they have applied in the principle of operation shall be reduced until it is wiped out, and ultimately it is hoped that the rates will be reduced to 5 francs per ton. That is a real principle which has been operated by an administra-

tive board of thirty-two, ten of whom are English appointees, because the English tonnage and interest are very large on the Suez canal. Such a large board would be very cumbersome, no doubt, here. The reason it is so large, to my mind, is that there are so many countries interested that they must have representation.

I would not fix such a large board for Canada, but that principle should be applied here so that this system can be and shall be worked independently by the Government through an administrative council or independent board, which will have but one thing always in its eye, the reduction of rates, consistent with proper maintenance and expansion by branch lines, and so on. The public interest is in reduction of rates, both for the farmer in the West and for the industrial man in the East. I do not take very much stock in the cry about Mackenzie and Mann; I do not believe the Government are guilty of anything wrong in the fact that their name has to come up in this House, because I thoroughly believe that financially and so far as the management is concerned, they have been eliminated entirely, and that the Government have a free hand, as free as the air, in dealing with this railway. What I complain of is that the Government have not let the country know their policy; they have brought themselves under some opprobrium by creating, for lack of giving information, a suspicion that Mackenzie and Mann do own the Government. That is not so, and I do not believe it. But the sooner we get a statement of the Government's policy and the form the administration of the railway will take the sooner will the country's mind be settled and satisfaction will reign, particularly if such principles are applied in the railway policy as will result in a reduction of rates, by competition if necessary.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) a few moments ago made the statement, if I understood him correctly, that no information had been given as to when there would be a change in the directorate of the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. VIEN: If the hon. minister will let me correct him, I said that the Government did not give any information as to the policy they intended to follow in the administration of the road.

Mr. J. D. REID: A few days ago the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) complained as to there not having been a change in the directorate of the Canadian Northern since the transfer of the stock in October last. I replied to that hon. member that a change in the directorate would take place as soon as the arbitrators' award had been made. I think he raised the question that perhaps the award might be appealed to the Supreme Court and then to the Privy Council, and that it might be a year or two before a final decision was arrived at. I replied that there would be no time lost after the award, that even if there was an appeal a change in the directorate and a reorganization would take place.

Mr. VIEN: What is the reason for waiting until that award is made?

Mr. J. D. REID: I might say to the hon. member that the Prime Minister explained the reason a few days ago in the House. The reason, as I understood him then, and as we all understood, was that at the time the Canadian Northern was transferred, it was understood that the organization of the directors would remain as it was until the arbitrators' award had been made.

Mr. VIEN: Understood between whom?

Mr. J. D. REID: At that time we did not think it would take so long, we expected that the arbitration would have taken only two or three months and would have been over long ago. Complaint has been made several times this morning that the railway policy of the Government has not been given to the House before.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not give it this afternoon when the farmers are here?

Mr. J. D. REID: Let me say to the hon. member that this is really the first opportunity that we have had. We have not been on any railway estimate yet.

Mr. BUREAU: Yet you want to close the session on Saturday?

Mr. J. D. REID: I would say to hon. members that if the Prime Minister had not been engaged at the meeting with the farmers this morning he would, no doubt, have announced the railway policy.

Mr. MURPHY: Then my hon. friend cannot make the announcement in the absence of the Prime Minister?

Mr. J. D. REID: The reason it is hardly fair to ask me is that it has been asked to give the policy for the whole Canadian railway system. I am dealing entirely with the Canadian Northern system, and the

Prime Minister is the person upon whom the duty of giving the whole railway policy of Canada devolves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will he give it this afternoon?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Prime Minister will be here. So far as the operation of the Canadian Northern is concerned, some hon. gentlemen have asked what the intention of the Government is: Will it be operated as a separate system; will the other Government railways be kept separate from it; will political patronage be kept out of it? I think I made a statement here a few days ago that the Canadian Northern Railway system is a separate corporation. It is the intention of the Government to see that the operation of the Canadian Northern is carried on free from patronage in any shape or form. In its operation it will be kept as far from the Department of Railways as possible. We will re-organize the board of directors, the members of which, in respect of future operations of the Canadian Northern, will be selected by the Government.

Mr. MORPHY: Is the board to be elected by the shareholders under the charter of the company, or does the Government propose to institute a form of administrative council entirely apart from that?

Mr. J. D. REID: The directors would be selected under their charter by the shareholders of the company, being the nominees of the Government. I do not see the difference between naming a body as a board of directors and appointing a separate commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Can you organize a new system without legislation?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not necessary to organize a new system. You can appoint directors who would have the same powers as a Government-appointed commission. Of course, the Government must be responsible for the men they name as directors. Every charter specifies the length of time during which the board of directors shall operate. It does not make any difference, whether we appoint this body as a board of directors or as a commission.

It has been asked whether the Government intend to operate the Canadian Northern railway system separate from the Canadian Government railways. My own opinion is that, so far as possible, the Canadian Northern railway and all roads owned by the Government should be tied up together and operated as cheaply as possible. It is my view that any railways that we own should be put under the same management as that of the Canadian Northern Railway system—under a commission, if you wish to call it that, or a board of directors. Why should the terminals of the Government railways and the Canadian Northern at Winnipeg be operated by two separate staffs? Why should they not be operated under one system? Why should not the same apply to other terminals throughout the country? Why should not the two roads running between Winnipeg and Quebec, one the Government-owned road and the other the Canadian Northern—the latter owned by the Government through the stock—be under one management in the matter of operation, but, in their relation to the department, as distant as the poles so far as political patronage is concerned? That is the way I feel about it. When the matter is taken up and discussed in Council, that is the position I shall take as a member of the Government.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the minister say that the matter has not yet been taken up by the Cabinet?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not taken it up as to the personnel of the new board; the time for that will not have arrived until we have reorganized the board of directors. The present directors and their officials are operating the road in the interests of the country. They are not permitted to spend any money in new works or to make any abnormal expenditures without the sanction of the Department of Railways and Canals. In other words, they are operating the road with the least possible expense, pending the reorganization of the board. I feel that it would be much better if we did not do away with the identity of the Canadian Northern Railway system at the present time. The Government must go out to the markets of the world and renew the securities that are now falling due. We may have to borrow more money on the system, and, if we do, it may be necessary to raise money on bonds and securities of the Canadian Northern, which the Government must endorse. It would not make good reading for those to whom we apply for loans if expressions of opinion should go out indicating that members of the House have not the same confidence in the road that, perhaps, the Government have. The impression that might be conveyed is that

the whole of the $400,000,000, representing the expenditures on the road, have been squandered. I have great confidence in the future of the Canadian Northern Railway system. Expressing my own private opinion, I believe that that system in years to come will prove to be one of Canada's greatest assets. Having regard to the $400,000,000, it is to be remembered that the construction of the Canadian Northern throughout the Northwest and in other parts of Canada has enormously increased the value of the lands and property through which it runs—practically to the extent of half the value of the road. This system is virtually bringing into the country $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 a year in the products that are raised in the vicinity of its lines. This the country would not have had if the Canadian Northern Railway system had not been constructed.

Mr. CAHILL: Or some other system.

Mr. J. D. REID: If the Canadian Northern system had not been promoted and carried on by those who constructed it I doubt whether other systems would have done the same work. Certainly they would not have done so without coming to this Parliament and getting the financial assistance that the Canadian Northern got.

Mr. ROBB: Is it the policy of the Government to acquire any of the other railway systems in Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not wish to be unfair to the hon. member, but he has asked me a question that I would like him to leave until the Prime Minister gives a statement in regard to the whole railway question. The hon. member has asked me to go outside of the Canadian Northern Railway system at the present time. I stated a minute or two ago that I would like that to be left until the Prime Minister makes to the House the statement that was promised at the time we went into the railway estimates. By the way, the right hon. leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago raised the question as to why we did not take up the Railway Bill this morning. Some of the hon. members say that they may have to leave soon. We thought it would probably be better, before we took up the Railway Bill, to have a statement on the whole railway question, and for that reason I intended, if we had got through with this matter, to have seen the Prime Minister and perhaps have that statement made this afternoon, and then we could go on with the Railway Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: An excellent intention.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is, as I stated a few minutes ago, the first opportunity we had, and, therefore, I do not think there is any fault to be found at the present time. I think I have answered the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien). If not, I shall be very glad to give any further information.

Mr. VIEN: I shall again put my question, because I do not think the minister has answered it. I asked why the Government was waiting, before determining upon its policy, until the award was given by the Court now sitting in arbitration upon the Canadian Northern. The minister has replied that, because an agreement was entered into between the Government and the managers of the railway, those managers would continue to administer the affairs of the railway until the award was given. That is no answer. That is no reason. Why was such an agreement entered into? Why did the Government enter into an agreement with the managers of the road to leave them in charge of the road until the award was given? The Government becomes the owner of the road and yet leaves the management of the road to persons who have no longer an interest in it. Will the minister kindly tell us the reason for making such an arrangement?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am sure, if the hon. member considers for a moment, he will see the unfairness of his statement.

Mr. VIEN: I do not see it.

Mr. J. D. REID: Supposing the hon. member was entering into an agreement to buy a piece of property, he surely would not expect to take possession of the property without even paying for it or saying what he will pay for it. We cannot take possession until the arbitrators come to some final decision. The agreement was made.

Mr. VIEN: The minister knows perfectly well that the moment the Government expropriates a thing, that thing is vested in the Crown by the mere expropriation of it, and the Crown takes immediate possession before the award is given. When the Crown, for any public purpose, expropriates land, it takes immediate possession. The land is vested in the Crown, and the owner has no longer anything to do with it.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member, who, I understand, is a lawyer, knows the differ-

ence between expropriation and agreement. He has read this Bill. He knows that we did not expropriate the railway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Government cannot get away from the Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not expropriated the railway at all; we have taken it on an agreement, and we are going to carry out that agreement. The agreement is that we are going to take a transfer of the road, have the ownership in our name, and take over the absolute reorganization of the board of directors as soon as the final award is made.

Mr. MURPHY: Where is that in the statute?

Mr. VIEN: What is the reason for that agreement? What reasonable ground is there for waiting for the award before taking over the management of the road? I cannot get an answer. What is the reason? Why is the Government waiting? I cannot get any answer to that.

Mr. BUREAU: Did I understand the minister to say that, as soon as the award is given by the arbitrators, the Government will take control of the road? There was an objection raised as to that, that the award might be carried to the Supreme Court or to the Privy Council. The minister said that would not make any difference, that the moment the award was given, reorganization would take place.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is what I said.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the minister says the Government cannot take over its property until it is paid for, and it cannot be paid for until the price has been settled by some tribunal. The minister answers himself. He destroys the reason that he gives. If the Government is to take over the road after the first tribunal has given its award, the Government does not know what it is going to pay. The award may be reversed or modified by the Supreme Court. The reason given by the minister does not stand, and if that is the reason, it is no explanation to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien).

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section pass?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Certainly not. The matter was opaque when the Acting Minister of Finance got through with it; it is now further obscured by the verbal fog which has been raised by the Minister of Railways, and which it will take all the ingenuity of the Government to dispel. The question that has been asked is a perfectly proper one, one that suggests itself to the minds of those who were members of the last Parliament, perhaps more readily than to the minds of those who are members of the new Parliament, although our new colleagues must be asking themselves the same question—why do the Government not take over the management of the road? Just for a moment let us look at what has happened. The Minister of Railways and Canals in one breath speaks of a statute under which it was provided to take over the stock of this company, and in the next he says that there was an agreement, thereby conveying, possibly not with the intention of misleading any one, an intimation that at the same time as the statute was enacted, an agreement was made or was embodied in the statute that the management was not to be taken over until the award was made and the amount paid. There never was any such agreement. Had such an agreement been mentioned at the last session, when this Act was under consideration, not even closure would have succeeded in getting that Act passed. There was no intimation that there was any such agreement. If anything of that kind has been done, then it has been done outside of the terms of the statute passed at the last session; it has been done without the authority of Parliament. What is going on at the present time by reason of the road not being taken over and by reason of the Mackenzie and Mann organization being left in charge of affairs just as they were last year? This is what is going on. This is the spectacle that is being presented to this country. An arbitration is taking place in the city of Toronto, the parties to the arbitration being on the one side the gentlemen that are interested in this road, and the parties presumed to be on the other side, the people of Canada, represented by this Government. By the fact that Mackenzie and Mann are left in charge of the organization, the people's side is being presented by Mackenzie and Mann. That is what is happening. There is no adjudication; there is no litigation being carried on with parties on opposite sides, with opposing interests, with their interests being represented through different counsel and so on. That is not being done. Mackenzie and Mann are left in charge of the situation. They are in charge of the books and records and all the information connected with this road. The people's interests are not being conserved or properly presented

before this Board of Arbitrators, and this committee is entitled to know whether that is the reason why the management of this road has not been taken over by the Government. Is it because the Government are willing that all the information should remain in the hands of Mackenzie and Mann, that the people's case might be either improperly presented or not presented at all before that board of arbitrators, so that Mackenzie and Mann would get an award to which they would not be entitled if the people's case were properly presented? If the Government were in charge of this road and had possession of all the records of the company and knew all the details and ramifications of the workings of that organization, the people's case could be properly presented before the board.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government's counsel, Mr. Tilley, had free access to all the books of the company and to all the officials of the company. They furnished him with all the information it was possible to get concerning the Canadian Northern railway. The whole Canadian Northern organization was working with him, that he might present his case to the arbitrators in the fullest possible manner.

Mr. MURPHY: I have the greatest possible respect for Mr. Tilley; I have great admiration for his legal ability, but that does not alter what I am saying or affect the situation in the slightest degree. The people's case, I maintain, is not being presented before that board of arbitration as it should be, and it is not being presented as it should be for the reason that the Government has not taken possession of the road and of the books and records of the company, showing all the details of the workings of that organization. Everybody who has had anything to do with the proceedings of the board of arbitration speaks of the situation in exactly the same terms as those I am now using.

At one o'clock the committee rose.

The committe resumed at three o'clock.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I was prevented from being here this morning; otherwise I should have arranged to make a general statement in regard to the general situation as a matter appropriate to be considered in connection with this Bill. I shall make that statement to-morrow morning. In the meantime I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. We will take it on this Bill to-morrow morning.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

A FRENCH-CANADIAN BRIGADE.

FORMATION OF FRENCH BRIGADE ADVOCATED BY MR. DuTREMBLAY.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) for the House to go into committee of supply:

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into committee of supply, I would like to put before it a question which is considered of very great importance and that is the desirability and propriety of forming a French Canadian brigade for overseas service, commanded by officers speaking the French language. In the province from which I come this question is considered as being of paramount importance and as one affecting the best interests of the country. That is why I ask the indulgence of the House while I briefly present the reasons for the request which I shall make to the Government. I submit that the number of French-Canadian soldiers actually at the front, together with those who are in England and those who will be enlisted under conscription, will be sufficient to justify the organization of a French Canadian brigade; and therefore I strongly urge upon the Government to take this matter into their immediate and favourable consideration. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, a brigade is composed of four regiments, or battalions, of 1,000 men each. There are actually, from the province of Quebec, seven regiments of which only one regiment is composed entirely of French Canadians and commanded by officers speaking the French language. The other six regiments are English regiments and are commanded by English speaking officers. The recruits that go from the province of Quebec to England are sent to a single unit depot and from that depot the seven regiments at the front secure the drafts necessary to keep their ranks filled. Whether they are English or French Canadians they draw from that unit depot all the soldiers they need. A few weeks ago a regiment in England composed entirely of French Canadians, the 150th Regiment, was disbanded. That regiment was commanded by a very competent and brave officer, who organized a regiment in Canada at the beginning of the war; he had been

in France, had been wounded, came back to Canada, raised another regiment, and went with it to England. That is the regiment which has now been disbanded. Four hundred of the French Canadian members of this regiment were merged into English regiments from the province of Quebec. Only 100 of these men remained to fill the ranks of the 22nd, which is the French Canadian regiment commanded by French officers.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Did the hon. gentleman say the 107th regiment?

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: The 150th regiment commanded by Col. Barré.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was in the 5th division.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I would like to put before the House a copy of a letter that was sent by Col. Barré to Sir Edward Kemp, Minister of the Overseas Military Forces. It gives certain reasons why the French Canadians should be grouped together in their own battalions and I think it would help my request if I put this letter before the House. It is as follows:

Witley, Surrey, February 14th, 1918.

Sir Edward Kemp,
Minister of the Overseas Military Forces,
London.

Sir,—

If I take the liberty of writing you this letter, it is not to protest against the military decisions or plead my personal case, but I have in view the prevention of a wrong to my men which is as useless as undeserved. It is therefore with confidence in your sense of fairplay and in the justice of my case, that I submit to you the following:—Canadian Headquarters have ordered the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion to be broken up and its effectives disposed of in a certain way. I am convinced that this step, and the trend it exhibits, constitute a grievous error. And I would be remiss in my clear duty if I did not put forward certain considerations which militate against that step being taken.

If it had been intended to punish me and my battalion for a breach of discipline, no more drastic measure could have been adopted than the order to break it up and disperse its men, without their Officers, through the cadres of four different English speaking battalions.

I am now under orders to draft out five hundred men. Of these, only one hundred are to go to the only French Canadian battalion in the fighting line; the rest are to be posted to English Canadian units from the province of Quebec. Even if the necessity of breaking the cadre were conceded, from every point of view, the dispersion of the men is indefensible. The great majority of my command have a very poor command of English. As a direct consequence, many of them will have to carry out, and risk punishment for inadequately carrying out orders, the full purport of which they cannot gather. I urge upon you that this

would work actual injustice, to say nothing of the resulting inefficiency.

Either the English Canadian battalions from Quebec have exhausted their proper recruiting sources, i.e., the English speaking population of the province, or they have not. If they have not, there can be no necessity for supplying them from other sources. If they have, they should be gradually withdrawn from the line and broken up to supply the remaining battalions fed from the same source. The only escape from this dilemma, under the territorial supply establishment, is by invoking sentimental reasons.

Now, on sentimental grounds the breaking up of my battalion is open to question. The proposed dispersion of its effectives is still more questionable. It can be proven, and after the war is over it will be proven that the provision of inadequate distinctive cadres for such French Canadians as offered to enlist was a potent check on recruiting from that element in Quebec. When French Canadian battalions were authorized, recruiting picked up somewhat but was again severely checked when unit after unit was broken up after arrival in England and their effectives dispersed through several different battalions. I noticed an immediate decline in voluntary enlistment when this was first done. A similar and proportional cooling off has followed the successive dissolution of French Canadian units until recruiting sank to zero.

At present, French Canadian minds are rather exasperated. It is not for me to seek the responsibility for their attitude. It is sufficient to note it as a fact, and to draw attention to it as a factor. Is it wise to furnish fuel to the incendiaries of public opinion in the province of Quebec, who will not fail to point out that this dispersion is like that of the Acadians, that it is made in pursuance of a determination to shed French Canadian blood without credit to the French Canadians, that it is dictated by a resentment of the recent vote cast by the province on the issue of conscription, and so forth?

May I suggest that if, as I am assured is the fact, the 1st Quebec Regiment and B. C. Reserves are not in a position to carry the burden of six battalions each at the front, the situation could be remedied by placing my battalion in the fighting line instead of a Montreal or British Columbia battalion on the point of growing too weak. This reasonable increase of French Canadian cadres would provide a reasonable and pleasant outlet for the French Canadian conscripts.

If this is too much to grant, might the battalion be drafted by companies, to which French Canadian conscripts could afterwards be sent, thus avoiding the injustice and inefficiency to which I have already drawn attention as resulting from lingual differences? I believe that this has been done in the case of one battalion ordered to be broken up.

This appeal to you is made with the greatest certitude that it shall have your serious consideration and dealt with the high spirit of justice and diplomacy which an officer who has been doing his duty since the first day of the war, can expect from his Minister of Militia.

This letter is signed by Hercule Barré, Lieutenant-Colonel 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion. A similar letter was sent to

Sir George Perley, and to Baron Beaverbrook, but without any result.

A few weeks afterwards this battalion was disbanded and merged into English battalions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I lay down the principle that it is necessary to group French Canadians together for a strong reason which does not exist in the case of the men from the English-speaking provinces, namely, because of their speaking and understanding best the French language. Most of the French Canadians do not speak, and do not understand English. I know that English battalions from some of the other provinces were disbanded and broken up upon their arrival in England, just as was done with a number of battalions, or regiments, that came from Quebec. But the language difficulty which necessitates preserving intact the French Canadian regiment, does not exist in the case of the English-speaking battalions. If it is desired to secure to the fullest extent that discipline and that esprit de corps that is essential in all regiments and in all armies, and to achieve success in military measures, men from the same city, or from the same village, must be placed together. This principle, or what is called the territorial idea, is not new. It exists in France and in Switzerland, and it was accepted by Lord Roberts, and afterwards by Lord Kitchener. It is a principle of general acceptance, that men from the same village should be formed into a company, and men from the same district into a regiment, where their numbers permit. It is necessary when these men are at the front that pride of race and pride in their regiment should be aroused in them to such an extent that they are prepared to die, if need be, for the honour and glory of their flag.

The French Canadians come of a race that appreciate to the utmost what is meant by courage, honour, and sacrifice. In speaking thus, I do not wish to reflect on the other nationalities of this country, whose qualities I admire and recognize, but I am speaking now on behalf of my own people. The people of Quebec know full well the history of such famous regiments as the Legion Etrangêre, the Turcos, the Zouaves, and the Alpines, whose bravery is renowned the world over, and whose regimental flags have been decorated time after time by the Government of France. They know, too, that it is the greatest punishment and the greatest dishonour for a regiment to be debarred from attacking or defending a position of danger. And what has developed those ideals? It is the esprit de corps which prevails in those historic battalions and the desire to perpetuate their glory. Therefore, if we are to have amongst the sons of Quebec the highest efficiency, if it is desired to treat justly, the men of my race, the suggestion which I am making should be given effect to by the Government. The desirability for forming a French Canadian brigade is fully concurred in by the people of Quebec. Nearly all the men who have been closely identified with recruiting in my province, and almost all the newspapers, are in favour of this scheme, and I submit in this connection a splendid patriotic article which I read in Le Devoir a few days ago. I have translated this article, though I am afraid the translation will not do it justice. It is as follows:

For our Conscripts.

Our young men have come by hundreds to enlist during the last few days. Considerable groups have already voluntarily enlisted in the Flying Corps and in other dangerous services. They will go bravely. All will do their duty, as did the boys of the 22nd Battalion.

General Mewburn, Minister of Militia, noted specially the conduct of these boys, some days ago, and declared himself sympathetic with the idea of grouping them as much as possible from the start, and of keeping them together also on the battlefield. That would indeed be an excellent means to keep up their esprit de corps; it will encourage them if they are merged in one combatant unit, so that they will not feel themselves too far away from their country, and alone in a strange land. This is well understood in the English military centres. An English catholic chaplain, the Rev. Father O'Gorman, according to a despatch from London published by the Globe, wrote to the Times on the 15th of April as follows: "That it was urgent to increase the number of French Canadian battalions in France." This opinion comes at the proper time, now that thousands of our French Canadians entering under the conscription law, or voluntarily, are preparing themselves to go across the sea.

To give them officers of their own blood and language would be equally an excellent measure. The Gazette correspondent in London said the other day, on the oecasion of the merging of the 150th French Canadian regiment with an English regiment, that it was regrettable that these men had not been merged in a regiment commanded by Quebec officers. The Toronto News the other day was scandalized and astounded because certain Austrian soldiers had German officers to command them; so that newspaper will now understand the attitude of its English confrere and also the good sense of the words in the Star the other day, of Rev. Father Doyon, military chaplain, who said in London, on May 1st: "All that we desire is that the French Canadians as much as possible shall stay together and have officers speaking the French language."

It is also time to consider the question of the formation of a French Canadian brigade to

form part of the Canadian divisions in France. For a long time, this project has been before the people without any result; circumstances were against it; it would appear also that it had the hostility of the higher functionaries. But, as the project of putting French Canadian conscripts in regiments commanded by officers speaking their language is highly commendable, the more ambitious project of forming a brigade of our men to be commanded by a general from our province should also appeal to the military authorities, if they are looking first and foremost to the best way of putting their conscripts in the best frame of mind before sending them to the front.

One of our European correspondents, well informed as to what is going on in the Canadian camps in England and in France, wrote us this authentic fact: "At Witley, a boy from Quebec province, being ridiculed, badly treated and unable to obtain his transfer from the Ontario Artillery to another unit where he could speak French and be well treated, committed suicide in a moment of despair." It would not be right to put our conscripts in such a position and expose them to such a temptation.

So we hope that General Mewburn, who seems to have good intentions, if he desires to be just, will take the necessary steps at London for the welfare of the French Canadians in the army. It is surprising also, as someone said, that it is at London and not at Ottawa that these details are settled. But, whatever the reason may be it is the duty of the military authorities to see that our conscripts are in charge of officers coming from their province.

These men are going on the battlefield. Numbers of them will meet death. They will fight with courage and with valour, and will prove to those who discredited them that they are not cowards and that what has kept them here far from the European front, were highly respectable motives. Surely, they have the right, at this supreme hour, to hear the language of their land to encourage them to go through fire and death; and we cannot refuse them at this last moment the right of French Canadian comrades to surround them, help them, and receive from their dying lips the last message to their families who are far away.

May it be that on the soil of France, these brave men will have the impression that they are fighting not among strangers but among friends and comrades who will recall to them their native land.

There is another article from L'Evenément, a Quebec organ friendly to the Government, of the same tenor as that I have read from Le Devoir, asking that a French Canadian bridgade be organized. I would also read to the House a letter sent to me by Colonel Mignault, who is well-known to the military authorities in Ottawa, who helped to organize the 22nd Battalion, who also organized the French Canadian hospital unit in France, actually operating in France to-day in St. Cloud. The letter says:

Montreal, April 29th, 1918.

P. R. duTremblay, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

Referring to our recent conversation with reference to the drafting of the French Canadians into the English regiments, I have consulted with friends of prominence down here who understand the situation, and we feel most strongly that it is our duty to ask you to lay before the authorities the justice of the claim of the French Canadians to a brigade of their own at the front, or failing this, at least a new battalion. If only on the score of the more efficient work that will be derived having the French Canadians under officers speaking their own language, the request should commend itself, and as we are all working for a speedy and successful termination of the war, this argument would seem unanswerable. The sentimental aspect of the situation also is a very important one, as it is known that to-day the French Canadian recruits, as well as going to the 22nd Battalion, are also sent to the 5th C.M.R., the 13th, 14th, 24th, 87th and 42nd.

It is a simple calculation for the authorities to see how, with conscription, a French Canadian brigade could now be kept up, and the English regiments should, as has been done in the past, if they cannot keep up their own reserves, be merged.

Can anyone in fairness be asked to risk his life and the life of many others in taking instructions in a language he does not understand? This must happen in the near future if the present policy is continued. I could write much more on this subject, but as we have discussed it very fully, I must leave it to you to place before Parliament this most important and vital question to our people.

Of course, as I have already mentioned to you in our previous interview, it has always been, and still is to-day, my ideal that all French Canadians should be sent to the French Army.

Very truly yours,

Arthur Mignault.

This question of putting French Canadians in the French army has been discussed before. I know it was discussed with the President of France. The Prime Minister had an interview on the subject with Colonel Mignault. I understand that the Prime Minister, if not in favour of the suggestion, was at least inclined to look upon it as a good one. For one reason or another, however, the matter was dropped, and we did not hear any more about it.

In this connection I want to read a letter from a gentleman in Montreal who has done good service in the cause of French Canadian recruiting:

May 2nd, 1918.

My dear DuTremblay:

Having, as you know, taken a great interest in the French Canadian recruiting ever since the war started, having been one of the organizers of the 22nd., 41st. and other Battalions, to the 22nd, (I sent over six hundred men from this district), and being also a member, appointed by the Government, of the French Canadian Recruiting Committee, I write to you, as a member representing one of the largest French and English constituencies of our City. I would like to bring your attention very

strongly to your duty, as pointed out by myself and the gentlemen that met you recently, of how necessary it is that the Government at once announce a strong policy of giving to these French Canadians, officers of their own, speaking their own language, and promise another French Canadian regiment at the front at once, with a French brigade in the near future, a wonderful step forward will be made. The fullest publicity of the French press, however, should be given to this. The whole situation has, however, been explained to you by French Canadians who have the welfare of their people at heart, military men and others. You, therefore, should be well posted and, apart from the justice of the claim, can lay the facts before the House, so that every fair minded man will understand the situation. It should be quite clear that a French Canadian, not speaking a word of English, cannot in a short time before he is sent into the firing line hope to learn enough English to understand the difficult explanations that he will need to be given, nor can be bring back and give in English the information he will gather. We understand that the authorities on the other side have many important questions at present to settle, and as they are over there in charge should be interfered with as little as possible, but in this case do they understand the present position and situation in the province of Quebec, and can they view it as we do? I think not, as otherwise there should be no hesitation in, at once, granting the French Canadians what they ask. The record of the 22nd needs no comment and, as you are aware, their commanding officer, Colonel Tremblay, a Kingston graduate, has a splendid record. He has, under him, officers who have been there since the beginning of the war, whose records, we understand, are of the best. Surely, in the question of the formation of a brigade, Colonel Tremblay could be asked if this could be done. He has the welfare of his people and his men at heart. This is only a suggestion, but might be brought forward, as I see by the press that the claim is made that there is no material for a brigade. With the recruiting that is now going on of the French Canadians, and taking the percentage of wastage at 2,500 a year for each battalion, this statement cannot stand. Sufficient reinforcements from this province can easily go forward to maintain a brigade, and if a school for young officers is formed in this province, a wonderful stride forward in the development of the situation will be made. Look into the enlistment of the young men, of French Canadians that have gone into the Flying Corps and the Tank Battalion in the last month, and you will see that now that conscription is the law it is going to be obeyed, but please do not hesitate to show the Government that the people of this province must be given men speaking their own language to command, and that they be put in a position to do their best and work up, if possible, the organization that will be a credit to the province and what they will be proud of. Understanding their mentality as you do, you know that it is far better to appeal to them than force them. They are law abiding and can fight if they wish, as the record of the 22nd shows. Do not hesitate to give them a full chance. We are all watching down here and will be glad to do anything to help the Government and yourself in this matter, if we are needed.

Your sincerely,
M. Scarth Stevenson.

P.R. DuTremblay, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

It is so obviously fair that the course which I have suggested be adopted, that hon. gentlemen will, perhaps, wonder why some action has not already been taken in the matter. One of the arguments made by the Prime Minister the other day was that we had not the material necessary to the formation of a French Canadian brigade. I shall not discuss the reasons why a French Canadian brigade was not formed, but I wish to point out that under the compulsory service law the men can easily be found, and one reason against it therefore disappears. How can the formation of a French Canadian brigade best be accomplished? Two suggestions have been made, one of which, I think, was considered the better by the Prime Minister in the interview which I had with him some weeks ago. On the battle line in France there are seven regiments from Quebec, one, the 22nd, composed entirely of French Canadians, and the other six commanded by British officers, each containing 200, 300 or 400 French Canadians. One way of forming the French Canadian brigade would be by furnishing reinforcements of French Canadians as these are needed. In this way, the units would soon become composed of French Canadians. The Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister are, I know, disposed to favour the grouping of French Canadians, but difficulty is met with in England because the military authorities there do not want to send raw recruits to the front; they want to send seasoned men.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What does the hon. gentleman mean by speaking of meeting difficulties in England? Who present the difficulties, the British Government or the Canadian Government, in England?

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: The hon. gentleman might better direct his question to his own side of the House, and seek a reply from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Militia. However, it is true that it may not be desirable to send to the front as a complete unit men who have never been under fire.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What I want to make clear is whether the British Government is the origin of the difficulties to which my hon. friend refers. If there is any opposition, it is not from the British Govern-

ment. I do not want the British Government branded as interfering in Canadian affairs.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) is quite right. There was no suggestion from the British Government on the subject.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I should think not.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understand that these regiments must be composed of men who are prepared to fight in the battle line, and the difficulty would be in changing the officers. But officers competent to command French Canadian regiments may easily be found in large numbers. These seven regiments from Quebec could easily be constituted entirely of French Canadians, because under the present military service law four-fifths of the recruits from Quebec speak the French Canadian language. It is well, therefore, that the military authorities should decide this question at once and take the necessary steps to ensure that these regiments shall be reinforced by French Canadians and that men speaking the French Canadian language shall be in command of them.

A few suggestions were made to me by a French Canadian officer of high standing who went to the front and was wounded, regarding the formation of a French Canadian brigade. He suggested:

1. The initial step to be taken is to appoint a director of personnel and personal services in Canada and in England. This position is of great importance and must be filled by an officer of high rank and one who has full knowledge of past methods of dealing with these matters and intimate knowledge of present conditions in Canada. He must be given the rank of brigadier-general in order to afford him the necessary prestige and protection it is an absolute necessity that he have a good record. Lieutenant-Colonel La Flèche, D.S.O. Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, is one of the few suitable to fill this mission. Owing to his wounds he is not fit for duty at the front, and being decorated by both the English and the French Governments, makes an ideal liason between the two races. Special duty: to look after French Canadian man-power in Canada.

2. Brigade organization. Complement: officers 140, men 4,000.

He suggested that the command of that brigade be given to Lieutenant-Colonel Tremblay, D.S.O., officer of the Legion of Honour, who should be given the rank of brigadier-general. As hon. gentlemen are aware, Colonel Tremblay is the hero who to-day commands the glorious 22nd in France. He has already had the experience of commanding a brigade in France on different occasions, though he has not had the rank or the pay of a brigadier-general. It is evident that Colonel Tremblay would be well competent to fulfil the duties suggested. The officer further says:

Colonel Tremblay has commanded the famous 22nd Battalion for over two years, is known as one of the very best and bravest officers in France, and has on several occasions commanded the brigade. This officer is loved by all who have fought under him and who have known him. He, of course, should have full power to choose his own officers. The names of the following officers are given to prove that there are easily enough senior officers to supply a brigade: Major A. E. Dubuc, D.S.O., Chevalier of the Legion of Honour; Lieutenant-Colonel H. Barré, Chevalier of the Legion of Honour; Lieutenant-Colonel Desrosiers, Lieutenant-Colonel L. R. LaFlèche, D.S.O., Chevalier of the Legion of Honour; Major Vanier, M.C., Chevalier of the Legion of Honour; Major Henri Chassé, M.C.; Lieutenant-Colonel Piuze, Major R. L. Calder; Major DeSerres; Major L. Gauvreau; Major J. P. U. Archambault, Lieutenant-Colonel Dansereau; Captain Leo M. Duval, M.C.; Major Asselin; Lieutenant-Colonel Verret, D.S.O.; Lieutenant-Colonel Lefebvre.

There are at present enough officers with experience at the front to fill the positions of company commanders and platoon commanders. Most of the officers are in France or England, though several are now in Canada. To meet the wastage amongst junior officers, a school of officers should be organized in Canada.

We should have a French Canadian officers' training corps in the province of Quebec. I make the charge against the Government that if it wanted to have a full measure of enlistment from amongst the French Canadians in the province of Quebec, it should have established, since the beginning of the war, a school for officers in that province. The officer goes on. The letter continues:

Applicants to be very carefully chosen. They should be tried out in Canada, and when proven to be likely subjects to be sent to England, to complete their course where they would be ready to proceed to France to fill vacancies. This measure is most important, as many young men have not enlisted, and knowing that under present conditions they must go as privates, they are not satisfied. By overcoming this difficulty, a remarkable change will be felt regarding the Military Service Act, and while cultivating the very necessary esprit de corps, these men will bring popularity to the brigade, thereby creating a needed strength and sympathy for our fighting army and its members.

One thousand men, seasoned warriors now fighting in France (22nd Battalion) to be withdrawn and divided into four groups of 250 men. To each group 750 trained men who have not been under fire are to be added to form a battalion. Given that a sufficient number of trained men are now available in England, or if not, they should shortly be (draftees recently sent over), this organization should take between six to eight weeks. Recruiting under the present arrangements fully provides for

wastage as French Canadian draftees are now expected to keep up over four English-speaking Quebec province Battalions, now at the front. All officers and men destined for this brigade should be recruited and trained in French-Canadian units, viz., Depot Battalions in Canada, and training battalions in England. This for maintenance of esprit de corps, development of self-confidence, pride of race and standardization of training.

As I have said, had this request been acceded to by this Government, certain misunderstandings in the province of Quebec would have been cleared away, because I am informed that French Canadian officers at the front would rather serve with their own people. The methods by which this end is to be obtained cannot be roundabout; they must be direct and to the point, and the Government should announce to the public that it is their intention to form a French Canadian brigade so that confidence may be restored to the people of the province of Quebec, and the Prime Minister knows well that confidence in the people begets confidence in the Government.

There is a special reason why a French Canadian brigade should be authorized in the province of Quebec, and that is the reason of language. The same reason does not apply in other provinces where there is unity of language. The Prime Minister seems to have good intentions in regard to this matter. If the Prime Minister will put aside criminal appeals from fanatics and follow his own good inclinations; if he will put himself on a high level of patriotism, then he will go down in history with the other great prime ministers as having been able to rise above petty questions of party and politics when a question of national unity and justice to the minority is at stake. I conclude with this appeal, that on this question the hon. members of this House will be true to themselves, aye, and above all, true to those brave boys who are fighting for us in France and Flanders, for our liberty and our future happiness.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend (Mr. DuTremblay) has spoken very earnestly on this subject, and I can assure him that, so far as his object can be carried out in conformity with military exigencies at the front, there is every disposition on the part of the Government to aid in every way. I am not altogether sure, and I think my hon. friend would not be altogether sure, that the mixing of men from other provinces with men from the province of Quebec in one company or one battalion would be without advantage. The difficulty in the past has been that men from different provinces have not been associated so as to know each other, to understand each other, to realize each other's viewpoint, and the good qualities of each other. That lack of understanding could perhaps, be obviated in the most effective way by putting men from different parts of the country side by side in the same company or the same battalion to fight for the same common cause. But I realize the force of the considerations to which my hon. friend has directed attention. We are not in the least unmindful of them, and we realize further the splendid courage and the fine achievements of French Canadians at the front, notably the 22nd Regiment. I speak particularly of that regiment at Courcellette, because, when Courcellette was captured, side by side with the 22nd Regiment fought a regiment from my own province. It unfortunately has been necessary to break up a good many units that have gone overseas, when it seemed almost cruel to do so. The Minister of Militia and Defence informs me that the city of Hamilton, from which he comes, has raised 10,000 men, and it is not represented at the front at present by a single distinctive unit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nineteen is the number of the Hamilton Battalion. It is still in harness.

Major-General MEWBURN: Only a company and a half.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have had the same experience in Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotians raised a very fine body of men called the Nova Scotia Highland Brigade. They went across the seas as a brigade, but it was necessary when they got overseas to break the brigade up. One regiment went to the front, another joined the 5th division and two others were used as depot regiments.

I would like to say that the idea of raising a brigade of Canadians of French descent is not by any means new, and I would like my hon. friend to know this, and perhaps my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) can tell him something further; I remember that in June, 1916, I had a personal interview with General Lessard and asked him to undertake the raising of a brigade of French Canadians, and to take command of it and lead it to the front. He found himself unable to undertake the task at that time and it has never been under-

taken since. My hon. friend (Mr. Du Tremblay) has alluded to a conversation which he had with me on the subject, in which I expressed, as I felt then and feel now, a great deal of sympathy with the purpose that he has in view. If French Canadians would like to have a greater number of distinctive regiments, and a French Canadian brigade, then so far as military exigencies will permit we ought to do everything possible to facilitate their formation. But my hon. friend will realize that it would be most unwise for the Government of this country to impose upon the military authorities at the front an undertaking which in the judgment of those authorities might be productive of disaster. It might be not only unfair, but positively cruel to send into the trenches a brigade of troops with only such training as they could get in camp, and without that acquaintance with the methods of trench warfare which is all essential. I was told in France a year ago last month that some of the methods of warfare in vogue a year before that had been absolutely discontinued. New conditions are developing all the time and new needs have to be met. Men have to be trained to the utmost limit before they are put into the trenches. I think, although I speak with no great knowledge of the subject, the usual practice is to put a portion of a new battalion in with men who have had experience in the trenches, in order that the new men may learn from their more experienced comrades how best to perform their duty and to meet the enemy.

But there is a possibility that something along the line of what my hon. friend suggests might be accomplished through the methods to which he alluded, or through some method analagous to that. I sent a telegram to the Overseas Minister, who communicated with Sir Arthur Currie with regard to it, and I received a reply giving expression to what Sir Arthur Currie thought might be done. The suggestion, in part at least, was this: that reinforcements for battalions and regiments at the front which at the present time contain a considerable number of French Canadians might be provided out of men of French descent who are now going forward from the province of Quebec, and in that way, by a gradual process such as my hon. friend has described, regiment after regiment now containing a certain proportion of French Canadians might be so supplied with reinforcements that eventually they would attain a distinctive character as French Canadian units, and in that way very probably a brigade might be formed. I do not know whether it would be practicable to form it in any other way. My hon. friend, who was good enough to communicate to me privately his own views which he has expressed on the floor of the House to-day, will realize, I hope, that I have the utmost sympathy with the purpose he has in mind, but he will also realize, I trust, that in respect of all these matters the Government must naturally take into account the judgment of the military authorities at the front, who are much more capable of judging what is possible and what is not possible in these matters than I or than any other member of this House could possibly be. So I leave the matter at that for the moment, subject to what my colleague the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) may say with regard to it. I emphasize once more my desire, so far as military exigencies will permit, to assist in the purpose which my hon. friend has at heart.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May we hope to have a further communication from the Government on this subject before the end of the session?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have given really about all the information that has, up to the present time, come from Sir Arthur Currie, but if there is anything that I can usefully add before the end of the session I can assure my right hon. friend that I shall be only too glad to communicate it to the House. I shall use any further endeavours of which I am capable to assist in accomplishing this purpose.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would respectfully dissent from the suggestion that the arrangement of these matters should be left to the Canadian command at the front. That practice should never have been followed in the first place, and should not be followed now. I know of one Canadian battalion which in three months after Lens wasted upwards of four thousand men. The 50th Battalion of Calgary in one year lost nine thousand men and one hundred and eighteen officers. The gentleman who so informed me is in the gallery to-day and was one of the unfortunates who were bowled out. It is this kind of generalship that has prevented not only the formation long ago of French Canadian brigades, but of a sixth division and two army corps in the field. In the summer of 1916 we had a plan for six division, two army corps, and a French Canadian brigade. The whole thing was thoroughly planned. One battalion was

from the Eastern Townships; I forget the commander's name, but he was a cavalry officer, an Englishman; I think it was Colonel Gilbert. Nearly half of that battalion were French, and they were perfectly satisfied to come in with the other three French Canadian battalions. We were going to organize them into a brigade, but the whole plan was knocked on the head. It was not necessary, of course, to break up these battalions. The Nova Scotian Highlanders, one of the finest brigades that ever wore uniform, were broken up after the solemn pledge of the Prime Minister that they would go forward as a unit. It was some officer or power in England—I know what it is but I will not discuss it—that was responsible for the breaking up of this brigade, just as it was responsible for preventing the formation of a sixth division and two army corps, instead of one army corps and four divisions. Our losses with two army corps would not have been any heavier. Take the case of the Calgary battalion that I mentioned a moment ago. It lost nine thousand men in twelve months and was filled up, filled up, filled up, and filled up again in the twelve months. What difference would it have made if those nine thousand casualties had been spread over three battalions instead of one? I maintain that if my plan had been followed we would have had at the front to-day six divisions and two army corps, and then we would have avoided the troubles the Prime Minister will find among those men when he gets over there this summer. We would also have had a French Canadian brigade commanded by a French Canadian officer. There are scores of gallant French Canadian officers, without dragging in General Lessard, who have covered themselves with glory and were not afraid to face the music. We could have had all this in 1916 if the plans I laid down had been followed.

The right hon. the Prime Minister referred to the new conditions of warfare. General Rawlinson, with one man to a yard and a half, held back 25 Germans to the yard, trimmed them to a finish and held the trenches. He defeated the Germans 25 men to a yard and did not seem to have much trouble in doing it, and there was not a man between Rawlinson and Calais. These men were armed with Lee-Enfield rifles. The Canadian corps at St. Julien and at the second battle of Ypres with practically a similar number of men, one Canadian to every two yards, held back from 12 to 25 Germans to the yard. It chanced that the Canadians were armed with Ross rifles on that occasion. I am sorry to say that the conditions of warfare are very much changed since that time, that rifle shooting seems to have fallen back, and that bombs, hand grenades, and all those side shows have taken its place, with results that are not altogether too satisfactory, as is shown by the loss of Cambrai and St. Quentin, where we did not cover ourselves with too much glory. There is one thing more and that is that if you train the men to feel their own power there is no power in Germany that can drive them back.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present when my hon. friend (Mr. DuTremblay) spoke, but I should like to say one or two words because he was good enough to speak to me yesterday regarding his suggestion as to forming a French Canadian brigade. It would be very easy for me to get into a critical mood and go back to the early stages of the war and find fault with the organization of our Canadian forces. It would be an easy matter for some to play the old game of criticising my good friend the former Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). But I must say that he is entitled to every credit for doing the utmost that any human being could do, and for the wonderful effort he made in raising the first and second contingents. I always objected to the methods by which he did it, and I do not hesitate to say so here. I have no hesitation in saying that if he had allowed the old militia units, which had been in existence for many years to have gone over, and held their original designations, and to raise one, two, or three battalions within themselves for reinforcements, it probably would have been better all round. We might have got better results if that policy had been adopted, but I shall not go into that now. I am trying to view the situation as it stands to-day.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would my hon. friend have had each battalion of the old militia force represented at the front as a corps? If so, he would have had about 200 battalions.

Major-General MEWBURN: We have at the front today in the four divisions 48 infantry battalions, not including the pioneer battalions and line of communication troops. We had in Canada autogether about

120 infantry battalions including the rural corps. I believe it would have been a very simple matter to have allowed a certain number of city battalions, and also some rural battalions which could have been made into composite battalions, to have been trained and to have gone to the front under their own regimental numbers, allowing these units to have raised as many battalions within themselves as they could. Those were my views and the views of some other members of the militia at that time. In the fall of 1915 a good many of us asked the then Minister of Militia and Defence if he would permit us in Military District No. 2 to raise an Ontario division for the front. He agreed and promised a division from Ontario. It was raised and organized in all its component parts, except the Howitzer brigade, but the military situation was such that it did not work out as we had hoped it would, and we were told it was not possible to carry out the scheme as we had supposed. We still "carried on," did a lot of work, got men, and we did achieve very good results.

It is not within my power to-day to say that a French Canadian brigade may be raised from the province of Quebec; that it shall go overseas as a bridagde; and that we shall take out one of the brigades at present at the front and substitute for it a new brigade. But I think my hon. friend will agree that I have gone out of my way —and it has been a pleasure to me to do it —to meet in every way possible the views of my hon. friends who have shown such a magnificent desire to get men from the province of Quebec. I have done everything in my power to meet that situation. I realize the fact that not only in their interest, but in the interest of the service, it is most desirable that men coming from the same localities and men of the same condition in life should be kept together, and have opportunity of associating together both in training and at the front.

Let me refer to the formation of the first Tank battalion that has been raised in Canada. We received instructions from overseas to raise a tank battalion. We thought it well to immediately get in touch with the various universities in Canada, we communicated with them, and the result is that we have in the city of Ottawa to-day the first Tank battalion raised in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many men?

Major-General MEWBURN: Nearly 800 men. It will be the privilege of the members of this House to see that Tank battalion on parade in front of the Parliament Buildings on Friday afternoon before they leave for overseas. That is the first battalion of that kind that has been raised in Canada and it is most creditable to my friends from the province of Quebec that they rose to the occasion and raised their quota for that corps. The result has been so gratifying that the question has been asked me by some members, "Could we not attempt a second Tank battalion." I did not hesitate to say that I thought we could, and I have already cabled overseas to see if we can get permission to raise a second Tank battalion in Canada.

As to a French Canadian brigade, I may say we have been in communication with the universities in the province of Quebec, and I am glad to say that Laval University both in Montreal and in Quebec has met us in a splendid spirit, and has undertaken to raise two companies from the C.O. T.C. I shall do all in my power not only to secure further reinforcements for our troops but to promote that solid unity of sentiment that should exist between the people of the different provinces of Canada.

That is my fond hope and desire and just as soon as I can get away from Parliament I shall take a trip through the province of Quebec to see what further can be done to put that plan into effect. I hope and sincerely trust that the C.O.T.C. to which I have referred, will not be the only one in the province of Quebec. As to whether a French Canadian brigade can be authorized and raised, or as to whether a French Canadian brigade can be sent to the front, it is not for me to say. That must be left to the Commander of the Force in France.

SUPPLY—DELEGATION OF FARMERS.

Mr. T. VIEN (Lotbinière): May I remind the House that a communication was made to us this morning from the convention of farmers now in session in Ottawa? These farmers have asked us to give them an appointment so that two or three representatives from their conference might address this House. I have been advised by one of the members from Ontario of the executive committee, that they will be in session at the Arena from two o'clock until six this afternoon and that their executive is expecting the answer that was promised by your letter, Mr. Speaker, in reply to their communication of this morning.

I venture to suggest that it may be proper to determine, first, whether we are going to receive these farmers, then fix the hour

for doing so; and then inform them of our decision without delay so that they could make arrangements to meet us at the appointed time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I rise to speak with the permission of the House, because I have spoken already. I had the privilege this morning, for two hours and a half, of attending a meeting with the delegates to whom my hon. friend has made allusion, and it does not seem to me desirable at this stage of the session that the proceedings of the House should be interrupted for the purpose which he has mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am in a position whenever the House so desires to make it acquainted with the views which were expressed at that meeting, and under the circumstances I do not feel that the House ought to interrupt its proceedings for the purpose referred to. If these gentlemen would like, between the hours of six and eight o'clock, to address any members of the House who would wish to be present to hear them, there is not the slightest objection to it, but to interrupt for that purpose, the proceedings during the ordinary hours at which this House meets, seems out of the question under present conditions.

SUPPLY.

CAMP BORDEN.

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR THE CAMP SITE.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to the manner in which the expropriation of land for Camp Borden was carried out. A motion in my name in regard to this matter has been on the Order Paper from the beginning of the session until lately, when, as it could not be reached, owing to the advanced state of the session, by agreement with the right hon. leader of the House, I allowed it to be dropped with the understanding that I should be free to bring the subject up on going into Supply. My remarks on this occasion will be short and to the point.

The matter in itself is of some importance. Prior to the war, Mr. Speaker, the military authorities in Canada had secured 359,000 acres of military camp ground. After the war my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence, acquired for the Government, and rightly so, the now famous Valcartier camp, which brought the total acreage of military camp grounds to 372,000 acres. Later on, in May of the year 1916, the Government further acquired what is now known as Camp Borden in the province of Ontario, comprising in the neighbourhood of 16,200 acres. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Militia Department controls other areas of land known as the Dorval property, the old La Prairie camp, and the Rockcliffe and Connaught rifle ranges. The contract between the Minister of Militia and Defence and the would-be owner or proprietor of the property which has since become well known as the Borden camp, was made on the 10th April, 1916. The contract was entered into between the Hon. Edward Kemp, now Sir Edward Kemp —who was then the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence,—and a gentleman by the name of James Barr.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I might point out that it was not the Minister of Militia and Defence, it was the acting minister who entered into that contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad to be corrected by my hon. friend. It was the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence. The contract was for the delivery of 17,300 acres of land for the sum of $207,600, at the rate of $12 per acre. James Barr obtained the land. He was the owner of a certain portion, but obtained the balance from divers owners at the rate of $8 per acre, and in some cases even less. Barr represented himself as the Government agent, and offered to many of the parties, as I will show in a moment, from $3 to $8 per acre for the land which he sought to acquire, he himself having an agreement at that time with the then Acting Minister of Militia and Defence under which he was to receive $12 an acre. At first the owners resisted and protested when asked to dispose of their property. Some of them had enlisted and gone overseas, and the bargain was made with their wives or relatives. As there was on their part a fear of the law and of long drawn-out litigation and proceedings before the Exchequer Court, with consequent delays and appeals to the courts, most, if not all, of the owners, agreed to accept the amounts which were offered to them.

Now in order to make this case very clear and to show how those poor people were duped, I will first of all read the agreeement entered into between the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence and James Barr. I need not describe the lands themselves, which are well known in char-

acter. In the contract they are described as:

Property containing 17,300 acres, and which said property is more particularly shown enclosed within the red lines on the sketch hereto attached, at and for the price of sum of $207,600, it being understood that if said above-mentioned property exceeds the acreage of 17,300 that you are to pay me in addition to the above sum, a sum equivalent to $12 per acre on such overplus, and in case it does not amount to 17,300, acres there is to be deducted from the above sum, an amount equivalent to $12 per acre on the deficiency.

Barr declares himself to be the owner of some 8,000 acres of the above-mentioned land, so he had to acquire from third parties the balance of the property. This agreement was signed on the 10th of April, 1916, by James Barr and by A. E. Kemp, Acting Minister of Militia and Defence, and was witnessed by F. B. Poucher, Toronto, April 15th, 1916.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who signs that as witness?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The witness is F. B. Poucher, evidently an old French name.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is he the land valuator of the National Trust Company?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have seen his name connected with the National Trust, but as to that I cannot vouch. Mr. Poucher could vouch, I suppose. Now, Mr. Barr evidently had in mind to get the balance of the property at as cheap a price as possible. He was already in possession of 8,000 acres. He retained the services of a gentleman named G. A. Radenhurst, solicitor, barrister, notary public and conveyancer, of Barrie, Ont. I will give the letter which this barrister wrote to the various parties owning the balance of the lots:

Barrie, November 25, 1916.

Dear Sir,—

I enclose you herewith the formal tender on behalf of the Crown—

You see, he represents himself as acting for the Crown, that is, for the Department of Militia and Defence.

—for the lands expropriated as part of Camp Borden. I would be glad if you would let me know whether it is accepted or not, and if not accepted the name of any solicitor who would accept service for you of the information to be lodged. Also if the lot named in the tender is not the property you are interested in, or if you are interested in any other property in the said site not settled for, please let me know. The Crown is only anxious—

Always speaking on behalf of the Crown, for the Department of Militia and Defence.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

and in the name of the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence.

—that what is fair and just shall be done, but as the purchasing agent and you differ as to values this is the only course we see that can be fairly taken to ascertain the value of the lands.

Yours truly,

G. A. Radenhurst.

Many of the unfortunate proprietors, fearing long-drawn out expropriation proceedings before the courts, yielded to the demand made by this would-be counsel for the Crown, and it was only after they had received the pittance presumably offered them by the Crown through Mr. Radenhurst, who, in fact, was acting only for James Barr, that they addressed a petition to His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, then Governor General. I have that petition here, and shall put it on Hansard:

Mimico, Ont., September 26, 1916.

To His Royal Highness The Duke of Connaught,
Governor General of Canada.

May it please your Royal Highness:

My husband, John Jepson, is a private in the 124th Battalion now in England, and my eldest son is at Camp Borden, and I am living here with my younger children. Four years ago we bought twenty acres which is part of the land taken for Camp Borden. We were well satisfied with the land and intended making our home there, paying for it by hard savings. We have already paid $333, and owe about $25 yet before we get our deed. A man saying he is the purchasing agent for the Government tells us that the Government has taken it and won't pay more than $160. This is a cruel injustice that the Government should rob us of $200, when the only wage-earners of the family are fighting for Canada.

I humbly petition your Royal Highness to save my family from this shameful robbery. My husband cannot attend to this himself and I do not know what to do; so I take this liberty which I hope you will pardon.

Your obedient servant,

Ada Jepson.

Simon Street,
Mimico, Ont.

The secretary of His Royal Highness acknowledged receipt of that letter, and said that it had been referred to the minister—the acting minister I suppose—who would see that justice was done. Mrs. Jepson, however, was nevertheless awarded $160, while James Barr, under his contract with the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence, got $80 profit out of it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. member says that this lady was awarded a certain amount. Who awarded it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Exchequer Court. Mr. Radenhurst got a deed signed by this lady in the absence of her husband, who

was fighting in France for Canada, and fearing that it would come before the courts, and being under the impression that Radenhurst and Barr were acting for the Crown, she yielded.

Let us take the case of William Russell, No. 29 Rusholme Park Crescent, Toronto, County of York, also on the matter of Camp Borden. I have here his affidavit. He was the owner of twenty acres, Mr. Speaker, in that site taken for the Government for Camp Borden. He had paid $17 per acre for it, had bought it after personal inspection for his summer home, and was well satisfied with it. What took place in his case? He will recite the facts:

That in order to get me to sell for less than it cost, a man named James Barr claiming to be the Government agent offered me $8 per acre, stating that was all the Government would pay, and if I did not take that price it would be confiscated by the Government. Previous to that, he offered my wife $3 per acre, using the same threats to her and stating that he had got lots of the land at that price, which I quite believe if he used the same means to acquire it, especially when his conduct was endorsed by Radenhurst, the Government solicitor, who referred to Barr as the purchasing agent and repeated his offer at $8, stating that the Crown is only anxious that what is fair and just should be done, but as the purchasing agent (Barr) and you differ as to values, etc. I have since ascertained that at the time Barr tried to compel my wife to sell for $3 he had already sold my land to the Government for $12 per acre.

So there was a clear gain of $4 per acre inuring to James Barr. Russell continues:

My son bought the adjoining lot at the same time. He is now fighting with the Canadian army in France and he is treated in the same way as I am. We each are offered less than half our cost and have both costs to pay, while Barr's costs are paid by the Government. I have two sons in the fighting line including the one they are trying to rob.

(Signed) W. Russell.

Then there is another case in which the Government paid $160, by the same device, for land which had cost the owner $670, James Barr making quite a profit on the deal. A man by the name of George Behe, of Toronto, solemnly declares:

I am nearly sixty years of age, working in a factory for my daily bread, and bought this land by hard savings, to live on when too old for factory work. I am well satisfied with the land, and did not wish to sell it. I have sent three sons to the war; my eldest, George, was killed at Ypres; my second, Harry, was wounded four times, twice while acting as doctor's assistant and continued dressing the wounded after the doctor was killed, for which he received the D.S. Medal, and I have to-day received a telegram that my third son, Tom, of the 204th regiment is severely wounded. I am told that the Canadian Government have taken my land without my consent and offered me $160 for it. Canada, not content with my giving three sons to her defence, proposes now to rob me of $520.

(Signed) J. G. Behe.

Mr. BOYS: What are the numbers of the lots and concessions in the cases referred to?

Mr. LEMIEUX: This man Behe said that in November, 1911, he bought twenty acres in lot 28, fifth concession, Tossorontio, paying for the said lot $320. He says that wire fencing, clearing and putting under cultivation cost him $350, a total of $670. In the other cases the numbers and descriptions of the lots are not given, but my hon. friend may obtain the official numbers from the department. My object in moving for the papers in this case was to get the titles and papers generally from the Exchequer Court proceedings.

In another case the property of a soldier at the front was sacrificed to make a profit of $80 for this man James Barr. The affidavit in this case is given by a lady, Isabel Tubb, who solemnly declares:

Henry Herbert Tubb was the owner of twenty acres included in the site taken by the Government for Camp Borden, which cost him $16 per acre. That in order to get him to sell it for less than it cost, a man claiming to be the Government agent wrote to me from Barrie and offered $8 per acre and stated that was the highest amount the Government would pay. The said party making the offer was the Crown Solicitor acting for the Government in the matter. The said Henry Herbert Tubb is now overseas and all business has been transacted through me, his wife.

That is, through herself. She declares that she has full knowledge of the matters in question.

Another case was that of George Buxton, who was the owner of 20 acres, being part of lot 27 in the fifth concession included in the site taken by the Government for Camp Borden. It had cost George Buxton $350 and for it he was offered by James Barr and a man named C. F. Wright, both claiming to be Government agents, $8 per acre. Both said that the amount offered was all the Government could pay and that unless George Buxton would take that price he might have to fight the Government for three years and finally get nothing. According to Buxton's affidavit, both these men, Wright and Barr, stated explicitly that they were employed by the Government and that the Government would not give more than $8 per acre. Of course Barr was pocketing the difference between $8 and $12 per acre.

Another case was that of I. F. Berry, of Toronto, who solemnly declares:

On the 16th August 1911 I went up to Lisle with a friend and selected the forty acres after full inquiry and personal inspection. My friend bought forty acres at the same time. We tested the land and considered it worth a great deal more than the $15 we paid for it. It was better than the advertisement said as we found qualities which had not been mentioned. We went up alone and paid our own expenses. On February 1, 1916, I paid my last instalment after much saving and self-denial, intending shortly to go on the land. The forty acres has cost me altogether $700 and represents all my savings for six years, But my land had a special value. It was near the river and in developing the water power my land would be absolutely necessary. Mr. Radenhurst, the Government's solicitor, wrote me that the Government would not take my land without just and fair compensation and advised me to see Wright and Barr, College Street. Wright and Barr sent a man named Barnes to see me and said Wright and Barr had been appointed by the Government to buy the land and would give me $8 per acre and if I refused I would have to fight the Government and that such cases lasted for years.

He also said the Government was getting land for less and would not in any case pay over $8. I have since learned that Mr. Barr had already sold my land to the Government for $12, expecting to compel me by threats to sell for $8, so he could make $160 at my expense. Mr. Radenhurst helped him all he could to compel me to sell my land at a loss of $450. The Government should at least give me what I paid for the land and order Barnes, Wright and Barr to be arrested, if the sentiments of right and justice have any influence. The land is assessed for $400, and I have paid taxes on that valuation.

The mulcted third parties have, through His Excellency the Governor General in Council, petitioned the present Government, and I sincerely hope the Government will live up to that sense of fair play and justice which must animate every true Britisher and Canadian. Here are men whose sons are at the front, some of them having been wounded; here are men who have given as many as three sons to the cause of liberty and justice; here are women whose only support is a husband or a son at the front, and during the absence of those dear ones, speculators have the audacity to represent themselves as being Government agents and Crown solicitors, and by their representations they get signatures from those unsuspicious, honest people, because the latter fear that if they plead with the Government before the courts of the land, their cases will take many years to decide and thus they sacrifice the earnings and the properties which they have acquired after many years of hard and unremitting toil. I hope the sense of British fair play which ought to animate the Government in the present instance will exhibit itself, and that, after investigation, those people will be reimbursed the moneys that have been snatched away from them by those agents. I do not accuse; I make no charge against the Department of Militia and Defence; I make no charge against the Government; but I say that, now that I have made public the facts and that they are known officially, it is the bounden duty of the Government to hold an inquiry into those matters and to see that justice is done.

This is the petition which has been forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General in Council by the aggrieved parties:

Whereas, by a certain agreement entered into between the Hon. A. E. Kemp, Acting Minister of Militia for the Dominion of Canada, and James Barr, of the city of Toronto, province of Ontario, dated April 14, 1916, the Government of the Dominion of Canada undertook to purchase at $12 an acre some 17,300 acres described in the aforementioned agreement as situate, lying and being in the county of Simcoe and known popularly as Camp Borden.

And Whereas, after entering into this agreement, the aforementioned James Barr, as the representative of the Minister of Militia, acquired possession of much of this land at $8, and less, an acre from soldiers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, their wives and widows, and farmers in none too opulent circumstances; and whereas, by the sale to the Government of this land at $12 an acre in pursuance of the aforementioned agreement between Hon. A. E. Kemp and James Barr, the said Barr realized an enormous, and altogether unjustifiable profit.

And Whereas, in the Exchequer Court of Canada, at a session in Toronto on May 17 and 18, 1917, the price paid by the said Barr to the original owners was ratified at expropriation proceedings, the learned trial judge holding that what Barr had obtained from the Government for the land had nothing to do with the value of the land and the price he paid for it:—

Now therefore, the following petitioners humbly pray that His Majesty's Government may in a spirit of justice deem it meet and right to order a further and more thorough inquiry into the transaction in all its ramifications with a view to determining what may be done further towards an equitable adjustment and award.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Though I make no charge against the Government, I wish however to qualify my statement by saying this, that the Government should never employ go-betweens as between the Crown and the party whose property is to be expropriated. An agreement was made in this case between the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence and Barr by which a certain piece of property was to be bought by the Government for $12 an acre. Why should the Crown have made such a bargain with James Barr, when the Crown knew perfectly well that Barr was

the owner of only 8,000 acres? The Crown knew perfectly well that the balance was the property of individual owners. The Department of Militia and Defence should have seen to it that the transaction took place directly between the Crown and the individual owners. From past proceedings and past evidence the department knew very well that any go-between would mulct the third parties in that instance. That is the fault I have to find with the Department of Militia and Defence. But cannot something be now done to right this wrong? We, the representatives of the people, are being asked by this Government on this very day to pay enormous sums to Mackenzie and Mann, to the Canadian Northern Railway company; we are being asked to be generous with a company which has already received millions at the hands of this Parliament. Mackenzie and Mann are presently claiming before a Board of Arbitration in the city of Toronto, one hundred cents on the dollar as the pretended value of stock which has officially been declared valueless by commissioners appointed under this Government. It was stated in the Senate at the close of the session last year that the Government was ready to pay up to $10,000,000 in satisfying the claims of Mackenzie and Mann. Surely, if this Government can afford to be so generous as that with an opulent syndicate, it can afford, not to be generous, but to do what is just and right for the unfortunate wives and young men who are being deprived of the ascertained value of their property at Camp Borden. I would appeal to the sense of fair play and justice in the Government. I do not know these individuals, but if any one in my own province had been treated as these British-born—I am told they are British born—have been treated, in the province of Ontario I would be grateful to any one who interceded for my compatriots thus mulcted in the province of Quebec. I say it is a crying shame to let these agents get away with the money of the poor lads who are fighting our battle in France.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): Owing to the fact that Camp Borden is within the limits of my riding it may be proper that I should offer an observation or two respecting the matter the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has just raised. I am sorry I did not know this matter was coming up to-day, for I have considerable information that would have been of great assistance to me, to cite, and which I think would have assisted this House in coming to a proper conclusion in the matter. I have therefore to speak purely from memory, with, perhaps, a reference to one or two matters that have just been placed in my hands by the minister. In the first place, if what my hon. friend says is strictly correct, not a very strong case has been made out. He refers to $80 in one case, and to about the same amount in another. But he entirely overlooks a feature which I think is a complete answer to what he has said. He has said that Mr. Barr—may I incidentally remark I hold no brief whatever for Mr. Barr, and have nothing whatever to do with him in any shape or form—he says that Mr. Barr stole eighty dollars. He proceeds upon the assumption that when Barr gets twelve dollars under the contract and only gives eight he is enabled thereby to pocket the sum of four dollars on each acre. If that were so, I would admit at once that, while the figures are not large, the ratio of profit would be exorbitant. But my hon. friend cannot have a knowledge of the facts, or I do not think he would have taken his seat leaving any such false impression with the House. If Mr. Barr was not compelled to give more than $12 for some of the lands he bought, or did not have to give more than eight in any case, his argument might be sound. I myself have a personal knowledge, I think I may say, of every case of a bona fide settler within the limits of Camp Borden. I have not a knowledge of the three or four cases my hon. friend refers to, nor have I a knowledge of perhaps the most important case, that of Enoch Thompson, a speculator in the city of Toronto, who had a large acreage within the limits of Camp Borden. But I think I have a knowledge of every case of a bona fide settler, for nearly all of them spoke to me and complained they were not getting what they thought was right. In one case a settler got $8,500—I may be two or three hundred dollars out because I am speaking from memory—another one got $7,000, another $6,500, and a number of others got all the way from $1,500 to the figures I have mentioned, all of which averaged more than, far more than $12 an acre. The question this House would require to be answered is to find out whether or not Barr was getting that to which he was not entitled reasonably: How much did he get for the total acreage at Camp Borden and how much did he pay? Figures were given to me—I cannot say whether they are absolutely accurate or not but if they are

accurate I venture to say that no member of this House would have taken over the contract Barr had, and gone to the trouble he did for the profit there was in it. We cannot judge by an odd case here and there; we must have the price that was paid in every case, and perhaps the fairest test as to whether or not the Government have been dealing fairly with the owners of Camp Borden is the fact that out of the whole 16,000 acres only eight or ten claims have not been settled satisfactorily to the owners. In three of these cases there was hardship I admit, but no hardship so far as the action of the Government is concerned. The hardship was that eight or ten or twelve years ago these innocent, and as far as land values are concerned, ignorant people were induced by somebody, I know not whom, to purchase twenty-acre blocks of land. I know what I am talking about, because I have lived within fourteen miles of this very property all my life. It is pure sand, blow sand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If, as my hon. friend says, they are ignorant people is not that all the more reason why the Government should protect them against the wiles of speculators?

Mr. BOYS: When I said ignorant I had reference to their lack of knowledge of land values in that part of Ontario. They may be cultured people in other respects, but they certainly had no knowledge of the value of this land or they would never have bought it. They were induced by speculators to buy this land at $16 or $20 an acre, not by Barr as far as I know. In expropriating this land does my hon. friend say it was the duty of the Government to accept as the true value the amount paid. In expropriating proceedings it is the actual value, I understand, not figured too closely, it is true, but rather a little on the generous side that should govern—would my hon. friend say that no matter what a man gave for his property that should be the price paid when expropriating it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The least the Government could have done would have been to give these people the price allowed to Mr. Barr. Mr. Barr got more than the property cost these people.

Mr. BOYS: My hon friend cannot have appreciated the argument I made, perhaps feebly and inadequately. Mr. Barr had to give a great deal more than $12 for a great deal of the land he bought. If he had to give $12, and never less, for every acre he bought, and sometimes as high as $25 and $30 and $40 an acre for land where there were improvements or barns—there were not very many of them it is true—he would have been a loser in the transaction and could not possibly have carried it through. Therefore, he had to acquire some of these lands at less than $12 an acre to be in a position to pay more than $12 for other lands he had to buy. So after all, it comes down to the question, what has Barr made? Unless we know that, we do not know whether this thing is iniquitous or not.

The hon. gentleman says that there were very many cases. There were, all told, fourteen cases. He says that these will take years to dispose of in the exchequer court. Let me tell him that these fourteen cases have all been disposed of long ago. They went before Mr. Justice Cassels in the exchequer court, a judge in whom I am sure my hon. friend has every confidence. If the matter were of sufficient importance, and time would permit, I would go through these cases. In only two out of the whole fourteen were they successful. In many of the cases the demands were considered so exorbitant and the land so worthless that his lordship even saddled the claimants with costs. He heard evidence and he found the amount tendered was ample. Unless my hon. friend is prepared to contest what his lordship Mr. Justice Cassels has concluded is the proper way to dispose of values in expropriation cases, that is by giving the actual value and not what these people gave through their ignorance, that puts an end to the case. I do not think he will go so far as to say that what they paid should be the test. In each case my hon. friend has referred to I asked where the lands were. I visited the location and I found that they were at the west side of the camp in the township of Tossorontio. I found that the land was blow sand. That is also what was found by Mr. Justice Cassels. Since I have been a member of this House I do not believe there has been any purchase put through a department in the service of this country cleaner or fairer than the Camp Borden transaction and it will stand any investigation that my hon. friend may ask for. You will not find any irregularities there. On the other hand, you will find that there are only a few cases of dissatisfaction and in these cases these unfortunate people gave too much for their land. Mr. Justice Cassels held that what they had given for the land was not a fair test of what it was worth. My hon. friend has forgotten to

state that Mr. Barr had to give more than $12 an acre for some of the land. I think it is hardly fair to accuse him of stealing $80, or the difference between $8 and $12 per acre, because he had to give far more than $12 for a very large acreage in the camp.

My hon. friend, I take it unintentionally and without knowledge, has done a great injustice to Mr. Radenhurst in this connection. If my hon. friend knew Mr. Radenhurst he would never have thought of doing such a thing. If he had not referred to the fact that Mr. Radenhurst was the agent of the department and assisted Barr I would not have thought it necessary to have dragged his name into this case because he is too respectable and well known in the town of Barrie to be brought into a discussion of this kind. But as my hon. friend has referred to Mr. Barr as stealing, and has coupled Mr. Radenhurst's name with the transaction, I feel called upon to protest in defence of one of the most respectable solicitors and gentlemen in the county of Simcoe. If my hon. friend will make any inquiry whatever in the town of Barrie, he will find that there is no one in that locality more honourable and more highly respected than Mr. Radenhurst. He is a man of the highest standing at the bar of the county of Simcoe, is President of the Simcoe Law Association and is as well known for his honesty and integrity as any man in that county. I think, in view of these facts, that my hon. friend will feel disposed to withdraw any insinuations he had made in regard to Mr. Radenhurst. The only way that my hon. friend can introduce him into the matter is by referring to his letter which he read, but I deny that this letter warrants any such insinuations as my hon. friend has made. In his capacity as agent of the Government, he did what was usual with regard to expropriation proceedings and answered enquiries of land owners telling them if they were not satisfied with the tenders made, the true value could be ascertained by expropriation. When I recall the investigations in the Public Accounts Committee, with regard to Valcartier, I am glad to be the representative of South Simcoe, of the conditions surrounding the purchase in which Camp Borden is, and I derive considerable satisfaction from a comparison of the conditions surrounding the purchase of lands for these two camps. I recall that men from the province of Quebec appeared before that committee and asked $35,000 for farms that were assessed for $900. We had nothing of that kind in the county of Simcoe. The bona fide settlers there were reasonable. Some of them, I thought, asked more than they were entitled to, and I told them so. Mr. Barr was in the office and so was his solicitor. I felt they were asking too much and I said to Barr: "As far as I am concerned I want this to be clean, to go through without criticism and without scandal. I don't want excessive prices paid. On the other hand, I want you to be fair to these people." The bulk of the settlers on these lands were humble settlers, although there were five or six good farms in one part. I asked him to loosen up a little bit and do the decent thing. I found Barr willing to do that, and he did it, but he did not do it to excess, in the cases my hon. friend referred to where the land was largely sand.

Sir SAM HUGHES: With reference to this particular case that has been referred to, were these not little blocks of land that had been sold as a summer resort some years before, where people thought they would have nice little orchards and gardens? There were 25 acres of this land.

Mr. BOYS: That is absolutely correct. The man who promoted that scheme must have had some faith in it because I found waterpipes laid down across the land, a gasolene engine and a private waterworks system installed. These lands on the west side of the camp were laid out in blocks and evidently he must have felt that something would grow on them but when I was there there were no signs of vegetation at all. Even the grass would not grow. It was, as Mr. Justice Cassels found, all blow sand. An effort was made to show that it was a sort of game preserve. The Pine river goes through some of this property and it was claimed that it was a fishing preserve, that mink, deer and wild animals of various descriptions were to be found and that this represented a certain amount of value. Every conceivable method was devised to add value to this property. I do not think any hon. gentleman will say for a moment that Mr. Justice Cassels had any idea of putting a lower value upon this land than the actual value. If my hon. friend will take the time to go through the six or seven typewritten pages of the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels the ideas which he has as to the situation at Camp Borden will be very quickly removed with this one exception which I am free at all times to admit, and that is that a hardship exists owing solely to the fact that they paid too

much when they bought years ago. If you are to lay down the law that because a man has given $20 per acre for his property, even if it is only worth $3, he should get $20, these men should have received more money. But I do not think my hon. friend can find any such law. Mr. Justice Cassels found to the contrary. There are some other features but I do not feel that it is desirable that I should take up more time at this stage. I want to point out in conclusion, for the benefit of those gentlemen who have not seen Camp Borden, that I do not believe there is any place in Canada where the Government could have secured 16,000 acres for anything like the same money more suitable for a military camp than the land within the limits of that camp. And in doing that I am not going by my own judgment. I have talked with officers who have been in the camps of Great Britain, and have been in all the camps in Canada—in Ontario and Quebec, at all events—and they have told me that all things being considered there is not a better camp in England or in Canada. There is, for instance, an abundant supply of the purest water that could be got anywhere. Artesian wells were sunk six inches across—one of them eight inches across—to a depth of 125 feet, thus securing an abundant flow of as fine drinking water as you could possibly get, and that is a most important feature in connection with such a camp. It is true that on one particular day of extreme heat, more than a year ago, there was considerable dust, mainly caused by the burning of hundreds and thousands of stumps, but you did not hear that complaint last year, and I do not believe you will hear it again. I only want to say here that I regret that the Minister of Militia and the department are not able to use Camp Borden to a fuller extent than it is going to be used this year. The Flying Corps, with a strength of some four to five thousand men, which is quite a good number, are located there, but there is room enough at the camp to accommodate thirty thousand—in fact, I think, fifty thousand—troops. The camp is well equipped and fitted to receive men at any time for training while this war goes on. I unhesitatingly say that, although there were some persons who suffered by reason of paying more for their land than they should have done, Camp Borden will bear any investigation that may be intituted and it is refreshing to hear of a case where the Department is accused of not paying enough money, generally the accusation is extragance.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I have some personal knowledge of this matter through the fact that the legal firm with which I am associated represented some of these parties in the Exchequer Court proceedings, over these lands before Mr. Justice Cassels. I do not wish to approach this case from a sentimental aspect at all. It is purely from the legal point of view that I would like to say a word or two.

I would draw the attention of the House to a very extraordinary clause in the agreement between the Crown and Mr. Barr—the agreement which was referred to by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). It is in a letter addressed to the Hon. A. E. Kemp, Acting Minister of Militia and Defence, and signed by James Barr on the 10th April, 1916:

> If I am unable to procure any portion of the said property so as to convey the same to you on or before the 10th of May, 1916, you are then to exercise expropriation proceedings in regard to the said property.

"You are to exercise expropriation proceedings in regard to the said property." This is an agreement made by Barr with the Crown. The Crown agrees to pay $12 per acre for this land, and Barr, in order to secure himself, makes an agreement containing the proviso that if he should not be able to secure this land the Crown would give him the machinery of the Exchequer Court, which has hitherto always been reserved to itself, and with this machinery Mr. Barr would wrest from these poor English settlers the land, at the price fixed by the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BOYS: I think my hon. friend is aware that the proceedings in the Exchequer Court would have to be initiated, not by the department at all, but by the person who believes that his or her land is worth more than is offered.

Mr. JACOBS: These proceedings were instituted by the Crown.

Mr. BOYS: Oh, no.

Mr. JACOBS: I am surprised my hon. friend would say that, because I acted myself in the case for the parties against the Crown, and Mr. Radenhurst appeared for the Crown.

Mr. BOYS: After the offer had been refused.

Mr. JACOBS: Certainly.

Mr. BOYS: I agree with the hon. gentleman, but not until the party concerned was unwilling to accept the amount offered.

Mr. JACOBS: Certainly, but Mr. Barr offered $8 per acre to these people and they refused to accept it. He then threatened them with Exchequer Court proceedings, and when they still remained obdurate, we find the Crown appearing as plaintiff in the case, although they had made arrangements with Barr to purchase that property from him for $12 an acre. They gave him the machinery of the Exchequer Court so that he would obtain the land from these people at the price fixed by the court. The case came on and the Crown, mark you, that had made arrangements to pay $12 an acre for the land a few months before, placed witnesses on the stand to prove that the land for which it had agreed to pay $12 an acre was not worth more than $8 an acre, and the Court so found, and further found that some of the land was not even worth $3 an acre. It maintained Mr. Barr in his contention. My complaint against the Crown is this: Had it not made this arrangement to give Barr the machinery of the Exchequer Court to obtain this land, Barr would have been in the same position as any other man, and owners could have held their land against the world; they might have asked $10,000 per acre, and Mr. Barr would not have been able to take it from them. But under this agreement the people found they had to part with their land, not to the Crown, but to a private individual, and the quarrel I have with the Crown is that it should have prostituted its position, and handed over the machinery of the Exchequer Court to a private individual, for his own gain, so that these men had to part with their property for $8 when they could have held it for any price they liked. That is the position.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if I am in order to speak on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the hon. member has already spoken.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to speak only once on a motion.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The language which has been used with regard to this transaction might, perhaps, be justified were it not that all the indignation indulged in is built up upon the assumption that the Crown bought the land of the particular people referred to at $12 an acre. Now, the Crown did nothing of the kind. The Crown required the whole block of 17,300 acres, and bought it from Mr. Barr for $207,000. Dividing that sum by the number of acres would give $12 an acre, but the Government did not buy each acre at that sum; they bought the whole area for a sum which would figure out at $12 an acre. However, it was perfectly known to them and perfectly known to Mr. Barr that each acre in the area was not worth $12; some of it was worth very much more, and other portions very much less.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it a fact that Mr. Barr paid in any one instance more than $12 an acre for that land?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: He owned some 5,800 acres, but what he paid for it I do not know. This much I do know; that before the Crown determined to buy the entire site at that aggregate price it had the land valued by two outstanding valuators of the city of Toronto, whose reputations certainly are above suspicion, who valued the entire area and put upon the land the price that was paid for it, taking one lot with another. We are not undertaking to say that each particular lot was worth $12. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jacobs) asked if Mr. Barr paid more than $12 for any one acre. As I said I do not know what he paid for the land, but I would point out this fact, which establishes beyond peradventure that some thousands of acres of the land included in the original quantity were worth more than $12 an acre; that subsequently to that contract there was a further arrangement entered into in virtue whereof the Crown could abandon any part of the land which it found not to be required, and there was found to be a very considerable portion of it not to be required or, at least, not to be desirable to take, because it was crossed by roads that would have to be suppressed, and it was not considered proper that that should be done. Those were abandoned. But when they were abandoned there was a valuation made on those lots which figured them out to be worth $13.62 an acre, and there was deducted from the price to be paid by Mr. Barr, not $12 an acre for those lots, but $13.62 an acre, which shows that those lots —and I think there were about 4,000 acres in round figures of that land—

Sir SAM HUGHES: North of the Mad river.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. As I say, there never was a purchase at $12 an acre of the land of these particular people referred to at all. There was a purchase of that whole block at a sum total price, which if you divide it by acres, would figure out at $12 per acre; and that price was made after the most careful valuation by men of the very highest repute. The interest of the Crown to acquire that as a whole is perfectly obvious, as Mr. Justice Cassels points out in his judgment.

It is quite true that Mr. Barr did not own all the land, and it is quite true that it was agreed that whatever portion of it Mr. Barr could not acquire the Crown would itself expropriate, as it did itself expropriate it. We have heard something about the prostitution of the rights of the Crown. Why my hon. friend, who is a very distinguished lawyer, will quite realize that if we had not bought from Mr. Barr we would have gone out and expropriated the entire property.

Mr. JACOBS: And saved money.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It was precisely because it was established to us by the valuation that I spoke of that it would be more economical for the Crown to pay this price which these valuators stood behind than to take the chance of exaggerated values in the expropriation that the transaction was carried out in the way in which it was. And the mere stipulation—this stipulation which the hon. gentleman qualifies as prostitution of the Crown's rights—it is hard to keep serious and so describe it—that, if Mr. Barr failed to deliver to us any of the property he had undertaken to sell to us we should exercise the methods which we had of acquiring it and charge him the difference in the price. If it cost us any more to expropriate it, we would charge him the difference; if it cost us less to expropriate it, of course then we had no damage to claim from him and he took his whole original price. I would like to point out that this price all through was $207,000, the price for the entire property. We deducted from that $13.62 an acre for the acres that were abandoned, and we set off against that whatever was paid when we expropriated the property.

What was this awful thing that was said to these people who complained? Mind you, I understand the people who complained. I do not as readily understand the indignation of the hon. gentleman, to whom I give credit for having, perhaps, a clearer apprehension of the actual facts. These people were very unfortunate victims, but they were victimized when they bought, not when we acquired the property. Mr. Justice Cassels points that out in his judgment. He makes reference to "what might mildly be termed the highly coloured literature" that induced these people to buy these "blow sand" hills for orchards and all sorts of purposes which on its face would give them an extraordinary value.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that they purchased those very lots from Barr originally?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware whether they did or not. And I am not interested in the slightest degree in the question whether Mr. Barr is a saint or a sinner. What I am trying to point out is that these people, so far as this Government is concerned, got absolutely every dollar that they would have got if we had proceeded in the ordinary course to expropriate, and as we did with regard to other lands and that they were not injured one iota, because if you figure out the total price which we were to pay Barr for the whole amount it would have been $12 per acre. We did not pay Mr. Barr anything for that acre; we charged over against the price that we were to pay Mr. Barr whatever the courts said we ought to acquire that property for at the expropriation rate. So that I fancy that if I am capable of making anything clear I have made it quite clear that under that contract there never was bought the land of those particular people at $12 an acre.

Now as to what is complained of that these people were told. In so far as Mr. Barr may or may not have said that he was the agent of the Government—if he so said I do not think he correctly described himself—but in so far as Mr. Radenhurst or anybody else told these people that if they would not accept the price that the Government offered them they would have to be subjected to expropriation, why they were told the simple truth. That is described as an awful threat. Well, it is what happens to any proprietor when for public purposes the Crown believes that it is necessary for it to take their property. These people were offered, I think, $8 an acre, which was the price mentioned with regard to these particular cases. I know a number were offered $8 an acre, and some were offered less; and some of the lots were

found when it went before the court to be worth less than that. If I followed correctly the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), he was speaking of the people who did not go to court. It is very unfortunate for those people, because they were told, which was the truth, that inasmuch as the Government required that land, if they would not accept what was offered they would have to resort to expropriation proceedings. If, because they were told that, they parted with their particular properties at anything less than they were worth, that is very unfortunate. But that is something that is not peculiar to them; that is what happens to any man whose property is expropriated by the Crown when the Crown does not feel justified in offering him an amount which he is willing to accept. The cases which did go before the court, as my hon. friend has pointed out, and as the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels which I have before me shows, demonstrated that the offers made to all of these people were, in the words of Mr. Justice Cassels, "generous offers."

His lordship deals with the question of how he is to proceed to value. He endeavours not to fail to be as liberal as a man can be, but he does not think it proper for him to be generous with the money of other people. He points out what I am sure both my hon. friends will not dispute, that the mere fact that these people had bought their lands at a price vastly more than they are worth did not justify him in allowing—nor would it, I think, justify the Crown in paying—more than they were worth. Looking at the facts of the case, therefore, I fancy that my two hon. friends will realize that their indignation was at least a little over-warm. Most assuredly the Crown had no desire to do these people out of one dollar of value that they owned. Reference has been made to the fact that some of them were soldiers and that some had soldier relatives. Surely it is not suggested that that would be a reason why the Crown would not want to do them justice. We were acquiring this property on behalf of the country and it was our duty to take the best available method of securing it at a reasonable value. We did secure the entire property at a reasonable price. We acquired it as a whole and were able to deal with it as a whole. No individual was thereby placed in any worse position than he would have been in had we exercised our undoubted right of expropriating without any transaction with Mr. Barr at all.

Mr. JACOBS: $75,000 might have been saved if the Crown had expropriated.

Mr. DOHERTY: It was because of the very best advice we could get on the subject—advice to the effect that we would save a large sum of money by making the acquisition in this way—that we proceeded as we did. My hon. friend has had enough experience in expropriation proceedings to know that what has happened in this particular case is rather the exception than the rule in expropriation proceedings. If the Crown had proceeded to expropriate this entire 17,300 acres, there was danger of its finding itself mulcted for more than the valuation put upon it. That is the experience of most people who have had to do with expropriations. Having been in touch during the last seven or eight years with the expropriation proceedings of this Government, I know that it is only rarely that on expropriation proceedings we do not pay more than in the judgment of our valuators the property is worth. The price fixed for the land we abandoned goes to demonstrate that, for a very large proportion of it at all events, we certainly would have paid more than $12 an acre had we proceeded by expropriation. I can understand that the situation of these people is such as to command our sympathy and very easily—with a little goodwill, perhaps—to arouse the very warm feeling that has been expressed. But with the facts before us, it must be clear that no wrong or injustice has been done any party in this connection save that which was suffered by those unfortunate people when they were induced to purchase this land at absolutely fictitious prices. I hold no brief for Mr. Barr; I do not know him; I never saw him. Whether he has had anything to do with the selling of the land to these people I am not in a position to say. If he had; if he is the author of "highly-coloured literature" of which Mr. Justice Cassels speaks, he certainly would be open to grave reprehension for his action in misrepresenting the property he was selling to these people. I do not say that he is deserving of that, because I do not know what his connection with the matter was.

The hon. gentleman has appealed to us to reconsider cases. I am not in a position to speak as to a particular case where a man made a settlement. It is, perhaps, possible that in some particular case a man took less than his property was worth because he preferred not to be expropriated. If there be room for consideration of cases

of that kind I shall be glad to look into them. But the facts as established by the documents on the file, by the judgments of the court and by the result itself to Mr. Barr, all tend to negative the idea that anybody was deprived of his property without getting full value.

I hold in my hand a statement of how this thing petered out. The hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) spoke about our prostituting the powers of the Crown by lending them to Mr. Barr. What was done with regard to the lands that had to be expropriated was this: the Crown expropriated them and charged up against Mr. Barr whatever it paid for the expropriation .

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend read from the judgment of Judge Cassels?

Mr. DOHERTY: That would not bear upon the result to Mr. Barr, but this is what Mr. Justice Cassels says, speaking of the purchasers—he had a great number of cases before him:

> There are different classes of purchases of these Camp Borden lands. A considerable number of acres were laid off into twenty acre lots, and influenced no doubt by what might be mildly termed very highly coloured literature issued by Messrs. Wright and Barr and by Mr. Enoch Thompson, numerous people were induced to purchase these twenty-acre lots at prices averaging from $15 to $16 per acre. These purchasers, needless to say, were persons living at a distance from Camp Borden. As for Mr. Shook, a witness much relied on by the defendants, he states in answer to a question:—
>
> "Q.—Can you tell us what the value of these lands are, say as orchard lands? A. Well, I can scarcely give you the value of them; from their surroundings I would not like to because the people there are pessimistic about the value of that land and do not think it worth anything.
>
> As lands for a Camp they may be very suitable. As lands for agricultural or fruit-growing purposes or vegetable gardens I would agree (except as to a portion of lands in Essa Township and perhaps a small quantity of acres in Pine River flats) with the "people there."

He is speaking of the particular lots that he had before him, not of the entire land; and he makes his exceptions. Further on he refers to the prices they paid, and points out what in law and in common sense must be perfectly clear; that the value of a land is not necessarily what a man may have been deceived into paying for it.

I was going to refer to the result of the transaction. Hon. gentlemen have spoken about an $80 profit on every lot. As I say, the process was that Mr. Barr, being credited with $207,000, was charged up with what we paid for the lots as we expropriated them.

Being credited with $12 an acre, the price agreed upon with Barr, on 14,596·6 acres, or an amount of $175,159.20, the Crown charged up to Mr. Barr $138,977.04, being the amount that we paid in acquisition of the land. We also charged up to him advances made to him, amounting in all to $22,000. Those two amounts deducted from $175,159.20, leave a balance of $14,182.15 available for the acquisition of the land still remaining to be acquired, which is 490·6 acres, which at $12 an acre would amount to $5,887.20. To be deducted from that $14,182.16, is $2,818.52, being what was coming to us for the land abandoned. That is what we were entitled to charge up. Over and above dropping $12 an acre from the price for those lands, we were entitled to an additional $1.32 an acre because they were worth more than $12. There was also to be charged up an estimate on account of buildings disposed of by Barr, amounting to $1,400. That makes a total deduction of $4,218.52 to be made from $14,182.16, leaving a balance of $9,963.64 to cover the cost of the lots still to be acquired. It is to be pointed out that, in the acquisition of these lands, Mr. Barr had to incur considerable expense in connection with agents and one thing or another, so that those figures do not represent a profit going to Mr. Barr. He had to pay out of that all the expenses involved in the acquisition of such lots as he acquired or endeavoured to acquire, so that when one speaks of getting a profit of $80 a lot on those particular lots, it is quite manifest he did not. It all comes down to this, that Mr. Barr sold us a block of land at a block price, and that therefore, you cannot conclude anything from the fact that, by dividing that amount by the number of acres, you get a price of $12 an acre, and that was so stated. You cannot deduce from that that each acre was worth $12 an acre, nor that he got $12 an acre for each acre of that immense block of land. Not only was it shown at the time of the abandonment of the property, but the fact was notorious to all at that time that all of this land had not an equal value, and it is quite obvious that a tract of that size would not have an equal value throughout.

Mr. FIELDING: The strangest part of this transaction, a part which has been lightly touched upon by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), and which has not been touched upon by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) or the Minister of Justice, is this: It is quite conceivable, under the circumstances de-

scribed by the minister and by the hon. member for South Simcoe that Mr. Barr may have made a loss and not a profit on his transaction. The hon. member for Maisonneuve has rather conveyed to us the impression that Mr. Barr must have made a great deal of money, and it has been contended on the other side that Mr. Barr may possibly have lost money by having to pay more than $12 an acre for some portions of the land. That is quite possible, but it is not at all probable that that took place at all.

Mr. BOYS: I did not wish for one moment to say I thought Mr. Barr lost money, but I did say that the figures given to me showed that the profit he made was not a profit that would induce any member of this House or any business man to interest himself in the transaction.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not question that for a moment, but I think it was intended that Mr. Barr as a business man should make a profit out of the transaction. I think it will be an equally fair assumption that the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence intended that Mr. Barr should have an opportunity of making a large profit, a profit he would have to make at the expense of either the owner of the land or the public treasury. But the question that strikes me as the most extraordinary part of the matter is—why did the Minister of Militia have anything to do with Mr. Barr in regard to anything that Mr. Barr did not own? Mr. Barr owned 8,000 acres. It would be right and proper for the Minister of Militia to bargain with Mr. Barr to buy his land; but why did the Minister of Militia bargain wth Mr. Barr for land belonging to other people? The Minister of Justice said they did not buy any particular acres; that they bought from Mr. Barr a tract of 16,000 acres of land. Mr. Barr did not own that quantity of land. They bought from Mr. Barr that which he had no right to sell. They gave Mr. Barr what was in effect a license to go around all those people representing himself as an agent of the Government, make bargains with them and, in some cases, acquire land at prices which they considered were too low. If the Government had actually paid $8 an acre, I do not suppose those people would have complained. What they seem to complain of is that the Government paid $12 an acre, and they got only $8, and it is not satisfactory to say that the Government paid an average price which was fair all around. Why did they have any "Barr" in this transaction? Why was Mr. Barr brought into the matter at all? My hon. friend says the experience of the members of the Government is that expropriation proceedings generally lead to considerable cost. I agree with him in that respect. Evidently he did not need to be alarmed in this case, because we have had the expropriation proceedings carried on under the peculiar circumstances described by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and the judge of the Exchequer Court has placed a low valuation on those lands. It seems that, if the case had from the beginning been taken into the Exchequer Court, a very high price could not have been allowed for those worthless sand lands or "blow sands," as my hon. friend describes them. There did not seem to have been any danger in expropriating; but, danger or no danger, this is a method of buying land for the Government which is open to the utmost possible abuse. Why should there have been any "Barr" middleman in this transaction? Why did the Government not buy from Barr that which Barr had to sell, and in some way, by an authorized, disinterested agent, paid for his services as an agent, meet those other people and buy their land on fair terms? This is the serious error on the part of the Government—buying from Barr something he had not to sell, giving him the equivalent of a license to beat down those people and compel them to sell their land for what seemed to them to be low prices. That part of the transaction, irrespective of gain or loss, is open to very grave censure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was not here last week when the Budget was under discussion, and as I am still anxious to occupy the time of the House for a few minutes in discussing some features of the Budget and some features of the war, I would ask you to call it six o'clock, and I shall endeavour to take up not more than half an hour of the time of the House on the resumption of business after dinner.

At six o'clock the House took recess

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill No. 75, respecting the Protective Association of Canada.—Mr. Demers.

THE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in Committee on Bill No. 89, respecting the Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Demers—Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 1—Extension of time:

Mr. BUREAU: This Bill is not on the Order Paper.

The CHAIRMAN: I might perhaps explain that this Bill, and Bill No. 75, respecting the Protective Association of Canada, were reported from the Banking and Commerce Committee this morning, and under the motion made yesterday by the Prime Minister, were placed on the Order Paper for consideration in Committee of the Whole to-night.

Mr. BUREAU: They do not appear on the Order Paper.

The CHAIRMAN: It was impossible to print a new Order of the Day this afternoon, but the Bills were added to the official Order which is in the hands of the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk, the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. The motion of the Prime Minister to which I have referred reads as follows:

> That owing to the advanced period of the Session the following Rules relating to Private Bills be suspended for the remainder of the Session, viz.:—Rules 28, 28A, and 103; and that Private Bills reported on Private Bills days by any Select Standing Committee be placed on the Orders of the Day of the same day for consideration in Committee of the Whole amongst Private Bills, or if reported on days other than Private Bill days then immediately after Routine Proceedings.

Mr. BUREAU: The leader of the Opposition, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when the motion was made, took the ground that the Bills should not be passed until we had had an opportunity of considering them. The Order Paper is the only guide we have to the business of the day, and we did not know that these Bills were coming up this evening. However, if the Bills have been reported by the Banking and Commerce Committee I have no objection, but I do not want this to constitute a precedent. I think it is only fair to the House that we should have some explanation of the Bill.

Sir HERBERT AMES: It is merely granting an extension of time to a fire insurance company. The company was granted a charter in 1916 and was expected to fulfil all the requirements within two years, but on account of war conditions, was unable to do so and is now asking for an extension of time.

Mr. BUREAU: Were any objections made in the Banking and Commerce Committee to this extension being granted?

Sir HERBERT AMES: None whatever.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY OF UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill No. 96, to incorporate the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood.—Mr. J. F. Reid.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Ordinarily, a Bill respecting the incorporation of a company might be spoken to, so far as the attitude of the Government is concerned, by the Secretary of State, but as this Bill has to do with a community that has been more directly under the administration of the Interior Department, perhaps it is as well that I should say a word with regard to it. There is a measure of much importance; in some respects, it is an extraordinary measure as far as this House is concerned. There is in Western Canada a community holding, in which a large percentage of what are commonly called Doukhobors, are the owners; they hold community rights in it, and no particular individual has any special individual asset. As everybody knows, the property of the community stands mainly in the name of one of their leaders, Mr. Peter Verigin. I believe a share of that property stands in the name of a corporation which was incorporated under the Companies' Act, and which has a name practically the same as the name intended to be given to this community, save only that the word " Limited " is added. A portion of the assets have been conveyed to that corporation. The stock of that corporation, I understand, is held by certain trustees for the benefit of the community, or if not the whole community, for the benefit of certain members of it. The purpose of this Bill appears to be to enable the whole community to organize in a corporate capacity, and to provide facilities whereby the assets of the people will be held by the whole corporation, but also whereby the communistic right of any individual in the corporation may be withdrawn and become an individual asset. I did not think Parliament would likely

favour the principle of the incorporation of a community in so far as commercial enterprises are concerned; but as regards this community, there have been urged certain claims and certain rights which the individuals of the community might seek to exercise and which they could not exercise if some such incorporation does not take place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What rights are they?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right to withdraw, inasmuch as the assets are now held by Mr. Peter Verigin in the name of the community. With respect to the rights of any individual member of the community, there is no way, unless the incorporation takes place, by which an individual member of the community can withdraw from the corporation and take his place as an ordinary citizen of Canada. This is not a matter of small concern. The community numbers about 7,000 souls. The assets run into the millions of dollars, and the position of these assets, it is very strongly urged, is not by any means on as secure a basis as it should be, having regard to the rights of individual members as against the rights of the community.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the community applied for the Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and the first incorporators are named in the petition and in the Bill. While I do not object to the passing of the second reading of this Bill, I want it to be understood that I do not favour the granting of extraordinary powers to a community of this kind. I do not oppose the second reading because I am not convinced that there will be any way by which an individual may withdraw his rights and become entitled to his individual assets unless some such protection as this is afforded him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do you object to the land tenure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are certain clauses of the Bill that I commend most earnestly to the consideration of the Committee to which the Bill will go. I refer particularly to sections 3, 11 and 14, and I ask the Committee to consider carefully whether it is wise on the part of Parliament to extend the principle which we already have adopted to the incorporation of communities for other than commercial purposes, and if it is necessary, in this individual case, to consider whether or not it would be well to restrict the powers given to this community so that no more than the imperative necessities of the day will be met and the prevention of injustice secured.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—CANADA AND THE WAR.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, I said I purposed to avail myself of this motion to discuss two or three questions that are of extreme importance at this stage of our country's career and in connection with the war. The first thought to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is that expressed by the London Times of yesterday in an article discussing war and condition of affairs in Europe.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) intend to speak to my motion?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, the debate is not concluded. My hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) intended to say something.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is entirely a matter for the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean); he has the floor.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) had the floor. I waited for him all afternoon and I do not see any reason why the hon. gentleman should ask me to give way.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: A significant thing was stated by the London Times of yesterday in discussing the condition of the war, or the entry of the United States into the war. It was dealing with the declaration that that country, which had refused up to recent times to concern itself with European questions, had gone into the war because it believed the rights and liberties of civilization to be in jeopardy and is opposed to autocracy and to the military system of Germany. The London Times, in discussing that declaration yesterday said that it was the most significant political incident that has happened in the history of the world since the French revolution. We are now voting money in connection with the war and I take this opportunity to say that I also regard the entry of the United States into the war as a matter of supreme importance. We find ourselves today, a great democratic community on the American continent, joined up with the

United States in asserting the rights of civilization as against autocracy and the German military system. Mr. Balfour, when he accepted that embassy to the United States, came to America, to Canada, to this House, and what he told us constituted an appeal from the progressive, constitutional governments, especially the British government, to the democracies of America to join with them in the great struggle. Mr. Balfour spoke here for his government, and for the British people, and he presented to us the view that a supreme issue had arrived in the history of the world and that the allied countries of Europe, through the missions which came from Great Britain and France appealed to the democracies of America to assist them in this great conflict. The glory of Canada is that the Canadian democracy, a Dominion under British constitutional rule, the day that it went into this war, assumed the leadership of America in asserting the rights of democracy and in showing that it was worth our while to take part in this struggle. We have been true to that. The United States have seen that we were right; they have joined up in this struggle, and the most significant thing flowing out of this important union between the two great democracies is that the old hatred that had been developed between the original Thirteen Colonies and the Mother Country, which had been nursed and had grown, in a way, for over a hundred years, suddenly ceased, and you find to-day Britain and her Dominions and the great American republic united in giving the whole of their resources to the defence of democracy and civilization. That is the great event of this war so far, which is making more and more impression on the people, and that is the reason why I say that I think we ought to readjust our views in regard to our position on this continent. Whereas formerly there was a disagreement between the United States and the Mother Country, and Washington was the champion of the republic as against the Mother Country, you see now that Washington is identified with the old democratic principle that was asserted by Cromwell: you see a union of the principles for which Cromwell and Washington stood, you see Lloyd George as the leader of the English democracy, and men like Mr. Balfour claiming a connection with Lincoln and Wilson in a way that surprises all the world. That is a great advance, and it shows a new unity and a new strength on the part of democracy: you see the

United States asserting it and ourselves asserting it, and putting all our resources into this war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are we living true to it?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: We are trying to do our best, but perhaps we have not done as well as we might have done. Still, we are now putting all our resources into the war, and the reason we are going to win eventually, and the reason we are going to win the world to our view, is the existence of this new condition that has brought about so great a change. What is the one thing that the German Kaiser failed to allow for, and failed to make any calculation in regard to? He never believed that the democracies of Europe and America would be united; he never believed that the United States and Britain would go hand in hand, and he thought he could defy the United States and could defy Britain; and the one thing he is up against now is this new and powerful union.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In view of that union between Great Britain and the United States, would my hon. friend revise his views and ideas about the reciprocity treaty?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: That is always in the hon. gentleman's mind. I stood on the floor of this House and defended, and am prepared now to defend, my record in regard to reciprocity. I was the first man in this House, session after session, to demand, for public reasons, the free entrance of the wheat products of the Canadian West into the United States—

Mr. LEMIEUX: But not in 1911.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: —and Canada is to-day the leader of democracy in America, except that in that reciprocity issue we decided to keep our independence on this continent.

Mr. FIELDING: Will the hon. gentleman define in what way the reciprocity treaty interfered with our independence?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I will answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Speak, for the farmers are listening.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It is very easy to answer.

An hon. MEMBER: Sidetracked.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I am not sidetracked, and I cannot be sidetracked on an issue of that kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Wait a minute. I hope the hon. gentleman will listen to me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I am not in the habit of interrupting the hon. gentleman when he is making an argument. At any time that he presents arguments he is listened to by the House. Why are we going to win this war? Because we have united and consolidated our efforts and our resources, and this is the surprising thing that the Kaiser never counted upon. The great American Republic has put into this struggle the resources of the great Mississippi valley—all their vast industrial resources; and we in Canada have put in the resources of the great Saskatchewan plains, with all their food products, and now we find that Germany will not be able to maintain against the consolidated American democracy their insolent assertion that civilization must bow to them, that the rights of smaller peoples must yield to them, that German military power must govern the world. Now that we have reached the point where all the resources of the United States and of Canada are bound together a new view has come to the people of America to this extent: They know now—and this is what I want to impress upon the House—that the continent of America to-day is the home of democracy, it is the place where the battle of democracy has to be fought, the place from which the food and all the resources to uphold democracy must come. That is why the United States have gone into the struggle, that is why they are putting all their resources into the fight, and that is why we are going to win. And, as I say, we of Canada, and the people of the United States, must take a new view and make a new alignment in regard to these great world questions. A while ago we would have said that our whole case for democracy and for the rights of civilization was our connection with the Mother Country. That was true, but it is still more true now that the rights of democracy depend more and more on these new political forces that have come together and that are asserting themselves in this great war. We must realize that to-day America, the mid-continent, the continent that by its Atlantic aspect looks on Europe, and by its Pacific outlook, takes Asia in view; America, the centre of the world and the centre of democracy, with that outlook, and with its resources controls the situation, and if it believes—as it does believe—in democracy, then we shall win. We have a great cause to vindicate, because, as all now admit, this war is not a European war, it is a world-wide war against German autocracy, and German domination It is a struggle into which America has entered, and which America has got to win, and practically the appeal in France and in Britain to-day is to America, "Come over and help us." And America has responded. Now, that is a matter of the greatest moment to democracy, and Canadians must take it in that light. There has been preached in this country the doctrine of what was called "The Round Table." We have heard a good deal of that Round Table, and that organization in England which was trying to educate us, and to lead us into what they call an Imperial Federation, in which Canada—if the idea were carried out as they proposed it—might lose her identity, and become one in some kind of confederation in which this country would have a certain number of votes as against a great many others. I am rising here to-night to object to anything of that kind, and I say that Canada must maintain her autonomy, her system of having a free voice in all these matters. And inasmuch as America hereafter is to have the controlling voice as to democracy, we must be careful that we do not drift into a system by which we might have our liberties restricted if we connected ourselves too closely with the political organizations of Europe, and especially with a political organization, perhaps an Imperial Confederation, as has been proposed to us by the Round Table organization in Britain. Not only that, but if the resources of America are now all devoted to this war, and there is to be great new adjustment, and if peace is to be maintained after this war, it must be done from America. And if there is to be a peace police, which is the ambition now of the most progressive men who are discussing this war, if there is to be a peace patrol, a police organization to keep down organizations like that of the German Kaiser, it is going to be in America and we will be part of it, and we want a very free hand in very considerable degree in regard to what we are to commit ourselves to in the future construction of the British Empire. My contention is that, instead of committing ourselves to a system of Imperial federation, we had better keep our autonomy as it is, remain in the Em-

pire as one of the Dominions of the Empire, but not to commit ourselves. And we are being invited to commit ourselves, and speeches of a certain trend that I do not quite agree with have been made in England in connection with this war. I want to discuss that matter or call public attention to it as I am doing now, and to see that Canada keeps her position and her autonomy on this continent free, to join with the other Dominions of the British Empire and with the British constitutional organization as it is, and with the great American Republic.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is dangerous.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Does my hon. friend, the late Minister of Militia, not think that we should have supreme control of the Canadian forces as the other Allies have?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was merely saying that it was dangerous to hear the applause coming from the direction it is. I have had it myself, unfortunately.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I have to thank my hon. friend for being a beacon light for me. If that is the case, we must be very careful. We have ministers who propose to go to Europe, and we have had ministers over there before, but the great Canadian people, I believe, wish to maintain their autonomy on this continent and a political alliance for the liberty of the world, not only with the Mother Country, but with our cousins to the south of us. Thanks to good fortune it has come that way, and I do not want to see that position jeopardized any further. Inasmuch as we have had speeches made in the Old Country by statesmen from Canada, and we are to have others hereafter, I take this occasion to rise in my place and say that the view of the Canadian people is that they wish to maintain their autonomy, that they wish to be a factor, the equal of any among the nations, with all the powers and all the Dominions and all the states that are fighting for the rights of civilization as against German domination.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is good Liberal common sense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Sometimes Liberals do not talk common sense. Since the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has referred to this question, I would ask what is the one reason why there was a certain holding back in the province of Quebec in regard to the great war and the participation of Canada in it? It was probably the suspicion the people of Quebec had that they would be led into some kind of European alliance which perhaps later on would prove objectionable to them. I believe the new view of it to the province of Quebec—and I want to congratulate that province on the splendid wave of patriotism sweeping over it now, and on the way its young men are coming forward and enlisting; they are going over as much from this Dominion as from America to maintain the liberties and the civilization of Europe—

Mr. LEMIEUX: We will follow you as long as you talk that way.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The ideas of what the Empire ought to be have been expressed, as I said before, by a kind of mediaeval Round Table, and they have a great propaganda out, and they are preparing a program for us of what the future Canada ought to be in regard to conditions in Europe and questions of that kind. I do not prefer that we should be led into these proposals or accept them in any sense until we discuss them fully in this country, know what they are, and whither they lead. I think I am fully justified by reason of what has taken place. A word of warning should be spoken in this House on this great issue, and the people of Canada and of America should say now that inasmuch as civilization and the liberties of the world and democracy are at stake, and that the Kaiser of Germany, if he had his will, would destroy not only the liberties of Britain and of France but the liberties of America as well, we ought to take that wider and greater view and keep our autonomy and our resources and our organizations here, ready to join with all the other British democracies and with the United States, and to recognize at last that with America—free America, that America which has made itself the dictator of the world, that America which to-day controls the situation by reason of the magnificent resources of the Mississipppi basin and plains of the Saskatchewan—we must use all our powers to maintain the liberties of the world, and are not to be inveigled into any arrangement, even if we call it an Imperial confederation, in which we do not have absolute liberty to decide what we are to do. When I say that, I am only re-echoing the statement of Sir John A. Macdonald constantly repeated in this House, that above all things, while Canada was associated with the Empire and with the Mother Country he, for one, wished that Canada should

always retain her autonomy, and that when she spoke in any Imperial gathering she would go there free, not to be governed by a vote of them all, but go as a free Government to express her assent or dissent and to withdraw if she saw fit and to keep her autonomy and independence on every matter.

The dreams of the Kaiser have been suddenly dispelled. He finds that this great free, democratic America is organized against him. He sees the handwriting on the wall; he knows that he will not succeed. Millions of Americans are being sent to the front; all the resources of the United States are being brought to bear against the enemy. Who, having read the farewell speech of General Washington, would have imagined that the United States navy would go to Europe in defence of the liberties of Europe? But it has happened—and the Kaiser did not expect it. We have maintained our sea supremacy; Britain and France and the dominions of the Empire have held the Germans back, on the western front. I do not think Germany will succeed, and that is why I believe that this country ought to make use of all its resources to carry on the conflict. Our people ought to stand for conscription; our farmers ought to stand for it. We should put everything we have into this war, into the maintenance of the rights of democracy. I sympathize a great deal with the farmers' deputation which is in the city to-day, but I am strongly of the opinion that our farmers must do their share of the fighting as well as of the production, as I believe the Prime Minister told them to-day. The farmers having been told that production is almost equal to military service, the Government must expedite their enumeration of the man-power of the country not engaged in war, and if the farmers are unable to reap their harvests the Government must find a way to get them all the assistance they can from those now engaged in unnecessary occupations. With the enforcement of the Military Service Act, there must go registration, conscription and a direction of the man-power of the country, in order that persons engaged in unnecessary occupations shall assist the farmers and take up any war work that has to be done. We have made some headway; it has taken a long while, but we have got that far. I believe that the farmers will accept this decision of the Government and that they will allow their boys to go. I know that they are going from my part of the country. We are presenting a united front—Canada, the overseas dominions, the Mother Country, the United States—in upholding the liberties of the world against the dominion of Germany.

In making this fight against the common enemy we have to alter some of our economic laws. The United States is becoming not only the strongest factor in the war, but the nation of greatest financial resources. This financial strength of the United States is practically due to their national system of currency and of banking. I have advocated on the floor of this House—and I advocate now, with still more fervour—that we should not let this session pass; that we should not let this war pass, until we have established the strongest possible financial organization. Immediately on the outbreak of war we should have had a national currency instead of a bank currency; a national system of banking such as they have in the United States, a great system of re-discounting by national banks. The United States by the adoption of this system, has stood the great strain of the war, spent billions of money, and kept down the rate of interest. We have to go to the United States for assistance in the matter of credit and money, and it is time that we put ourselves in good standing with them by following their example in the matter of currency and banking system. I make no objection to the Canadian banks or to what they are doing for the building up of the country. They are doing all right, but they are working under an obselete system which ought to be modernized, especially in view of our position on the American continent. If we had taken steps in this direction we should have been able to do a great deal more than we have done. The proof of my contention is found in the fact that the moment Britain went into the war she adopted some of the methods which have been adopted in the United States. Leading bankers of England in recent meetings affirmed that before the war is over Great Britain will have to revolutionize further her system of banking and currency and follow that of the United States, and if it is necessary there, it is necessary here as well. If we had a national currency instead of a bank-note currency, the rate of exchange as between this country and the United States would not to-day be against us, and the discounting of our bank notes in the United States would not prevail. In some cases it is two per cent; in some cases our notes are not taken at all, although they are just as good as United States notes. For years we have accepted notes of the

United States amounting to millions, constituting practically a loan from the Canadian people to them, and we have not had a corresponding advantage. I had hoped that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), who is not now in this country, would have taken steps this session looking to the establishment of a national currency and a national system of banking such as they have in the United States.

I am not going to touch on the tariff, but I am going to touch on one thing in connection with the war. The war has clearly proved that a pastoral people, when its liberties are assailed, is quite able to take care of itself. Every nation, in order to maintain its liberties when they are threatened, must see to it that hereafter it is not only able to produce food, but is highly organized industrially. It must be just as strong a people as is the strongest nation in this war, that is, Great Britain. I am not asserting that as a reason for a tariff or for protection; but the new view that will sweep the North American continent is that any country that thinks it is its duty to uphold democracy and to fight for the liberties of the world must have universities with men highly qualified in the technicalities and sciences, and most of all, its education must be such that it will turn out not only soldiers, but scientists, professors, engineers and other skilled men who will be able to organize and utilize the resources of the country for the maintenance of its liberties. We must have factories, we must have engineers, we must have mechanics, we must have a high organization of our industries, we must have diversity of employment. The United States, which has all these things, is our neighbour, and while I am not, for one moment, advocating anything in the direction of protection, one of the great lessons of this war in which we are now engaged and in which we are putting our all is that we should have our industries organized to the fullest extent.

The people of Canada feel that in this great war the transportation of the country must and ought to be nationalized. The day that Great Britain went into the war she nationalized her railways. The day that the United States went into the war the railways of that country were practically nationalized. When we went into the war we should have nationalized our railways. We are now in process of doing it partially. If the war is to continue—and it is not over yet—it is not too late to begin,

and I hope the Government will, in a day or two, be in a position to announce to this House that they are entering upon a policy of nationalizing all the railways. I have no sympathy with the legislation recently passed in this House that out of the profits of the Canadian Pacific we shall take a percentage which shall be devoted to war purposes. How much of that is contributed by the people of Canada in increased freight rates? I do not believe that is the right way to use the railways in order to help to win the war, and I regret that the Government advanced the freight rates, instead of boldly, at the beginning of the war, taking over the railways. By taking over the railways they could have affected consolidation and co-ordination, and, consequently, economies, which would have made possible a reduction in freight rates—and the greatest relief and encouragement that the farmers of the West can receive is to have the freight rates reduced to the lowest possible limit.

9 p.m.

It had been my hope that by this time we should have a national system of railways, a national telegraph system and a national telephone system; that the telegraphs and telephones would be centred in the national post office, and that the central life of every community, large or small, would be in the national railway station and the national post office. If you had that, you would have in every little village, in every big town and city this splendid institution which would be the centre of national life and service. I had hoped that we would have in the Union Government a Postmaster General with instructions from his colleagues that the telegraphs and the telephones were to be taken over and concentrated with the post office and the railway ticket office in each community; that a good salary would be paid to the man or woman in charge of the office, and that it would be kept open night and day if the business of the community warranted that being done. The war would have given us a pretext for entering upon a policy of nationalization. But the war has been going on now for four years, and we have not got very far yet in nationalizing our railways. But we are making some headway. I hope the Government will tell us that they are going to take such further steps as are necessary to the establishment of the conditions I have indicated. We have been delayed a long time in getting national railways. Those of us who years ago advocated the nationalization of our railways

did not think it would ever arrive, but like other unexpected things, it is beginning to arrive. I appeal to the ministers from the West that we have right away in this country national railways, run absolutely free from politics, and with the main object to create a great central service in every community and to give service to the people. We should have started with taking over the Canadian Pacific. I do not believe the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will ever again have an opportunity of getting what they could get now, during war time, for that organization coming in as the foundation of a national system of railways. But they have seen fit to maintain their independence. If I interpret aright the speech delivered the other day by Lord Shaughnessy, it was an intimation to the people of Canada that if they wanted to take over the Canadian Pacific for war purposes or anything else, they would have to pay $200 for $100 worth of shares; or, what is the same thing, guarantee the shareholders ten per cent. I am not prepared to say that I would guarantee the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific ten per cent. I would be quite willing to see them guaranteed eight per cent, if the road was made the backbone of a great national system of railways. Sir Adam Beck in his proposal to electrify the railways of Canada, and especially of Ontario, should have included not only the Grand Trunk and any railways the Government may take over, but the Canadian Pacific as well. I am sure that if we had a great national system of railways we should be stronger for war purposes and stronger for the development of our own country.

While on this question I would point out that Lord Shaughnessy, and the management of the Grand Trunk Railway who have spoken about the amount they have invested in railways in Canada, have also invested largely in railways in the United States, and when they appealed to the Canadian people to do certain things in this war they forgot to tell us that only one-fifth of the mileage of the great Canadian Pacific Railway had been taken over and is controlled to-day by the government of the United States. One-fifth of the mileage of the Grand Trunk has also passed out of the hands of the road, and is now under the control of the United States government. Inasmuch as the American government have taken over the portions of these roads lying in the United States we should take over what is left in Canada, and then with portions of Canadian roads under the control of the United States government and the balance under the control of our government a great continental system of transportation would evolve. That is coming. I will never believe that the American government will give up the control of those roads. The whole tendency is in the direction of public ownership, and as we are taking over some of the railways in this country we ought to take over them all and nationalize them. We ought to urge on the people and government of the United States, and on our people and our Government, that private ownership of railways is not in the public interest.

There is one other thing I should like to touch on which concerns the war and is on the line of democracy, and that is the presence in Canada of an irresponsible Senate. The time has come—certainly now that we are engaged in war—when the Senate as constituted in this country must cease. The people of the United States, if they believe in anything, believe in electing representatives responsible to the people, and their Senate is responsible to the people through election by the State legislatures. There is no such thing in that country as an irresponsible Senate, nor has there ever been made in any other country, but this is a declaration such as I am told was made in another place in Ottawa not long ago, that the Senate of Canada was the custodian and protector of vested interests in this country. It is the people of Canada who has the right to say what are and what are not vested interests, and the people, as an outcome of the war, want a reorganized Senate which will be a responsible body, and then democratic principles will obtain throughout the whole organization of Government in this country.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the appointment of Senators should come under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I did not say anything of the kind, and I hope the hon. gentleman has never said anything so foolish. I said the Senate of Canada should be responsible to the people of Canada. Does the hon. gentleman object to that?

Mr. BURNHAM : No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I hope I have the support of the hon. gentleman when I say the Senate of Canada should be reorganized. They are reorganizing the House of Lords in Great Britain. England is the most progressive country in the world, so far as putting into practice democratic

principles is concerned. A report has been made to the British House that the hereditary principle in the House of Lords must be abolished, and that the interests of the nation demand that the people should be represented not only in the House of Commons but in the House of Lords as well.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Can the hon. gentleman tell us something about that report?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: All I know is that Lord Bryce presented a report in the British Parliament the other day recommending the reconstitution of the House of Lords, and that the hereditary principle and the domination of the House by the aristocratic families should be wiped out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: My hon. friend says "Hear, hear." He supported a party for many years that could have accomplished a similar reform in our Senate, but I am not blaming him so much.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was young.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Youth is no cloak for wrong views. I say that, inasmuch as they are reorganizing parliamentary institutions in England and making them more progressive; inasmuch as the American republic has representative institutions and has no hereditary principle in their Senate —and life appointments are the next thing to hereditary appointments, and we have life appointments in this country—the people of Canada not only demand the reforms I have urged to-night, but they want Senate reform right away so as to give us a parliamentary organization that will be truly democratic.

I have asked the attention of hon. members for a short time, but I thought it was my duty on this occasion to say that inasmuch as we are engaged in a war we ought to take a new view of the war—the American and democratic view. We should have more national organization in this country; the nationalization of our railways and telegraphs; we should have Senate reform, and banking reform and a national currency. We cannot get all these things at once, but we ought to set our hearts on some of them and go after them. We have now a Union Government, and as we are in a position to deal with Civil Service reform and things of that kind, we ought to deal with these greater questions, and deal with them in the presence of this great war.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I had intended to say a few words on the motion of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), but as I have just been trying to follow the meanderings and excursions of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), perhaps I had better say a word first on the very interesting discussion in which as usual the hon. member has indulged. Fortunately or otherwise, there are usually long intervals between the deliverances of the hon. member. His deliverances are always exactly the same.

But they are exactly the same. There is not the slightest conceivable difference between them, but by reason of the fact that they are not delivered very close together they are always more or less interesting. I think a man finds the Ten Commandments almost interesting when he reads them over, but they are ancient literature. I would rather think, without meaning the slightest offence, that the speeches of the hon. member smack somewhat of the Ten Commandments in so far as ancient literature is concerned.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: They are good Commandments, and the hon. gentleman might well observe them.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was one part of his speech that struck me as somewhat interesting, and that was the part of it in which he was so strongly in favour of reciprocity. He was a strong reciprocity man and emphatic in the assertion that intercourse should exist between ourselves and the United States. It just occurred to me that perhaps the hon. gentleman was getting out his flying topsails for the time when the reciprocity gale passes over. He rigs his little Tory craft and trims it to the breeze when it is necessary to carry him through the Tory storms and to bring him safely to the Tory harbour. But when that passes away and when we come to the blue skies of common sense and free breathing in regard to trade again, he pulls out these old sails that he has temporarily stowed away and plays around with them again. But, from time to time, when anything like a storm appears on the horizon, this, the most agile sailor who ever trimmed his sails to meet Tory conditions, is again on the yard-arm and his little Tory craft is fitted out and made ready to carry him to a safe haven.

The hon. member was talking to the farmers who are here to-night. I did not intend

to say anything had he not invited me into that realm of discussion. It is exceedingly interesting to me as a farmer—not a farmer now, but a farmer's son brought up on the farm—to see the farmers around here. It reminds me of home and friends and the conditions of my early days. I have the greatest sympathy with and respect for the men who come here looking for their rights and a hearing of their case. The hon. member for South York told us the reason why they were here. I do not think he made the reason why they are here plain enough. I will tell him why they are here. I wish my hon. friend would turn his mind back to the third day of December last when there was something going on in this country in which he was interested. While he, no doubt, was practically secure in his county, I imagine that he still had an interest in his friends making a safe harbour, and I have no doubt he had a hand in passing this Order in Council. Here it is:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, the Prime Minister, and under and in virtue of the provisions of The Military Service Act, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that in any case where a person engaged in agriculture has applied for exemption and such exemption has been refused—the Minister of Militia and Defence, if he is of the opinion that the services of such person are essential for promoting agricultural production may, by order under his hand, discharge such person from military service.

That was the promise that was made to the farmers of Ontario.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman quotes there the simple fact that "if he is of the opinion," which implies "if he is not of opinion" as well.

Mr McKENZIE: This Order in Council speaks clearly and distinctly for itself. I have the greatest respect for the outbreaks of the hon member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) and I must say we are never sure as to where he is going to break out next. But, I have greater respect for the deliberations of Union Government. When, acting together and in the name of the Governor General, they reach a certain conclusion and put that in writing and publish it to the world, I prefer to take that as against the hon. member for West Peterborough. Because of the necessity of encouraging production to wipe aside the Military Service Act and make provision for the exemption of men engaged in agriculture, every Tory candidate in the province of Ontario from the third of December until election-day preached the doctrine: "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest; my yoke is easy and my burden is light; nobody shall go to the war if he comes to me and supports the Tory candidate in the province of Ontario; this doctrine of conscription is intended for Quebec; it is a Quebec nostrum; it is not for you; you have done all you should do; this Order in Council is to let you out and to bring in the men from the province of Quebec and elsewhere; therefore, do not be afraid, come and vote for us and we will do you good." Well, the Government found themselves elected. They found that these farmers in Ontario voted for them and now they say to the farmers: "We are here and you are there; we have no further use for you as voters, we want your sons for the front and to the front they shall go." The farmers of Ontario are reasonable and sensible men and when a farmer in Ontario or elsewhere promises a thing it means that he is going to do it. This Union Government, or the Government of the day, promised that they were going to exempt the farmers' sons and the people of Ontario believed that that was true. Because they are insisting on that promise is why they are here to-day, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) did not know it. And I hope they will be successful in impressing upon the Government the weight and force of a promise. When the name of the Governor General and the name of His Majesty are introduced into a promise and when that promise is published in the form of an Order in Council which has the force of a statute, the Government, I hope, will think seriously before they forsake their promise, or treat it as a "scrap of paper," or take the position before the country that they are not bound by it. That is about all I propose to say with respect to the speech of my hon. friend. There is no man in the House or in the country who can speak with greater ease upon general questions when we are at a safe distance from an election. But when he gets close up to the wind a chicken never ran under its mother's wing quicker than the hon. member gets under the wing of the old Tory hen.

SUPPLY—CAMP BORDEN.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Now, my purpose in addressing you this evening, Mr. Speaker, was to offer a few observations in connection with this Camp Borden land purchase.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who is not here this evening, amused me rather this afternoon in discussing this very innocent case of land purchase that he found at Camp Borden, which is situated somewhere in the vicinity of the town of Barrie in the county of Simcoe. It is marvellous, Mr. Speaker, the extremely innocent cases that the Minister of Justice will find. I was trying to think out for myself some other conceivable purchase of land that could by any possibility be as innocent as this purchase of the site of Camp Borden, and being somewhat of a Biblical scholar, my mind reverted to the fact that Adam had a piece of land in which he was cultivating trees. I have no doubt he bought that land from somebody, I do not know who it was, and as he bought it in the days of his innocence, before he took to dealing in apples, I have every reason to believe that it was a most innocent transaction, perhaps the most pure and stainless transaction that ever took place in the world up to this; but, nevertheless, as compared with the innocence, beauty and purity, the crystal-like brightness of this transaction at Camp Borden, it is dark and forbidding. Perhaps the Minister of Justice made himself believe that everything in connection with this transaction was innocent. Let us ask ourselves first the question, why was this man Barr bothering with the thing at all if it was the child-like transaction that it is sought to be made out? If there was no money to be made out of the deal, why were the great money-making barons of the city of Toronto bothering with it? We find in connection with this sale of land names which suggest transactions which are somewhat lucrative. We find that this agreement was likely made in the office of the National Trust Company, because one of the men connected with that company is a witness,—one name I find on the contract is that of Mr. Poucher, of the National Trust Company. The same man, Mr. Poucher, witnesses the signature of Sir Edward Kemp, evidently in the office of the National Trust Company. Apparently too, Mr. Barr is present in the office, because the same gentleman witnesses his signature also. Knowing who the directors of the National Trust Company are, I realize that they would not be playing with a matter of this kind unless there was some money in it. I am informed, Sir, by a gentleman from Toronto —I am not vouching for the statement which was sent to me in writing over the signature of a certain man who may be, and I have no doubt is, a respectable resident of that city—that $60,000 or $90,000 cold cash was made out of this transaction, and if the National Trust Company, and the other parties mentioned that appear in connection with this agreement had anything to do with it I can well believe they would not bother with any matter in which much less money was made.

If I correctly remember the statement of the Minister of Justice, he said there was nothing in the papers which would indicate that there was a guarantee of $12 an acre for Mr. Barr. If he did not say that, or if Hansard does not show that to be correct, my statement will have to be regarded as not having been uttered, because I am basing my assertion on my recollection of what the hon. gentleman said. The agreement, however, discloses that the statement of the Minister of Justice is not correct. That there was such a guarantee is disclosed by the agreement which I find on page 2 of a pamphlet which was sent to me. The agreement, which is signed by Hon. Mr. Kemp and by Mr. Barr, and is dated April, 1916, declares that Mr. Barr is to have $12 an acre for the land, whether he can buy it for that price or buy it for less, and he is not to pay for the cost of any expropriation proceedings. If it was found necessary to go to court a condition of the agreement is that Mr. Barr is not to pay any costs. He is sure of $12 an acre, and the Government undertakes to pay whatever it cost to expropriate the land. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a fair proposition. If Mr. Barr had land of his own that he wished to sell, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) said, it was perfectly right and proper for him to give the Government an option on it and to state how much he would take; but, as far as the rest of the agreement is concerned, I submit it is an absolutely new and novel procedure—at any rate it is absolutely new and novel to me. I never heard before of a man going to any Government and saying, "You want to buy a certain area of land, I have some land that I will sell you, and I know where some more land is to be got; I do not own a foot of it, but I will try to buy it, and if I do I will sell it to you at a profit. If I cannot buy the land you will expropriate it for me, and I will sell it to you at a profit." That, in brief, constitutes the agreement, and it is one of an extraordinary character. It is a transaction that should be fully

sifted, and upon which the full light of day should be thrown.

Now what happened, and was this transaction fair to the poor men who owned the land? The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) said that a man should not get for land all that he paid for it. Well, I have had a good deal of experience in connection with the expropriation of land and I have never heard, until this extraordinary case came before us, of any man who sold land getting less for it than he had paid. As a rule, you go up against the Government; you show them your titles and the price of your land. You say: "There is a piece of land; I paid $20 an acre for it; I do not want to sell it at all; you are taking it from me; is it not little enough for you to give me what I paid for it?" Most men representing the Government would say: "That seems to be a fair proposition, it does not look out of the way; so long as we are satisfied you paid that for it, we will give you that amount." That is what these poor men would have got for their land but for the interference of Barr. It was to his interest to beat down this price and get as much below $12 as he could, and he, no doubt, corralled into that court and brought to bear upon that judge all the sharpers he could gather round him to run down the price of that land, and they got it well below $12, and that enabled him to make a profit. I submit, Sir, that there is nothing of the square deal about that. It looks to me as if there was an understanding by which those representing the Government entered into an arrangement with Barr for the purpose of helping him out, and what was to be done with the money at the heel of the hunt I do not know. All the information and evidence we have is that Barr received all of this money, but we do know on accasions it does happen that in transactions of this kind more people benefit than those whose names appear upon the surface. And I do submit to the Government and to you, Sir, that transactions of this kind should not be permitted to pass without some notice; that when the Public Works and other departments of this country want land they should have the courage to go straight to the owners themselves and make their own bargains, and if they cannot make a straight bargain themselves, if they cannot get the land for the price they think is fair, then the Exchequer Court exists, and they can go there and fight the thing out openly before the people. If they do that the people will stand with them and have greater satisfaction than if they play a hide-and-seek game of some kind through a middleman. The people of this country are not anxious to do business in that way, they are anxious to do business in a straightforward, square manner in the open market. Although my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Boys) spoke very highly of the solicitor whose name appeared in this affair—and I have no doubt in the world but that he is as excellent a man as he is represented to be—nevertheless in a letter written by that gentleman on November 25, 1916, there are two inaccuracies. In the first place, he holds up this man Barr as the agent of the Government which he is not, and says he is the purchasing agent of the Government, which he is not. He says:

> I enclose you herewith the formal tender on behalf of the Crown for the lands expropriated as part of Camp Borden.

The tender which Mr. Barr made was not on behalf of the Crown but on behalf of himself. He was trying to get the land himself and sell it to the Crown, and any tender he made was not on behalf of the Crown. Another statement in this letter is misleading. He says later on:

> The Crown is only anxious that what is fair and just shall be done, but as the purchasing agent and you differ as to values, this is the only course we see that can be fairly taken to ascertain the value of the lands.

So far as I can gather there never was a purchasing agent of the Government who went to the owner of the land at all, except the man who went for the purpose of getting the land for himself. If any further proof were necessary to show that this land was to be $12 an acre to Mr. Barr, no matter whether he bought it for $1 or more from the owners, I quote from page 6 of the reasons for judgment given by the Judge of the Exchequer Court:

> It was strongly and repeatedly pressed during the course of the trial that the Crown having agreed to pay Barr $12 an acre for his lands and those to be acquired by him is estopped from disputing the fact that the market value of the lands is at least $12 an acre.

The judge found there was an agreement by which Barr was to get $12, and there is no question about that at all. He said so; it appears in the evidence, and the judge so finds. I repeat that statement because I understand that the Minister of Justice stated that it was improper for us to make the argument that this man had a fixed price of $12 an acre. I say, Sir, and I do not want to take any more of the time of the House, that this is a transaction which

should not have taken place; that powers were placed in Barr that should never have been placed in him; that agents and men were used to get hold of this land and to make a big profit for the middleman, to the detriment and disadvantage of the owners of the land. I am glad that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) brought this matter up, and that it has been aired in the House, and I believe that letting daylight in on these things will have a tendency to check departments from getting entangled in shady transactions of this kind in the future.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): I wish to express my sympathy with the large number of people whose property was virtually confiscated in this Camp Borden undertaking. I have had many letters and a great number of declarations from these people, and it was stated this afternoon by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) that the real estate men a short time before subdivided into ten or twenty acre farms a great deal of this property, and it was virtually exploited by these real estate men; and in that way these people were induced to purchase land at an exorbitant price. I do not agree with that statement. There were many acres of land there that were sold at a price that the people were satisfied to pay, which ran at $10, $15 and $20 an acre. But if these real estate men were accused of exploiting that territory, what about those who came after and exploited it from those people or confiscated the property they were satisfied with? I have been over many hundreds of acres of land that was so condemned. There are some parts of it, as has been stated, with drift sand on it; there are other parts with considerable forest, good land and splendid running streams. For those people who purchased that land with the intention to build bungalows or summer homes and who did not want to farm, it was perfectly satisfactory. I will admit that if a farmer had to occupy that land as farm land with the idea of making money out of it, he would perhaps have had difficulty with it. But for the purpose most of them purchased it, for it was worth all they paid for it. Then if these exploiters who came after and said the land was only worth $3, $7 and $8 an acre—and it has been suggested by the hon. member for South Simcoe that they paid in some cases more than $12 an acre; perhaps they did, but they had to make that up by squeezing the smaller men to get it down to an average—they did that with the men who had

no other alternative, on a threat, than to give up their holdings at a great sacrifice. Why should they have been treated in that way when it is admitted that while many got very good prices, others did not get anything like what the property cost them? I believe that the Government had no desire that these people should receive that treatment.

Apparently somebody who was on the inside took advantage of the Government and exploited this land. I consider that these people who sacrificed the earnings of many years in order to purchase this property have a grievance. They feel that the matter ought to be gone into. If, according to the various declarations and communications sent to members of this House, it is evident that these people have been taken advantage of by agents of the Government, then the Government should make good. If, on the other hand, the Government was not responsible for these agents, who, perhaps, got an inside inkling that quantities of land would be required, then it is not for the Government to make good. It is said that some gentleman connected with this transaction had eight thousand acres of land. The question is, did he own that some years previous to this transaction, or did he become the possessor of it at this particular time? It looks as if he must have got some inside information which caused him to secure certain land. To make the transaction complete he had to get other lands and even had to do considerable squeezing. A statement has been made on the floor of the House that a considerable profit was realized out of these speculations by some person at the expense of the poor people who were not in a position to go to the courts and fight their cases. Some of those who were able to go to the courts and fight their cases got better prices than those who were not in a position to do so but had to give up, you might say, under threat.

I wish to read another case which has not been brought to the attention of the House and which will show the position in which some of the people were placed. Not merely one or two but quite a large number have the same grievance. This appears to be one of the extreme cases where advantage was taken of a person who was not in a position to fight his case. The following is the declaration of David McClelland, of Toronto:

I, David McClelland, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, do solemnly declare:

1. That in August, 1915, I purchased 20 acres in Tosorontio for five hundred ($500):

I paid seventy dollars ($70) on account of purchase and undertook in wrtting to pay four hundred and thirty dollars ($430) the balance thereof.

2. That I expended the sum of $731.20 in cash on said lands for lumber and materials for a dwelling house which I erected thereon and outbuildings, and for clearing and fencing said lands.

3. That said lands with others were on the 11th day of May 1916, expropriated for the purpose of a military camp or training ground for soldiers and now called "Camp Borden," though I got no notice of such expropriation and knew nothing whatever of my having to give up the lands until I was called upon by Mr. Wright (of Messrs. Wright and Barr, real estate agents, Toronto) who told me that Mr. Barr had purchased my interests in said lands from a Mr. Smith who had sold the land to me and that the lands had been expropriated by the Government for the purpose of a military camp, and he offered me $200 for my title therein, saying if I did not take that sum I might get nothing at all, but later on he sent me word to meet him at Barrie where he, through Mr. Radenhurst, the Government solicitor, served me with a notice, offering me $300 for said lands.

4. That my family were living in said house on the lands and in the latter end of July, 1916, we were told to get out and away or we would be shot as we were in the firing line, and were compelled to leave, and after taking the furniture away I went back for the window hanging and floor rugs left behind but the house had in my absence been partly broken down and the rugs, etc., taken away and I was refused permission to take away anything further off said lands.

5. That in the expropriation proceedings before the Honourable Sir Walter Cassels I claimed $1,810 including my cash payments for my expenditure in material and labour in fencing and preparing said lands for crop, for loss of season's crops, and for compensation for trouble, inconvenience and expense in moving to and from said lands.

6. That the Honourable Sir Walter Cassels heard the evidence but though I testified to my expenditure of $731.20 and asked him to look at my receipts therefor, he refused to do so, saying he was appointed to try the value of the land on the 11th of May, 1916, and afterwards gave his award for the $300 offered me, and I was to pay my own costs, which amounted to $130 leaving me a balance of $170 in lieu of all the money I paid out for said lands, etc., although he expressed himself (page 283, lines 13 and 14 of the evidence) that in all fairness I should have my expenditure but whether he could allow it or not as a matter of law is another matter (and on lines 19, 20 and 21) "I will consider it as he is entitled to whatever I can give him legally" and in delivering judgment said "The case is a hard one and under all the circumstances I think each party should bear his own costs."

7. That after payment of the $731.20 above mentioned I am still liable for the sum of $430 being the balance price of said lands, and I submit that it is neither just, fair nor reasonable that I should be put out of my holding and not be allowed the money it cost me, and I feel it in a worse sense than Naboth's Vineyard as in that case the King offered the full value but the Crown has taken mine and robbed me of the price thereof.

124½

That is surely evidence that injustice was done, and that the matter should be looked into. Why should agents or anybody else take advantage of a few people in a district like that who have invested their life's earnings in these lands and do not wish to sell them? They could not be considered as real estate subdividers of ten or twenty acre lots, because the land was worth what they paid for it; in some cases it was worth more than they paid for it. My sympathy is, therefore, entirely with those people who have in that matter been treated under conditions that should be investigated.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —Welland ship canal construction, $1,860,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: The work of construction on the Welland ship canal was closed down about a year ago. This amount is required to pay salaries of staff and miscellaneous expenses incident to the suspension of construction and the maintenance of work, and also to settle the claims of contractors. There were on this work four large contractors whose claims we had to pay. In settling their claims, we took over their plant. We are practically reselling that plant, and we shall get the money back for it. That is why we are asking for this appropriation. It is not for the purpose of proceeding with the work.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the minister settled with all the contractors?

Mr. J. D. REID: Of the four contractors there is one, the Dominion Dredging Company, with whom we have not yet settled. In settling with the different contractors we took over the plants, engines and cars and so on, that were purchased for this particular work. There is no dispute with the Dominion Dredging Company except that they have a dredging plant and tugs which we did not consider we should purchase because the company had them prior to this work. The amount involved is about $375,000, and there the matter stands. Otherwise, we could have settled with them at any time. Their claim is under consideration with the Government.

Mr. MURPHY: I understand that the minister said that the plant that was taken over was to be disposed of.

Mr. J. D. REID: A great deal of the plant which the other contractors had came in very useful in connection with the Government railway system and the Canadian Northern Railway system. There were, for instance, engines and cars used for ballasting. The other machinery used in connection with the work we are disposing of to contractors and others, and my assistant chief engineer tells me they are selling it at a profit over the prices paid by the Government.

Mr. MURPHY: Will this appropriation cover the claims that are settled as well as the claim that is not yet settled?

Mr. J. D. REID: This will pay the claims that have been disposed of together with the claim of the Dominion Dredging Company, if we come to a decision in regard to it. This will clean the whole thing up.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I wish to draw the attention of the committee to a matter that has been generally overlooked in connection with the little province down by the sea.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman is certainly out of order.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: No, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN: The Welland canal has nothing to do with the little province down by the sea.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I am talking about the Welland canal. I want to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that a few years ago the canal systems of Canada charged tolls on all vessels that went through them, and an agitation was set up by the people of Ontario and some of the western sections of the country that the canals should be made free. The canals were made free, with the result
10 p.m. that the Maritime Provinces, which had contributed to and assumed their proportion of the consolidated debt of Canada invested in the canal systems practically made a present to the western provinces of $100,000,000 worth of canals. The reason I mention this matter in this connection is so that, when the minister comes to look after our little province down by the sea, he will see that we get our fair share of the public funds, and that it is not all monopolized by that big octopus, the province of Ontario.

Canals—capital—Rideau canal, towards construction of bridge on Rideau canal at Pretoria Avenue, Ottawa, $8,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This work has progressed to such a point that a payment of $3,200 has been made on account, and the balance will be paid over on completion of the work to the satisfaction of the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the contractors?

Mr. J. D. REID: Our dealings are with the city authorities, who pay the contractors.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Very good. The city is well administered.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—canals—Trent canal construction, $500,000.

Mr. BURNHAM: I should like to have the privilege of congratulating the Government on the approaching opening of this splendid work. It is true that only four-fifths of the canal is now completed, but it means the opening of the canal to all that vast arterial commerce of central Ontario upon lake Ontario. The upper part, which connects with Georgian bay is, of course, not yet finished. It is progressing according to war conditions. That is the best that can be said, and we do not expect anything more, but it will necessarily be completed in a very few years. It is a fine thing to think that this great work, which has been under construction for no less than seventy-eight years, is about to be opened. It must have been a great proposition, or it would have died a natural death or been slain by criticism many a long year ago. Of course, in recent years, the population of the country, and of central Ontario, has very considerably increased. The consequence is that, as in all countries where population accumulates, industries have arisen, and favourable opportunities such as exist along the line of the Trent canal are sure to be taken advantage of. Places like Trenton, Campbellford, Peterborough, Lakefield, Lindsay, Fenelon Falls, Orillia, Barrie—all of those places have become centres of industry. The Hydro-Electric has an opportunity of developing 150,000 horsepower. That opportunity has arisen in consequence of this canal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the available horse-power?

Mr. BURNHAM: That will be the available horse-power. The consequence is that you will have a cheap waterway which will immediately serve the interest of no less than 2,000,000 people. More than forty-three constituencies are directly concerned. It is only necessary to quote an instance or two to show how important the opening of this canal is to the whole district to which I refer. The Quaker Oats Company have just com-

pleted the reconstruction of their factory in Peterborough. The manager of the firm, from Chicago, told me the other day that the work had cost them $2,250,000, and he assured me that the minute the other end of the canal was opened and they could bring in their grain from the West in their own barges, they would treble this expenditure, and factories totalling not less than six or seven million dollars would immediately arise. He said the people of Canada, especially in that district, had no idea of what was in contemplation and of the industrial development that must take place as soon as the canal was completed. There are at present 615,000 bushels of oats of the company at Port McNicoll awaiting transportation. The grain cannot be shipped because of the shortage of cars. Last year, the year before, and on several other occasions this immense factory had to be shut down because they could not get transportation facilities. This great industrial concern is capable of elevating 288,000 bushels of grain a day, and they turn out in one day a hundred cars of their finished product. It is an immense concern, backed by enormous American capital, and such enterprises as these have sprung up solely because of the Trent canal. At last we have a very respectable means of conveyance. Right up as far as Peterborough it is eight feet four inches on the sill, and in the course of time we shall have it all the way through. This will enable a long stretch of territory from Peterborough to Lake Ontario to be well served, and the people all the way up to Washago will be able to get by cheap water transportation from Lake Ontario and the waters tributary thereto the goods they need. Therefore, I say I cannot let this milestone in the progress of that district pass—and a milestone also in the progress of Canada for this is a great national undertaking—without directing attention to this great event. On or about 1st June the minister, accompanied by all the members who care to go, will take a boat here at Ottawa, will sail through the Rideau to Kingston, will leave Kingston for Trenton and on up to Peterborough and into the Georgian Bay—the loveliest as well as the most serviceable water route that I know of anywhere in Canada. I am well aware that in the East and, needless to say, in the Rockies, there is some beautiful scenery.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did my hon. friend ever sail around the Bras d'Or lakes?

Mr. BURNHAM: They are very fine. The hon. gentleman was not quite so appreciative of his own district the other day when he said, speaking on the Civil Service Bill, that composition in Cape Breton was considered decomposition in Ontario.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say that.

Mr. BURNHAM: The Bras d'Or lakes, the Annapolis valley and many other portions of the East are extremely beautiful.

Mr. McKENZIE: We do not require canals to beautify the country.

Mr. BURNHAM: The flowery eloquence of its representatives is enough. In calling attention with my humble voice to the completion, so far as I have outlined it, of this really splendid and important undertaking, let me thank the Government for what it has done. The work has been done under war conditions, which has meant that it has crawled rather than proceeded at the speed we otherwise should have liked to see. I should like further, in the name of that whole district, to invite all hon. gentlemen to accompany the minister on his trip through the canal. The House will then be closed, at any rate until August possibly—I have no authority for saying that, but I fancy it may happen—and I hope all who can will come and see for themselves what I have endeavoured to call attention to, and I can assure them they will be surprised at the importance and greatness of the undertaking to Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does this item include the works for storage dams?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, that is under items chargeable to income.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I heartily endorse the very charming address given by my hon. friend from Peterborough, and join in wishing a speedy opening of the canal.

Mr. JACOBS: I would gather from the remarks of the two hon. gentlemen who have preceded me that this canal passes through their constituencies. I understood that it was the policy of the Government not to construct any new work during the war. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) told us that the question of building the Trent canal has been mooted for the last seventy-eight years. That being the case, do not you think, Mr. Chairman, that the work could very well have stood over until the end of the war? Five hundred thousand dollars is quite an item to expend on a work which is not absolutely essential, and I understand this amount is only a small

item compared with the entire expenditure on the canal. I do not know very much about this canal, or about the district through which it passes. All I know is that in our part of the country we only hear about the construction of the canal during an election campaign, when, I understand, the Government always sends out a corps of engineers to make reports and lead the people of the district directly to be benefitted to believe that some work is actually going to be done. Am I to understand that the inclusion of $500,000 in the estimates for this work is an indication that the Government contemplate an election in the very near future? With regard to the expenditure of large sums of money, I made inquiries the other day as to the cost of piling certain ground in the city of Montreal. Ground was being piled which was not to be used for any building the Government had in contemplation; it was merely piled because the Government were piling, at that time, other ground on which they were going to construct an extension to the examining warehouse in Montreal. What do you think, Mr. Chairman, the piling of this ground cost? You will be surprised to hear it cost close on to $500,000, to be exact, some $470,000, and that was for piling unused ground on which the Government did not know whether it was ever going to erect a building or not. That was a criminal waste of money, during war-time, when we are paying six to eight per cent interest. We have now before us an item for another $500,000 for a work which I believe could very well stand over until after the war, when we could get the money at a reasonable rate of interest.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does my hon. friend say that this work has been under construction for seventy-eight years?

Mr. JACOBS: I said the question of the building of the Trent canal had been mooted for the past seventy-eight years, according to the hon. member for West Peterborough.

Mr. EDWARDS: You could hardly call it a new work, then.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman will do himself the honour of going over to the Chamber of Commerce or the Board of Trade in his own city and will consult any clerk there, he will get all the data about this canal and will find out that both those bodies in the city of Montreal have again and again strongly endorsed the building of the canal.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

He shows how badly he is posted on the needs and wishes of his own city. I am not going to defend this work because it is ancient history now. The work was dropped for a number of years until 1893 when it was revived and continued until the defeat of the Liberal-Conservative party in 1896. From that time onward nothing was done until shortly before the general election of 1908. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) can tell you about it. I had the honour of inducing that hon. gentleman to make his first speech in the province of Ontario long years ago, and he did it very nicely. I was also partly instrumental in inducing him to make a trip through the charming waters of the Trent system, visiting Peterborough and other towns. He came to the beautiful village of Kirkfield in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and he made one of the most delightful addresses to a vast assemblage there. He told them how this work had been neglected by the great Liberal-Conservative party and how the great Liberal party had thrown all its energies into it. The people just laughed. That evening my hon. friend was very sad. He and I were sitting holding hands on the deck of the vessel and, in the absence of any one else I endeavoured to console him. He said: "Tell me frankly what happened to-day, that I fell so flat." I said: "The first thing is that you read a speech prepared for you by a couple of gentlemen whom I shall not name. In the second place you told them that the rocks had been thrown out by the Liberal party and that this work was being pushed forward by that party when there was not a man or a woman sitting on those rocks who was not familiar with every one that had been blown out long before the Liberal party came into power." I happened to have an old campaign sheet of the election of 1896 showing a photograph of the spot that he had been sitting on and talking and preaching about that day. He appreciated the situation and he realizes the nonsense of the stuff that has been talked by the hon. member sitting at his right to-night. We have a staunch advocate of the Trent canal here in the person of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve.

Chambly canal—renewing, in concrete, top of Wharf—St. Johns, $9,200.

Mr. J. D. REID: The upper part of this wharf is in very bad condition, so much so that it is not safe for barges to tie up there. The work has been delayed an ac-

count of building the bascule bridge between Iberville and St. John's which has just been completed.

Mr. McMASTER: Is an expenditure like this charged to capital or to income?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is charged to income.

Mr. McKENZIE: The income from the canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister did not hear me or he would not have answered me in that way. He said "yes." Does he stand by that "yes?" I did not think there was any income.

Mr. J. D. REID: The canals are free; it is paid out of consolidated revenue account.

Carillon and Grenville canal—protection walls —Lake St. Francis, $2,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is a yearly vote. The erosion is continuous and it would take some years to do all the protection work.

Carillon and Grenville canal—rebuilding lower entrance pier, $9,740.

Mr. J. D. REID: This pier which forms the north side of the lower entrance is completely decayed, and unless attended to at once will fall into the entrance and block navigation.

Lachine canal—dredging, $15,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: A number of vessel captains reported that their vessels had touched bottom in the upper part of the entrance, and for the safety of navigation it is necessary to have the boulders removed up to Cote St. Paul. There is a dangerous lump of soft rock below the locks which also should be removed.

Mr. MURPHY: Is this going to be done by the department or will it be let by tender?

Mr. J. D. REID: By our own dredging fleet.

Ontario St. Lawrence canal—improvements, $43,000.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is meant by "Ontario St. Lawrence canal?"

Mr. J. D. REID: That would be the Galops, the Rapide Plat and the Cornwall canals.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It means the St. Lawrence canals in Ontario.

Mr. J. D. REID: In Ontario. This amount is required to do the following necessary work: Rebuilding lower entrance pier, lock 23, Rapide Plat canal, $26,000 and a similar work, lock 25, Galops canal $17,000. These old timber entrance piers, the tops of which are proposed to be rebuilt in concrete, were constructed at the time of the enlargement of the canals, and are so badly decayed above water line that it is impossible to keep them in repair and any expenditure for ordinary repairs would simply be wasted.

Mr. MURPHY: How is that work to be done?

Mr. J. D. REID: By contract.

St. Peter's canal—improvements, $4,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the old contract been completed?

Mr. J. D. REID: The whole contract is completed and this item was supposed to pay for the final completion but I find that we shall need about $3,000 more and that will be put in the supplementary estimates.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that on Lake St. Peter?

Mr. J D. REID: No, that is on St. Peter's canal in Nova Scotia. This is to pay the Weller contract.

Trent canal—improvements, $57,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is to do the following work:

Dredging Otonabee River..	$14,000
Dredging Bobcaygeon..	5,000
Lock gates, Burleigh & Fenelon.. ..	12,000
Concrete, Superstructures, upper entrance pier, Fenelon Falls..	3,500
Concrete entrance piers above and below Peterborough Lift lock.. ..	4,500
Dam keepers' house at Nassau.. ..	3,000
Canal shop at Peterborough..	1,100
Concrete dam at outlet of Redstone Lake..	9,000
Rebuilding repairs to Reservoir Lake dams..	5,000
	$57,100

Mr. MURPHY: Why are concrete piers required above the lift lock? Are they to replace others or is that new work?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is new work.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What work is to be done above Bobcaygeon, dredging or rebuilding the lock? I need not tell the minister that the lock needs to be rebuilt.

Mr. J. D. REID: The expenditure at Bobcaygeon is for dredging some stone that was blasted last year, and is still there.

Sir SAM HUGHES: His officers will report to the minister that there is absolute necessity for a new dam at Bobcaygeon. The current there is so strong that it is practically impossible to get a boat through the locks. Besides, it has completely ruined the property below. Perhaps the minister has some other item dealing with it.

Hon. J. D. REID: I am informed by the officials there is quite a current at the point mentioned, but that we cannot do anything but rebuild the whole lock, and that has been postponed.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not rebuild the whole lock? It is much more essential than some of the works being carried out on the Otonabee. It is absolutely necessary. Now that the canal is going to be opened out into Lake Ontario it practically prohibits any traffic above Bobcaygeon, from Lindsay, Fenelon Falls, Orillia or Barrie, unless the lock is completed this summer.

Hon. J. D. REID: I am informed they can get the lock in operation during the present year, and for that reason we have postponed the large expenditure for another year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is a very small expenditure. I see the minister is building a new dam at the outlet of Red Stone. That is well.

Hon. J. D. REID: A concrete dam at the outlet of Red Stone lake.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What about Drag lake dam? It is a very important work and I wrote the minister some time ago about it. There was a mistake made in the department in regarding this as two dams instead of one. There is just one dam required, which is divided by an island in the middle of the stream, which saved the construction of part of the dam. That is how the department got the idea that two dams were required. I may point out that it is essential because the people of Haliburton are putting in an electric light plant, and they wish to get the privilege, accorded all along the line, of utilizing the dam for their power works, otherwise it will put them to very great expense. I would like if the minister could see his way clear not only to build the Red Stone dam but the Drag Lake dam. The latter is on the Burnt River waters, and the former is on the Gull River waters. Both are very essential because the Red Stone dam is likely to give way. It is one of the largest reservoirs in Ontario, and it will cause a great deal of damage if it breaks. Drag Lake dam is also likely to give way, and it has not sufficient water now to allow the lumbermen who utilize the rivers going into it to bring out their timber. I wish the minister would look into the matter and see if he can adjust some of these things.

There is another matter that I wish to draw attention to. Some years ago one of the lumbermen in the district—the correspondence is before the department—carried out some work at his own expense on the guarantee of the superintendent of the canal that it would be put in the Estimates and voted. I think the expenditure amounted to $2,100. The minister will remember the instance because I brought it to his notice. That expenditure has never yet been made good, and the lumberman in question has been out of pocket for a number of years.

Mr. J. D. REID: What is the name of the company that has the $2,100 claim?

Sir SAM HUGHES: John Carew and Co.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not find any items in the Estimates for the Drag Lake dam, or this other work. However, I will take the matter up to-morrow with the chief engineer and see if it is possible to put an amount in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will be greatly obliged to the minister if he will do that. The town of Haliburton is going to put in works and it means double the cost if they have to construct this special work in connection with their electric light and power plant. If the dam is built it will go a long way to provide facilities and save money in that way. It is a very necessary item, and if the minister carries this out he will greatly oblige the people of Haliburton.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will look into the matter to-morrow, and also the other matter which the hon. gentleman spoke of.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: An item of $500,000 has already been accepted by the House, and another of $57,000. If I remember well it was stated here a few days ago by the minister, when I asked him about going on with works on the St. Charles river in Quebec, that all permanent works would be postponed until after the war.

Mr. J. D. REID: These were contracts that were made a number of years ago, and were practically completed. To stop these works now would cost more than to complete them. Their completion means

rendering available to navigation about one hundred and eighty miles through one of the best settled districts in Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, and you will save three hundred miles on the journey from Port Arthur to Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, and the result is that a number of large towns and cities will have the benefit of water transportation, a thing that they have been looking forward to for many years. Had it not been that they are really nearing completion these works would have been closed down like the others. The result of their being open to navigation within the next thirty days means that vessels will be able to sail from Lake Ontario up to the Georgian bay, thus giving the benefit of transportation to a well settled country. It would hardly have been fair to have closed such works down when it did not involve a very large amount of expenditure.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: If I draw attention to these items, it is not in any spirit of opposition. The Government is perfectly justified in continuing works that were started some years ago. But they should adopt the same policy in regard to works that were begun some time ago on the St. Charles river, in Quebec, and for which a contract has been granted. Not only is that the case, but the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), in 1913, speaking in Quebec, made the declaration that the works on the St. Charles river were of great importance and would be proceeded with. I also think that work in connection with the Transcontinental terminus in Quebec should be continued. The Government have spent millions of dollars on those works, but they have not been touched for a couple of years. Workshops have been erected at a very large cost, but they have not been equipped as was promised in an agreement signed between the Government and the municipal authorities of Quebec. The Government also bought three miles of frontage on the River St. Lawrence at Quebec, for the purpose of the Transcontinental railway, on which they have spent millions. For a small additional outlay these works could be proceeded with and result in great benefit, not only to the city of Quebec but to the whole of Canada. I respectfully call the minister's attention to the fact that if there is money available to proceed with works on the Trent canal in Ontario it is equally proper that money should be forthcoming for the completion of important undertakings in the city of Quebec which are of national importance.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not think I should get into a discussion on the Transcontinental railway on an item dealing with canals.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I only wanted to draw the attention of the minister to the works on the St. Charles river.

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Chairman, if it is in order that I should discuss on a canal item the reason why we are not going ahead with work on the St. Charles river which has to do with a railway item, I will answer the hon. member. I do not want to go outside of the rules. Am I in order to discuss the River St. Charles matter?

The CHAIRMAN: I fear that the hon. gentleman would be out of order. I understood the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Lavigueur) merely to refer to the St. Charles river works by way of analogy, and for that reason I did not call him to order at that time. But any lengthy discussion of the St. Charles river works which pertain to the Public Works Department, or of the Transcontinental which comes under another item, would certainly be out of order.

Mr. BUREAU: The amount voted in 1917-18 was $25,000. The department could only have spent $15,000, as there is a revote of $10,000. This year the minister is asking for $57,000. May I ask if conditions have changed now? How does he expect to spend $57,000 this year when he could not spend the whole of his appropriation last year?

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course, another year has made these conditions referred to very bad, and we really must proceed with the work. There is some dredging along the river that must be done when navigation is proceeded with on and after the first of June.

Welland canal—Heavy repairs, $35,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: This appropriation is for: (1) renewing three old canal weir foot bridges in concrete, $1,500; (2) replacing four old canal lock gates with reinforced concrete gate bars, $5,000; (3) placing stone protection along certain portions of Summit Level between Thorold and Port Colborne, $15,000; (4) to clean out and deepen entrance to Port Dalhouse, $6,500; (5) unforeseen expenditures, $7,000. The bridges to be renewed in item (1) are in a very decayed and unsafe condition. This amount will complete Old Canal weir bridge renewals. Item (2) is a

continuation of work commenced last year, authorized by letter from the chief engineer. With regard to item (3), continued high water and heavy traffic on the summit level between Thorold and Welland have caused the banks to become badly undermined and eroded. Portions of the towpath, which is the main travelled highway between Port Robinson and Welland, have slid into the canal, and immediate rip-rapping is essential to preserve the road. It is estimated that about 9,000 cubic yards of stone protection will be required. No stone protection has been placed on this part of the canal since 1914. Item (4) is to be done by contract. Owing to continued abnormally high water in lake Ontario during the past year, it was not found necessary to carry out the work.

Railways and canals—Collection of revenue —Canals—Staff and repairs—Statistical officers, $1,642,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does this vote apply only to canals?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. This amount is required to pay the wages of the staff on all the canals throughout the Dominion. The hon. member will see that last year the vote for staff and repairs was $1,440,000; this year it is $1,600,000. The item for statistical officers, $42,500, remains the same as last year. We have to increase the salaries of the men on the canals staff, and there is an increase in the cost of materials required to keep the canals in repair.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the increase over last year?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is $160,000. It applies to our whole canal system.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the increase in wages?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not any detailed statement of that increase. The employees are increased from time to time. We intend taking that matter up as soon as the session is over, and to see that an increase is given to the canal employees throughout the whole system.

Mr. TOBIN: Will the increase be uniform for all employees, or will it apply to just a few?

Mr. J. D. REID: You have to consider each individual class. No uniform system has been adopted.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister might as well give on this item, as on any other, his policy with respect to the patronage system on the canals of Canada. Last night he told us that he would announce his policy on this matter when he was on his estimates. When he comes to the railway estimates, we shall expect him to tell us his policy with respect to railway patronage. He is now dealing with the canals, where there must be large patronage because a large number of men are employed, and heavy purchases are made. I believe the Government is making an honest attempt to eliminate patronage, but as the railways and canals do not come—as I understand the minister—under the Civil Service Bill, the hand of the minister and of his officers will be upon these matters to a greater degree than in other works coming under the Civil Service Act. If the minister is prepared to tell the country what his policy is with respect to matters of that kind, perhaps he can do so on this item.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think I explained my policy last night. The hon. member understands that the Railways and Canals Department comes under the Civil Service Bill which is now going through the House; in fact they are now practically under it, as they have been under it since the Order in Council was passed a couple of months ago.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister will pardon me: Does he say that the railways and canals come under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, I do not; I say that the Civil Service Act excepts railways. It does not except employees of the Railways and Canals Department. It does not say that it excepts the employees on the railways and canals. If the hon. member will read the Bill he will see that it excepts employees of the Government railways. So that the canals are under the Civil Service Commission. Since that Order in Council was passed, all appointments in connection with the canals and the other branches of the department, excepting the Government railways, have been made by the Civil Service Commission. For some years purchases in the Railways and Canals Department were made by the purchasing agent of the department, but they are now made by the War Purchasing Commission. It would be impossible to put the railways under the Civil Service Commission, for the reasons which I gave last night.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Under what department are the docks and approaches at Port Borden and Cape Tormentine?

Mr. J. D. REID: They are under the direction of the general manager of the Canadian Government Railways at Moncton.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Dredging is absolutely necessary there; probably the minister knows it.

Mr. TOBIN: Who makes recommendations to the minister for increases to employees on canals?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Chief Engineer and the Superintendents of Canals go into the matter and make recommendation to me. I have always approved these recommendations; I have no doubt that it will be satisfactory to proceed in that way.

Mr. TOBIN: Will the lower-salaried men get larger increases than the higher-salaried men?

Mr. J. D. REID: That would be taken up when the reports of these officers are made. The larger-salaried men would be statistical officers, and it will be observed that we have not put in any increases for them.

Mr. TOBIN: The increas d cost of living bears more heavily on the man whose salary is from $800 to $1,500 than it does on the higher-salaried man. I would ask the minister to consider this.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister has said that the Order in Council of 13th February applies to labourers and employees on the canals. Is that Order in Council being enforced?

Mr. J. D. REID: So far as I am aware, it is, in every way.

Mr. BUREAU: The Order in Council recites that a doubt existed in the mind of the Prime Minister whether, under the War Measures Act, such an Order in Council could be passed, and that, in the view of Parliamentary counsel and other legal officers of the Government, the Government had no power to pass such an Order. I was wondering whether the minister, who wants to stick to the rules so closely, would enforce an Order which was illegal or issued without authority.

Mr. J. D. REID: A doubt was expressed—

Mr. BUREAU: Not a doubt, a certainty.

Mr. J. D. REID: In the Department of Railways—indeed, in all the departments—we have lived up to that Order in Council. In every case the Chief Engineer takes the matter up with the Civil Service Commission. I am trying to live up to that Order in Council just as if it had been an Act of Parliament.

Mr. SIMPSON: I desire to corroborate the statement made by the minister with reference to patronage, at any rate, so far as the ship canal at Sault Ste. Marie is concerned. Two vacancies recently occurred in the staff there, and I know that instructions were sent out that applications for appointments to fill these vacancies should be made to the Civil Service Commission. I am glad to hear the minister say that after the work of the Session is over the question of increases to employees of canals will be given consideration. Many of the men employed on these canals are not receiving sufficient salary to maintain their families, particularly in these days of high cost of living.

Mr. BUREAU: This year we had before us a Bill to create a bureau of statistics under the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Department of Agriculture has a statistical branch; so has the Department of Labour. Will the statistics taken in this case go to the Department of Trade and Commerce for compilation and publication, or is the work of these officers of a special or technical nature?

Mr. J. D. REID: This name, "statistical officers," applies to men, formerly designated as collectors of canal tolls, who issue passes to vessels going through the canals and obtain particulars as to the destination of the vessels, their cargo, and so on. In this way a record is kept in the department. The name of those officers was changed some years ago and they are now called "statistical officers." One copy of the passes is sent to the department at Ottawa, and in Ottawa are collected the statistics in regard to the vessels passing through the canals. A copy of the passes and the information obtained by those statistical officers will not be sent to the Department of Trade and Commerce, but the Department of Trade and Commerce will get from the Department of Railways and Canals a detailed statement showing the quantity of grain or any other article of commerce that the vessels take on board while going through the canals.

Mr. BUREAU: How many canals have we?

Mr. J. D. REID: Eighteen. That, of course, does not mean only one collector on each canal. For instance, for the Rideau canal there is a collector in Ottawa for this end, and there is another at Kingston for that end, so that on some of the

canals there is more than one collector. There must also be a night man. Take for instance the St. Lawrence canals. Vessels are going up and down these canals day and night, so that there has to be a double staff.

Mr. TOBIN: What salaries are allowed to those men?

Mr. J. D. REID: From $750 to $1,200 a year.

Mr. BUREAU: There are eighteen canals which are open for about six months in the year. If we multiply eighteen by two, that would mean thirty-six men employed, say at an average salary of $1,000, or $36,000. As the canals were not numerous, I was wondering, when I saw the amount of the appropriation, whether there was a man at each lock instead of a man at each canal.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—miscellaneous—Canadian Government railways—compassionate allowance to the widow of the late Harold E Robeson, who died from fatal injuries received in Mulgrave yard on November 4, 1916, $2,000.

Mr. COPP: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to some correspondence I have had with him in connection with the late Mr. Edmund Cole, who was killed on the Intercolonial railway in February or March last. He was a section foreman on the railway for a number of years—I forget exactly how long—and during the very severe storms of last winter, 11 p.m. when the roads were blocked, he was out assisting in getting trains through. During a very severe storm a train, while going around a curve, struck and killed him. I wrote a letter to the minister in connection with the case. Mr. Cole had a small farm. His son is overseas, and his widow is left entirely alone in poor circumstances and with very little support. While I am glad to see these items in the Estimates, I hope the minister will be able to put an item into the Supplementary Estimates to provide a compassionate allowance for Mrs. Cole.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am glad the hon. member has mentioned this matter this evening, because the Supplementary Estimates are being considered. I remember the names of at least two men on the Intercolonial in connection with whom compassionate allowances are to be voted. I shall take this matter up to-morrow, and if it has been overlooked I shall then be able to place it in the Supplementary Estimates or give a good reason for not doing so.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope one of the cases for which the minister is asking compassionate allowances is a very touching case, in regard to which I was corresponding with the department, from River Dennis, in the county of Inverness. A young man was killed on the train there some time last summer. They were filling one of the big cuts at Macdonald Gulch between West Bay road and the Strait of Canso. They were hauling the material from some gravel pit at River Dennis, and they had a long train of gravel cars coming up a heavy grade, to the east of West Bay road.

Mr. J. D. REID: Was the man's name Campbell?

Mr. McKENZIE: No, it was McGinnis. A freight train was behind and it began to push the gravel train, and the trains were so long that, when the pressure came upon them, the cars piled up in some way or another and the boy who was working on the train was killed. I wrote the department about the matter. He was an only son, indeed, I think, the only child, a bright young boy of about seventeen years of age. This is a very deserving case, as the minister will see from the correspondence, and something should be done to compensate the father so far as the department can do by the payment of a fair sum of money.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am glad the hon. member has brought up this matter also to-night, because I shall take it up and see if the father of this young man should receive a compassionate allowance. It strikes me, from looking over the Supplementary Estimates to-day that the name River Dennis is familiar. I am under the impression that we have this man's name on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. McKENZIE: I forget the young man's name, but his father's name is John McGinnis.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall take the matter up. I was glad to bring in the Bill to provide compensation for Government employees, because the way in which we have been dealing with these matters in the past has not been satisfactory. It is much more satisfactory, in cases of this kind, to be able to deal with them immediately an accident occurs. Now that we have this Act, we shall be able to deal immediately with cases like this instead of having to put the amounts in the estimates.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister ought to be congratulated on the generous way in which he deals with such cases. In the old days, when other ministers were handling the department, when I had cases of this kind, I got some money, but I think $750 was the biggest allowance I ever got, and I am only sorry my people were not killed now instead of ten years ago.

Quebec Bridge, construction, $700,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: I thought we could take up this item and then perhaps go on to the item for construction on the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was not understood that we were going into railway matters to-night.

Mr. J. D. REID: I understood that some hon. gentlemen wanted to discuss the railways when these items were called, so I will not press the matter to-night. We could, however, leave one item on which any railway matter could be discussed.

Mr. McMASTER: I should like to bring before the committee, if I am in order, the matter of the rate on soft coal from points in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to points in Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: That could only be done with the unanimous consent of the committee. Discussion of that question would be entirely out of order on this item. Is it the unanimous wish of the committee that the hon. gentleman shall have the right to speak on the question of soft coal? The hon. gentleman may proceed.

Mr. McMASTER: I am informed that for many years the rate of $1.80 per ton prevailed on the Intercolonial for the transport of soft coal from points of origin in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to points of consumption in Quebec. In the year 1916 the Minister of Railways and Canals almost doubled this rate by raising it to $3.20 per ton. This works a very great hardship to the province of Quebec, because the rate is practically prohibitive. It is more than fifty per cent of the cost of the coal in the lower provinces. We have from the minister's own lips, in reply to questions in the House, information from which we can calculate how much it costs the Government railway to carry a ton of coal for the four or five hundred miles between points of origin in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to points in Quebec. On 18th April last the minister, in reply to a question, told the House that the cost of transporting a ton of coal for some four hundred miles was $1.65. If we add another hundred miles, which might easily occur between points farther distant from each other, that would add one-fourth to the cost, which would bring the rate to just over $2, to be exact, $2.06. By a curious coincidence if you add 15 per cent to the old rate of $1.80 per ton, you get $2.07, and $2.07 would appear to me to be a fair rate per ton for coal from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia points to points in the province of Quebec. I should like to know whether there is any sound railroad reason for charging $3.20 per ton to carry coal which must cost a little over $2 per ton? What is the reason that has led the minister to raise the rate that has prevailed for so many years from $1.80 to $3.20 per ton?

Mr. J. D. REID: Between what points?

Mr. McMASTER: I have no exact points, but was taking the minister's statement in reply to a question which appears on page 906 of Hansard this year, and which shows that the cost of transportation from St. Hyacinthe, Montreal, and St. Lambert down to Campbellton, a distance of 406 miles, was $1.65. Now to be perfectly fair in my argument I have assumed that there may be another 100 miles between the point of origin of the coal in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick and the point of consumption in the province of Quebec. Therefore, by taking one-fourth of $1.65, we get $2.06, which amounts to the old rate of $1.80 plus 15 per cent. I would take it that it was quite fair for the Minister of Railways to raise the old rate of $1.80 to something over $2 in conformity with the 15 per cent increase which was granted to the other railways, but what I want to be enlightened upon is why the rates should have been raised from $1.80 per ton to $3.20 per ton, because it is a practically prohibitive rate and shuts out the province of Quebec from the enjoyment of coal from Nova Scotia.

Mr. J. D. REID: Why does the hon. gentleman say that a rate of $3.20 from Nova Scotia to Montreal by rail would be prohibitive?

Mr. McMASTER: It would add more than fifty per cent to the average price of the coal at the Nova Scotia points where the coal originates. I have some figures here given in answer to questions asked by the Hon. Mr. Tanner in another place. A member of the Government gave these as the average prices for coal charged by the different coal companies in the Maritime provinces:

	Screened.	Run of mine.
Acadia Coal Co...	$6.60	$6.35
Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co..	5.50	5,25
Inverness Railway & Coal Co...	5.75	5.50
Bras d'Or Coal Co... ..	5.75	5.50

I presume that is at the mine. I would say that a freight rate which represents more than half of the price in most of these instances is a very heavy rate, and extremely heavy when compared with the former rate of $1.80 per ton.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is hard for me to give the hon. gentleman an answer to the question which he raised without making inquiries as to the reason. The hon. gentleman states that the increase has been from $1.80 to $3.20. When the 15 per cent increase went into effect on the other roads the rates were increased on the Government railway. I shall make inquiries and be able to answer the hon. gentleman when we take up the estimates again. Three dollars is not a high rate for that haul; I claim it is a low rate. Vessel tonnage is supposed to be carried at a much cheaper rate from Nova Scotia to Montreal than the same tonnage carried by rail. If they were to charge the rates that they are charging now it would almost make the traffic prohibitive in normal times. The rate to-day from Nova Scotia to Montreal, if we could charter vessels, would amount to at least $3 per ton. Vessel rates have increased very considerably. You cannot get vessels to go from Nova Scotia to Quebec or Montreal.

Mr. McMASTER: I would hardly think it fair to compare the rates obtaining to-day by water with the railway rates, because we all know that the shipping situation is quite abnormal.

Mr. J. D. REID: I admit that, but we have had to increase the rates on the railways on account of the increased cost of operation. The water rates should not exceed those of the railways. Surely, to bring coal from Nova Scotia to Montreal by rail, the railways should get an amount equal to the vessel rate. The same thing applies to coal which is being transported from Lake Ontario and Lake Erie ports to Montreal. The rate in normal times was about 50 to 75 cents per ton. To-day the rate on coal is about $3.50 per ton from Lake Erie ports to Montreal. That shows the way in which freight rates have been advanced by the vessels. They have also been advanced from time to time by the railways. If the rates are not raised the railways are going to lose a large amount in the cost of operation. The hon. member might have read in the press within the last forty-eight hours that the American railways are going to raise their freight rates on account of the high cost of operation. When the 15 per cent increase was ordered by the Board of Railway Commissioners for the other railways the Government railways simply increased their rates 15 per cent the same as the others did. I am not familiar with the whole situation but this little discussion will give me an opportunity of becoming thoroughly posted, and when the item comes up again I will be in a better position to give my hon. friend the answer to which he is entitled.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I know a good deal about this question and perhaps I can throw a little light on it. In ante bellum times it did not cost the Dominion Coal Company more than 35 cents a ton to bring coal from the Cape Breton mines to Montreal. I am speaking of those large ships that carry 10,000 tons such as the Storstadt. No. railway can compete on a long distance haul with that rate. To-day, with the high cost of ships and the high freights you might send coal from North Sydney, where it originates, to Montreal for $3 or less. The trouble is that the ships are not available at any price.

Mr. J. D. REID: Nor are cars, for such a long haul.

Mr. J. READ: Under the present condition of things in regard to the high price of coal for use on the railway, and the high working expenses by reason of increased wages, $3 is not too much from the Cape Breton mines. That is the only place where there is any considerable quantity of coal available. There is some coal shipped from Springhill in Cumberland county, Nova Scotia, also mined by the Dominion Coal Company, and that is 300 miles nearer Montreal than the Cape Breton mines. No other coal company, except the Pictou Coal Mines, is producing coal there. They are charging about $6 a ton for coal at the mines to-day, which practically means that the Montreal people have to take coal from Pictou county laid down at about $9 as the first cost, regardless of profit, and from Springhill mines the charge would probably be $8.50. I do not know what is going to happen if we have to rely upon the Sydney coal mines.

Mr. J. D. REID: Until the war broke out about two million tons of coal per

annum were brought from Nova Scotia to Quebec and Montreal by vessel. In fact that is the only way that coal can profitably be transported to Lévis and Montreal; in normal times it would not pay to bring that coal by rail—the railway could not possibly compete with the water rates. Since the outbreak of the war, I do not think there has been any coal brought into Montreal from the Maritime Provinces, the demands of that city for coal having been supplied from the United States. Last year the only coal that came from Nova Scotia to Quebec was brought by two small steamers that the Department of Railways and Canals purchased the year before, vessels of 2,500 or 3,000 tons, respectively, and they altogether carried less than 100,000 tons. This year I do not think we will take any coal from the Maritime Provinces to Quebec or Montreal —it must all come from the United States, for the reason that no vessels can be secured. The Dominion Coal Company have no vessels, their fleet having been taken by the British Admiralty. That company lost the Batisca the other day, and have also lost the Louisburg, and they cannot get any other vessels; they cannot even take coal to St. John. We are being asked to use the little vessels that we purchased in order to supply the cities of St. John and Halifax. The Intercolonial railway is really taxed beyond its capacity on account of the shortage of cars. The cars are being used to move lumber, pulpwood and other products. If we could only spare the cars it would pay us much better to carry pulpwood and lumber to the United States, which is profitable, and transport coal from Nova Scotia to Montreal in vessels if the necessary ships could be obtained.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the Quebec bridge open for traffic, and has it been accepted by the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Quebec bridge has been in operation for some months, and I had the opportunity of going over it, I think, in November last. Trains are operating backwards and forwards over the bridge, in fact, there is an express train that runs along the south shore. On the local trains there is a great deal of traffic going to and fro. The good old car ferry Leonard has been disposed of, and we now have the bridge to depend upon.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would urge upon the minister to have arrangements made with respect to the train from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces so that passengers travelling to Quebec might cross by the bridge instead of using the ferry.

Mr. J. D. REID: What the hon. gentleman suggests is that the train should run across the bridge at Quebec and out again?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, I do not suggest that. A local train might meet the Maritime express somewhere near the bridge, and convey the Quebec passengers direct to that city.

Mr. J. D. REID: I purpose taking that matter up, but I had intended leaving all such questions until we came to consider the votes for the Government railway systems.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the bridge been delivered?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, it has not been taken off the contractor's hands, because there is some painting and other small things yet to be done. Mr. Montserrat, the chief engineer, tells me that probably the bridge will not be taken over officially until about September. We are responsible, however, for the bridge now.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I am glad that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has raised this question, because it is a very important one for the city of Quebec. I hope the minister will give this matter his attention, so that passengers may be taken to Quebec across the bridge as suggested.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will take the matter up as promised. Of course, it means an eight or ten mile run from Quebec via the bridge to Levis to meet the train. However, when I am considering the whole railways situation I will take that matter up and see what can be done.

Mr. POWER: Have any arrangements been made with any of the other roads, except the Quebec lines, with a view to giving them running rights over the Quebec bridge?

Mr. J. D. REID: No other roads have asked for running rights over the bridge, and until they do so we cannot force them to use the bridge. If other lines want the privilege we will be only too glad to make the necessary arrangements with them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are other railway companies that will want to make such an arrangement after the war is over. I can speak for the Delaware and Hudson com-

pany, because I happen to be a director of the subsidiary companies in Canada. This company had built along the south shore as far as some point in Lotbinière county when the first collapse of the bridge took place, and then they stopped work. Then the war came on. I know the company intend to run via the Quebec bridge, but are not in a position to announce their plans until after the war.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Other railways would like to enter Quebec, but the proper facilities are lacking until the works that have been projected are carried out. That is the pity of it. All the other companies, like the Delaware and Hudson, and the Grand Trunk, would run into the city of Quebec if the required facilities were available.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Opportunity for the further discussion of this matter will be afforded when we again go into Supply on the Railway Estimates.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 11.37 p.m.

Wednesday, May 15, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

BILL TO AMEND INSURANCE ACT WITHDRAWN.

Mr. M. Steele, for Sir Herbert Ames, presented the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce:

Your Committee have had under consideration Bill No. 62 to amend the Insurance Act, 1917, and have agreed to recommend that the said Bill be not proceeded further with this session, owing to the fact that it affects British and foreign insurance companies and that such companies have not had sufficient time to consider and express their views on the proposed measure.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Return showing food destroyed in Toronto between April the 4th and April 29th, 1918, and the action of the Food Controller in regard thereto.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

Names of persons employed in preparing the Votes and Proceedings, Orders of the Day, and Journals of the House of Commons (English and French).—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

Names of persons employed in reporting and translating the Proceedings of the House, and cost of printing and binding Debates; also cost of reporting the translating, typing and printing of proceedings before Parliamentary Committees.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has asked me to read to the House a statement with regard to some criticisms which have been made in the House. The memorandum is as follows:

SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK AND PRIVY COUNCIL.

Fiscal Year, 1913-14.—Vote:—Travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.00. No claim for this amount and no payment made.

Fiscal Year, 1914-15.—Vote:—Travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.00. This amount was paid as Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attended sittings of the Privy Council in August or September, 1914.

Fiscal Year, 1915-16.—Vote:—Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.00. Claim was made for this amount, in monthly instalments, by the department having charge of the vote and as attendance at the sittings of the Privy Council had been omitted as a necessary condition of payment, the claims were allowed as in other cases of special allowances.

Fiscal Year, 1916-17.—Vote:—Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.00. This amount was paid for the same reason as in 1915-16.

Fiscal Year, 1917-18.—Vote:—Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.00. No claim was made for payment of this amount as Sir Charles Fitzpatrick did not attend the sittings of the Privy Council.

PUBLISHER OF OFFICIAL NEWS.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I deem it my duty to make a statement to the House with respect to an item which has appeared in the press of the country touching a despatch received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies at the end of last week, which was given out to the press in the ordinary course.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Received from and by whom?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. About the middle of January last I suggested to the British Government, through the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that

it would be desirable to have a weekly resumé, or summary, of the war situation, which should be issued under the authority of the War Cabinet, and which might be published. We had been receiving for some time secret reports, which, of course, could not be made public, and the information set forth in those weekly reports was communicated only to members of the Administration, and in some cases to the Prime Minister alone.

We received a reply intimating that the matter would be taken into consideration, and about the end of March we were informed that such a despatch for publication would be sent to us weekly in the early future. These despatches began to come in about the end of March, or a little after, and when received they were published as was intended. They were not sent in code, and they were marked as official news for publication. It is understood that one of the Dominions of the Empire made a suggestion about two or three weeks ago that these news summaries were not as valuable as they might be for the reason that they set forth for the most part matters that had already been published in the press of the country. On Saturday last, one of those official news despatches was received in the ordinary course through His Excellency the Governor General, signed, as all these despatches are signed, by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Hon. Walter Long. It was handed out to the press and published in the usual way. Yesterday a further despatch correcting it in one respect was received in the same manner from the same source, and signed in the same way. That also has been given to the press. In communicating to the British Government in January last, we asked that these despatches might be sent to us under the authority of the War Cabinet. I do not know, of course, whether or not this particular despatch was sent out under the authority of the War Cabinet. I am content to accept the statement of Lord Reading in that behalf; he doubtless has more information on the subject than I have. What I desire to make clear to the House and to the country is that the despatch in question was received in the ordinary course under the arrangement alluded to, and purported to be signed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It was received through His Excellency the Governor General, and the despatch which corrected it was received in the same manner through the same source and signed in the same way. My purpose in making this statement is to assure Parliament and this country that if there has been any mistake or misapprehension with regard to this official news despatch it has not occurred here at Ottawa; it has occurred somewhere else.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

Mr. W. P. McKAY.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is W. P. McKay employed in the War Trade Board?
2. If so, what are his duties and salary?
3. What was the date of his employment and was he recommended by the Civil Service Commission under the provisions of the recent Order in Council?
4. Is this the same W. P. McKay who was associated with A. DeWitt Foster, formerly Member of Parliament for Kings, N.S., in the purchase of horses for military purposes, which transactions were investigated by Mr. Justice Davidson?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. In charge of issuing licenses of exports from Canada under supervision of Director of Licenses. Salary $200 per month.

3. 13th March, 1918. Yes. Mr. McKay was recommended to the board by Mr. John McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, as an efficient customs officer.

4. Do not know and have not investigated as Mr. McKay's work is and has been satisfactory to the board.

WAR TRADE BOARD OFFICERS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Are the following persons employed in the War Trade Board: Messrs. Trower, Wilkie, Forrest, Russell and Murphy?
2. If so, what duties are they performing, what salary is paid to each, and by whom were they recommended for employment?
3. Did the Civil Service Commission under the provisions of the Order in Council authorize their employment? If not, why not?
4. On what dates were the above named persons employed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. W. K. Trower, general secretary, $500 per month; Mr. J. H. Wilkie, assistant secretary, $250 per month; Mr. T. M. Forrest, in charge of Statistical and Information Departments, $208.33 per month; Mr. E. M. Russell, expert on metals, $175 per month; Mr. W. P. Murphy, in charge of Filing Department, $125 per month. These men were selected by the board

as being competent for the duties they are now performing and the board were satisfied with their credentials and they are now performing the duties assigned to them in an efficient manner.

3. Yes.

4. Mr. W. K. Trower, February 25, 1918; Mr. J. H. Wilkie, March 1, 1918; Mr. T. Mr. Forrest, March 13, 1918; Mr. E. M. Russell, April 8, 1918; Mr. W. P. Murphy, February 14, 1918.

EMPLOYMENT AT VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government been informed that in the spring of 1912, men were hired to go to Victoria, British Columbia, and work there as lumbermen, carpenters, painters, etc., at the rate of $3, $4, and $5 per diem, travelling expenses prepaid and lodgings gratuitously provided for?

2. Has the Government been made aware of the fact that, when the said workmen and mechanics had reached Victoria, all travelling expenses were deducted from their wages; that they were paid only $2 and $2.50 per day, and that they had to pay for their lodgings?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to pay for these men's travelling expenses so as to enable them to return home?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS: We have no information concerning this question. I intimated some days ago that if the hon. member would give further particulars we would look into the matter. I have not received any particulars. As the question now stands, the answer to the first question will have to be no, and the answer to the second and third questions: Answered by No. 1.

MILITARY SERVICE REGISTRARS, QUEBEC.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Is Mr. Ant. Gobeil, lawyer, ex-deputy minister of the Public Works Department, still registrar, under the Justice Department, for the operation of the Military Service law? Has he put in an application to be relieved from such function?

2. Has he been asked to send in his resignation? In what way has he been required to resign?

3. What were the number of women or girls, and the number of men, under his employ, on the 15th March last?

4. What is the name of the new registrar?

5. What are the names of the assistant registrars?

6. Are the offices in the Chateau Frontenac temporarily leased, or are they leased for a fixed term?

7. What were the number of lady employees on the pay-list, on the 20th instant?

8. What were the number of men employees on the said pay-list on the 20th instant, or on the preceding week?

[Sir George Foster.]

9. What are the duties of Mr. Alleyn Taschereau, K.C., in the said office?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. Relieved by Order in Council, 3rd April, 1918.

3. 56 men, 49 women.

4. Alleyn Taschereau, K.C.

5. First Assistant, J. F. Belanger.

6. Leased temporarily to the 1st June.

7. 107.

8. 32.

9. The duties of the registrars and deputy registrars are those of recording, indexing, and notifying the men affected by the Act so as to give effect to the conclusions arrived at by the tribunals and medical boards. They are also charged with the duty of obtaining the equal application of the principles governing the disposition of claims for exemption by causing appeals to be entered when it appears that any tribunal has come to a conclusion the validity of which is doubtful, whether such conclusion is in favour of or adverse to exemption being granted, and with the obtaining of such information as will assist tribunals to perform their functions intelligently and with despatch.

APPOINTMENTS TO PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. BALL:

1. How many appointments have been made in the Printing Bureau since October 1, 1911, to the present date?

2. How many of them are English?

3. How many of them are French?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

		French.	English.
Number of employees as per list of October 12th, 1911	837	320	517
Number of employees on May 1st, 1918 ..	1,235	615	620
Increase	398	295	103
Number of appointments since October 1st, 1911	765	452	313
Deaths since October 10th, 1911	102	47	55
Resignations since October 10th, 1911..	229	120	109
Dismissals since October 10th, 1911.....	36	19	17
	367	186	181

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—QUEBEC APPEALS TO CENTRAL APPEAL JUDGE.

Mr. CURRIE:

1. How many cases for exemption under the Military Service Act were appealed to the

Central Appeal Judge from the province of Quebec?

2. How many of these appeals from the province of Quebec were disposed of by the recent Order in Council refusing all exemptions to men 20 to 23?

3. How many appeals for exemption from the province of Quebec were disposed of by the Central Appeal Judge, of others than those called up by Order in Council, during the month of April, 1918?

4. How many appeals from Quebec under the Military Service Act are still pending?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Up to May 10th, 11,657 appeals to the Central Appeal Judge from the province of Quebec have been received.

2. 3,645.

3. Up to May 13th, 3,211 appeals for exemption from the province of Quebec have been disposed of by the Central Appeal Judge, other than those called up by Order in Council. The records are not kept by months.

4. 4,155.

NATIONAL WAR MUSEUM.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Is it a fact that representatives of the National War Museum about to be established in London have taken possession of the war trophies captured from the enemy by the Canadian Army, and are retaining the most interesting specimens for the said War Museum of London?

2. If so, has it been done with the consent of this Government?

3. Does the Government contemplate making any representations to the Imperial Authorities with the object of having these returned to Canada?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. All trophies captured by the forces of the British Dominions are assembled under the control of the Imperial authorities. A register is kept of all these captures, specifying in each case the name of the claimant thereto. Many of the trophies captured are still effective and have been put into service. The final disposal of trophies remaining at the close of the war will then be decided. It is understood that the National War Museum intends to form a Canadian section in that museum, and that certain Canadian trophies will be requested for that purpose.

2. The Canadian army has a representative on the Committee of the National War Museum.

3. A considerable number of interesting trophies have already been sent to Canada and others will be sent shortly. The interests of Canada have not, and will not, be neglected.

CANADA REGISTRATION BOARD.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What Department of the Government is the Canada Registration Board responsible to?

2. What is the street address of said Board?

3. What is their telephone number?

4. What are the names of the officials of said Board and the amount of their respective salaries?

5. What are their duties?

6. Have Superintendents been appointed for the registration of man and woman-power for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island?

7. If so, by whom were they recommended?

8. What are their names and addresses, and what remuneration will they receive?

9. What are their duties?

10. Have Registrars been appointed for the different constituencies in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island?

11. If so, what are their names and addresses?

12. By whom were they appointed?

13. Who recommended them?

14. What remuneration are they to receive?

15. Do they appoint the enumerators for the different polling sections?

16. What remuneration will said enumerators receive?

Mr. McCURDY:

1. The Canada Registration Board is a subcommittee of the War Committee of the Cabinet.

2. Regal Building, O'Connor street, Ottawa.

3. Queen 4026.

4. The members of the board are: Hon. G. D. Robertson, chairman; E. McG. Quirk, vice-chairman; Mrs. A. Plumptre, G. M. Murray, Philemon Cousineau, K.C., Thomas Moore, F. B. McCurdy, E. L. Newcombe, J. D. McGregor; secretary, Henry C. De Wolf. Only the secretary receives compensation; amount $300 per month.

5. To effect a registration of persons in Canada over 16 years of age.

6. Yes.

7. Selected by the board.

8. For Prince Edward Island, J. J. Trainor, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; for Nova Scotia, George E. Corbitt, Annapolis Royal, N.S.; for New Brunswick, Charles Comben, Woodstock, N.B.; $8 per diem for time actually given to the work.

9. To recommend suitable persons to act as registrars in each of the electoral districts, and generally supervise the detailed organization necessary for the successful carrying out of the registration.

10. Yes.

11. For Nova Scotia: Annapolis-Digby, Wm. E. VanBlarcom, Digby, N.S.; Antigonish-Guysboro, D. D. Chisholm, Antigonish, N.S.; Cape Breton North and Victoria, Malcolm A. McLeod, Baddeck, N.S.; Cape Bre-

ton South and Richmond, Daniel R. Cameron, Glace Bay, N.S.; Colchester, W. B. Armstrong, Truro, N.S.; Cumberland, H. Wyckoff Rogers, Amherst, N.S.; Halifax, Chas. F. Tremain, Halifax, N.S.; Hants, John W. Blanchard, Windsor, N.S.; Inverness, J. D. Doucet, Port Hood, N.S.; Kings, Archibald A. McNeill, Millville, N. S.;Lunenburg, D. F. Matheson, Lunenburg, N.S.; Pictou, J. Ed. McDonald, New Glasgow, N.S.; Shelburne-Queens, Wm. A. Smith, Liverpool, N.S.; Yarmouth-Clare, Wm. A. Godfrey, Yarmouth, N.S.

For New Brunswick: Charlotte, Robt. A. Stuart, St. Andrew, N.B.; Gloucester, Arthur J. Meehan, Bathurst, N.B.; Kent, Camille Boudreau, Richibucto, N.B.; Northumberland, Wm. F. Cassidy, Chatham, N.B.; Restigouche-Madawaska, Timothy Robinson, Dalhousie, N.B.; Royal, Samuel A. McLeod, Sussex, N.B.; St. John-Albert, Amon A. Wilson, St. John, N.B.; Victoria-Carleton, Albion R. Foster, Woodstock, N.B.; York-Sunbury, J. B. Hawthorne, Fredericton, N.B.; Westmoreland, Newton Killam, Dorchester, N.B.

For Prince Edward Island: Kings, Wm. Cain, New Perth, P.E.I.; Prince, Fred. J. E. Wright, Summerside, P.E.I.; Queens, Henry Smith, Charlottetown, P.E.I.

12. By Governor in Council.

13. The respective superintendents for the districts.

14. $6 per diem for time actually engaged.

15. They appoint deputy registrars for the different polling subdivisions.

16. Deputy registrars will receive $4 per diem. All registrars and deputy registrars are being invited to give their services free, and many are responding.

UNION STATION AT QUEBEC CITY.

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is the so-called Union Station at the Palais, Quebec city, owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government or by one of the two?

2. If by the Canadian Pacific Railway, has the Government made any arrangement with this company regarding the rent for the accommodation of the Government railway trains in the said Union Station?

3. If so, when did such agreement take place, and how much has been paid the company per year since the agreement was entered into?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. The new Union station building was erected and is owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Part of the lands comprising the terminal yard is owned by the Government and part by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

[Mr. McCurdy.]

2. An arrangement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway has been made regarding the rent for the accommodation of the Government railway trains in the said station and terminals.

3. The agreement is dated January 1, 1915, $1,104.83 was paid the company in 1917, and $19,347.08 in 1918. Accounts to the amount of $203,056.88 are held pending adjustment of contra accounts.

APPOINTMENTS FROM Y.M.C.A. AND SALVATION ARMY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN.

1. How many persons formerly in the employ of the Y.M.C.A. are now in the employ of the Government? What are their names?

2. How many former officers or employees of the Salvation Army are now in the employ of the Government?

3. Were all these appointments made on the recommendation of the President of the Privy Council?

Mr. BURRELL: I would point out that it is absolutely impossible to answer a question of this kind, considering the thousands there are in these two organizations and the thousands of employees of all kinds in the Government. Unless the question is made more explicit, I may say that the Government has no information.

SUPREME COURT REPORTS.

*Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Did the ten-year contract under which the Canada Supreme Court reports were printed by the Canada Law Book Co., Ltd., expire in June, 1915?

2. If so, were tenders called for in connection with the printing of said reports or was the old contract continued with the Canada Law Book Co., Ltd.?

3. Did the Carswell Co., Ltd., write the Department of Justice on the 16th June, 1915, offering to pay $500 per volume for the privilege of printing the reports for the current ten-year period commencing from June, 1915?

4. Would $500 per volume net the department from $8,000 to $10,000 in ten years?

5. Did the Carswell Co. also offer, if awarded the contract, to supply free for the use of the Government from 300 to 400 copies of the reports?

6. Under what contract or arrangement are the reports now being printed by the Canada Law Book Co., Ltd.?

7. Is the department receiving any monetary consideration from said company for the privilege they are enjoying? If so, how much?

8. If nothing is paid by the Canada Law Book Co., why was the offer of the Carswell Co. not accepted?

9. Is it a fact that the Carswell Co. is capable of complying with all the conditions imposed by the department in connection with the printing of reports?

10. Did the Minister of Justice before the expiration of the contract with the Canada Law Book Co. which was due to terminate in June, 1915, promise to invite tenders from both the

Carswell Co., Ltd., and the Canada Law Book Co., Ltd., before making a new contract? If so, why was that course not taken?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. No, except as stated in answer to No. 10.

3. Yes, for a period of ten years.

4. It would depend upon the number of volumes issued. For the past ten years sixteen volumes have been issued.

5. Yes.

6. Under a contract dated 10th February, 1917.

7. Yes. $500 per volume.

8. The Canada Law Book Company does pay $500 per volume as just stated. The offer of the Carswell Company was not accepted, because the service for the previous ten years had been conducted in a most satisfactory manner by the present contractors, the Canada Law Book Company, and it was not deemed advisable, in view of this consideration, to experiment with another publisher.

9. It is so represented, but the Government is not otherwise informed.

10. Yes, and offers were received from both companies accordingly.

MR. PHILIPPE FUROIS.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Did Mr. Philippe Furois, of Quebec, offer the Department of Trade and Commerce a vessel for the purpose of performing the service between Quebec and the northern shore?

2. What is the name of this vessel?

3. Is Mr. Furois the owner of said vessel?

4. What subsidy did Mr. Furois ask for?

5. Was he awarded a contract?

6. Was Mr. Philippe Furois the Unionist candidate in Bonaventure County at the last general elections?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. Schooner " St. Onloine ".

3. Mr. Furois did not state whether he owned the vessel or not.

4. $5,000 or $6,000.

5. No. No definite information was obtained from Mr. Furois as the department was negotiating for a better ship.

6. The hon. gentleman can satisfy himself by reference to the public records of the elections.

CONNAUGHT RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What are the names of the parties who have Connaught Rifle Range rented for pasturing cattle?

2. What is the amount paid for rent?

3. What is the duty of Mr. Holbrook, who lives on the Range?

4. What salary does he receive?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Robert Richardson.

2. $925 per annum.

3. Caretaker.

4. $90 per month, with free house and grounds.

COLONEL LABATT.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Was a letter written by H. H. Stevens, Esq., M.P. for Vancouver Centre, to Hon. N. W. Rowell in the following terms:—

House of Commons,

Ottawa, April 23, 1918.

Hon. N. W. Rowell,
President of the Privy Council,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Rowell,—Referring to the attached questions and answers in the Hansard of March 20th, you will observe that Colonel Labatt is in receipt of a total disability pension and also is in receipt of a salary of $5,000 a year as a member of the Pensions Board.

I cannot conceive that such a condition should be allowed to exist with the knowledge of the Government and I feel that it is but necessary to bring it to your attention to have it remedied. I am writing you as Chairman of the Pensions Committee of the House of Commons, and I not only ask that that case be considered and rectified, but that the Pensions Committee should recommend such amendments to the regulations as would prevent the occurrence of any such cases as this. Briefly, I may state that in my view, either Colonel Labatt is in receipt of his pension by virtue of misrepresentations or undue favour through powerful influences, as it is clear that he is not suffering from Total Disability at all and if the Pensions Board is to be swayed by influences from the outside in the granting of pensions, I warn you as a prominent member of the Cabinet, that it will result in destroying your influence as a Government because such injustice will not be tolerated by the people.

I prefer to place this before you in this way rather than take it up on the floor of the House and cause undue embarrasment. I think, as a final word, I would point out that Colonel Labatt is reported to be both brother-in-law to the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Militia.

I am.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) H. H. Stevens,
Member for Vancouver Centre.

2. Was receipt of the said letter acknowledged by the minister's assistant private secretary in the terms following:—

Ottawa, April 26, 1918.

Dear Mr. Stevens,—Mr. Rowell is in receipt of your letter of the 23rd of April in regard to the question of Pensions.

As Mr. Rowell is working now every day on the Pensions Committee this matter is receiving careful consideration. He has had your letter with him in the Committee, and I am writing you merely to acknowledge it.

Yours very truly,

Assistant Private Secretary.

H. H. Stevens, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

3. Do the above quoted letters form part of the printed record of the proceedings now in progress before the Pensions Committee of the House of Commons?

4. Have the statements contained in Mr. Stevens' letter been inquired into, and will the Committee make an interim report thereon prior to the conclusion of its labours?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.

2. Yes, and also by letter of May 1st, as follows:

Dear Mr. Stevens:

Re Pensions Committee.

I duly received your letter and laid it before the Pensions Committee. The matter you mention had already come before the Committee, and it is their intention to deal with the questions raised in the course of their deliberations.

With reference to the personal matter mentioned in the letter, I understand from Dr. Reid that he was not consulted regarding the appointment of Colonel Labatt to the Board of Pension Commissioners and had nothing whatever to do with it. So far as General Mewburn is concerned, as you are aware, Colonel Labatt was appointed many months before General Mewburn became a minister.

There is, however, a question of principle involved, which is a very proper matter for consideration.

(Sgd.) N. W. Rowell.

3. The following is the extract from the printed records of proceedings of the committee on May 1st relating to this matter:

The Chairman read a communication received from Mr. H. H. Stevens, M.P., dated April 23, re the case of Colonel Labatt's disability pension; also a communication received from Mr. F. S. Scott, M.P., dated April 23, re the revision of pension regulations in respect to dependents of British Reservists—said communications were ordered filed for records and for further consideration.

4. The matters referred to in Mr. Stevens' letter are being enquired into and the committee will report in due course.

MR. J. A. DENIGER.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is Mr. J. A. Deniger employed by the Post Office Department in Montreal?

2. If so, what are his duties?

3. What is his salary?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. Field officer in connection with rural mail delivery work.

3. $1,200 a year.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER:

1. What amount has been expended by the Government on Toronto Harbour since Confederation?

[Mr. Brouillard.]

2. What is the initial cost of such protection as has been placed on the south shore of the Island; also cost of repairs to same?

3. To what extent has the Island been reduced since Confederation due to erosion?

4. What part or parts of the harbour front are controlled by the Dominion Government?

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. What was the total amount paid to the Journal Publishing Company of Ottawa, Limited, during the fiscal years 1912-13-14-15-16-17 inclusive, for (a) rentals; (b) printing?

2. Were the official cheques of the Government for said rentals and printing jobs issued directly in favour of the above company, or to P. D. Ross, Esq.?

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchéres) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada in relation to the proposed visit of some members of the Canadian Government to London this spring.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The motion may be adopted with the proviso that it shall not cover such documents, if any, as may be confidential and which it is not in the public interest to bring down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is understood. May we have this return at an early date?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I should think so.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. EDWARDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I desire to rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday's Ottawa Citizen contains the following article, headed "Absolutely Untrue; Chief Justice on Dr. Edwards' Charges in the Commons":

"I do not know that I have very much to say about the charge of Dr. Edwards, except that it is absolutely untrue," stated Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, chief justice of Canada yesterday.

"I do not receive any such salary," stated Sir Charles. "The amount voted by parliament now is for travelling expenses when I go to London as a member of the Judicial Committee. When I don't go I do not draw the allowance. There was one year when I drew it. At that time the amount was voted expressly without reference to expenses. It was a statutory allowance in connection with the position, the same as the amount allowed in my capacity as deputy of the Governor General. Afterwards the statute was changed to make the vote cover travelling expenses. When I don't go to London why, of course, I do not receive the money."

My statement, to which exception was taken, may be found in Hansard of May 13, and is as follows:

$2,500 a year was voted to a certain gentleman, whom I am not permitted to mention, for a specific purpose, which that gentleman did not carry out. The money was voted and taken. The next year the money was again voted and taken for that specific purpose, although that specific purpose was not carried out. The third year the money was voted for the same specific purpose, which purpose again was not carried out, but the money was taken.

That is the statement which the gentleman in question says is absolutely untrue. The Appropriation Act and the Auditor General's Report show that for the year 1915-16 a vote of $2,500 was put through in these words:

Travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The Auditor General's Report, page U3, shows that that amount was drawn. The next year the vote was similarly worded, and the Auditor General's Report, page U3, shows that the amount was taken. The next year, 1917-18, the wording was slightly changed to read:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

That amount was not drawn. According to the Appropriation Acts and the Auditor General's Report, the amount was drawn in two of the three years. My statement cannot be characterized as absolutely untrue; at least it is two-thirds true, while the assertion in the press of the gentleman in question can only be taken as fifty per cent true. I am willing to place my veracity on that basis against that of the Chief Justice of Canada, at all events, so far as principle is concerned —and that is the point wherein my veracity is called to question. The amount was taken for services which were not performed, and that is what I stated in the House. That was the principle involved, and admission has been made to that effect. As a matter of principle, it does not matter whether the amount wrongfully taken was $5,000 or $7,500. It has been admitted that $5,000 has been taken for which—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: —no services were rendered.

SHORTAGE OF SALT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I have received a letter from the firm of Robin, Jones and Whitman, a large fishing firm in the Maritime Provinces operating on the coast of Gaspé, with regard to the shortage of salt. Perhaps I may read the letter, which I have received from the general manager of this firm, in order that I may induce the Government to do something towards bringing cargoes of salt to Canada; otherwise serious losses will result to the fisheries this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that the hon. gentleman summarize the letter; otherwise, it would be in the nature of an argument.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the hon. gentleman puts a question, I will answer it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to help the fishermen to get the necessary supply of salt, which is absolutely lacking this year on the coast of Gaspé, on the north shore, and, I am told, in the Maritime Provinces generally. My correspondent urges on the Government the necessity of asking the Imperial authorities to send a vessel from the Mediterranean to Canada with a cargo of salt.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A shipment of 5,500 tons of salt is on its way, which, I am informed, will carry the trade in Canada up to the 1st of July. I am in communication with the Admiralty as to a further shipment, and I am ascertaining how much will be required for the remainder of the season. My hon. friend will see, therefore, that the help has already been rendered.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope that I shall not have to take my hon. friend's answer with a grain of salt.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—MR. FOWLER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): With regard to the revelations made by the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) the other night, is it the intention of the Government to dismiss Mr. Fowler from the service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That matter will be brought to the attention of the Prime Minister, and a further answer will be given to my hon. friend.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): In view of the reference made on Monday night and this morning by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, does the Government purpose allowing Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to retain the money which he admits he improperly received?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall have to answer that question in the same manner as I answered the question of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken).

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the House that such questions should more properly be put upon the Order Paper. They are not of such urgency as to require their being brought up on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. MORPHY: Some time ago I put a question on the Order Paper, and I received an evasive answer.

FARMERS' DELEGATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you have received a communication from the delegation of farmers now in session at Ottawa, and if so, if it is your intention to communicate it to the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Since I entered the chamber I received a voluminous communication. I obviously have not had time to read it. I cannot communicate it to the House until I have read it. When I have read it I shall take what action I deem proper.

Mr. VIEN: Are we then likely to have this document communicated to us, while delegates are still in this city?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already stated to the hon. member that I shall, if I think proper, communicate it to the House the moment I have had an opportunity of reading it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it a communication from the Ontario farmers?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not yet had an opportunity of reading it.

RURAL MAIL CARRIERS' CONTRACTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Is it the intention of the Government to afford an opportunity for a discussion of the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) on March 21 last, relating to the difficulties experienced by rural mail carriers and the salaries received by them? The Prime Minister on that occasion asked that the resolution should be withdrawn in order that the Government might consider the matter, and he stated that an opportunity to discuss it would be given at a later date.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When the Estimates of the Post Office Department are under consideration there will be full opportunity of discussing that matter.

HEREDITARY TITLES IN CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I remind my right hon. friend that the motion of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in regard to titles was to be further discussed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I thought we had heard a good deal about titles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have not heard the last of them yet.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the matter.

THE INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance), Bill No. 82, to amend the Inland Revenue Act was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—duties of excise on manufactured tobacco:

Mr. BUREAU: Does this include the whole section?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister give an explanation of the difference between clauses (a) and (b)? Clause (a) enumerates a number of tobaccos such as fine-cut, cavendish, plug or twist. Clause (b) says:

> (b) On common Canada twist, when made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, and on the farm or premises where grown, by the cultivator duly licensed therefor, or in a licensed tobacco manufactory, twenty cents per pound, actual weight.

If it is manufactured into chewing tobacco or otherwise the duty is 20 cents per

pound. I do not quite understand the distinction that is drawn here.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is tobacco twist made from the Canadian grown leaf. The duty has been raised from ten to twenty cents.

Mr. BUREAU: What is meant by the words "on common Canada twist when made solely from tobacco grown in Canada?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is a Canadian tobacco.

Mr. BUREAU: It goes on to say "when made on the farm or premises where grown." Surely, it would not be grown in a factory.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The twist may be made in a factory. It is also frequently made on the farm.

Mr. McCOIG: Is there any provision covering the point I raised the other day as to the duty being remitted on tobacco damaged by frost or otherwise?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is nothing in the Bill which specifically covers that point, but there is a regulation now in force which provides that the duty shall not be exacted where the leaf has been destroyed.

Mr. BUREAU: Does this section mean that a farmer who grows tobacco and makes it into twist for himself and his family is exempt from paying the duty?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Thirty pounds are allowed to the grower for every male adult of his family.

Mr. TOBIN: Does the minister think it is fair to charge a duty of six dollars a thousand on cigars regardless of quality? That duty would be all right on cigars costing seventy-five or a hundred dollars a thousand, but on the cheaper cigars costing from eighteen to forty dollars a thousand, does the minister not think the duty is too high?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The increased duty upon cigars amounts to two-thirds of a cent per cigar. In the case of the five cent cigar the profit of the retailer now is forty per cent. With the increased duty it will be twenty per cent, or a little over. There is some objection, possibly fair, from the trade in respect to the duty on the cheaper cigar. In the United States the duty is based on the selling price, but that has not been the practice in Canada; we have always charged on the quantity. If the tax is too onerous in the case of the cheaper cigar, we will reconsider the matter before the next session of Parliament.

Mr. TOBIN: I think the minister should increase the duty on the more expensive cigars selling at $150 per thousand, we will say. The margin between the wholesale and retail price on the five-cent cigar is so small that with the duty it will have to sell at six or seven cents; that is the cigar the workingman and the farmer smokes. I think the minister would get more duty if he increased the tax to ten dollars per thousand on the higher-priced cigar and decreased it to two or three dollars per thousand in the case of the cheaper cigar.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of the tax is to raise revenue, and if we impose too high a tax, consumption will cease and there will be no revenue.

Mr. TOBIN: I do not admit that. I am sure the minister when he goes into a store does not buy the five-cent cigar of the workingman, selling at six for a quarter, but a brand selling at three for fifty. If he chooses to smoke that quality of cigar, let him pay for the luxury. He is better able to pay the duty than the workingman. I again repeat, the minister should increase the duty on the higher-priced cigar, and reduce it on the lower-priced cigar.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can promise my hon. friend that before the next session of Parliament we will reconsider the duty on the five-cent cigar.

Mr. TOBIN: The minister admits I have good grounds for my appeal to him. Why not reconsider the duty now? This is the proper time when we are passing the Bill. If the minister will not meet the farmers in the House, at least he should allow them to get a cigar at a reasonable price.

Mr. McMASTER: Would it not be well for the Acting Minister of Finance to consider the advisability of putting excise duties on an ad valorem instead of on a specific basis? I believe we are going to have very high taxation in this country in the future. In the past the excise and other duties have all been of a more or less trifling character, except the tax on liquors, but now we have to face the practical inevitability of heavy taxation all along the line. Reasoning by analogy, a duty of ten cents per pound on tea is equivalent to a duty of twenty-five per cent on the tea used by working people, selling at around thirty cents a pound, but it only works out

to about twenty per cent in the case of the higher-priced tea. I am merely arguing by analogy, but it seems to me the principle is a correct one, and I would join with my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe in urging on the Acting Minister of Finance the advisability of starting out right in regard to these taxes, because, after all, it is new conditions we are called upon to meet. I think it was the Acting Minister of Finance himself who said the other day that it was a condition and not a theory that confronted us. Being confronted with new conditions, I would urge on the Government the advisability of meeting those conditions by starting the new regime of taxation on a just and reasonable basis. I believe the House is with me entirely when I say that the principle and the practice of ad valorem duties is more reasonable than specific duties. Specific duties usually work out so as to place the heavier burden on the poorer people of the country.

Mr. LALOR: Does my hon. friend advocate an ad valorem duty on tea?

Mr. McMASTER: I am not advocating any certain ad valorem duty. I am not attempting to advise the Acting Minister of Finance as to the amount of any duty that he should place upon any article. I am laying down a principle and it is a just and right one. That principle is that we should have our duties apportioned on an ad valorem basis and not on a specific basis.

Mr. McCOIG: Possibly the acting minister did not understand my point in reference to a damaged crop. A damaged crop very frequently sells for about one-quarter of what the crop would have sold for had it not been damaged. The argument of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) would apply to a very large extent to the point I was trying to make. If the producer had to depend upon selling his tobacco, a duty of five cents a pound would have a discouraging effect on the industry.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under subsection 6 of section 2 of the Bill we are taking power to make regulations which will cover the point my hon. friend has mentioned, as well as other possible conditions which may arise to reduce the value of the home grown tobacco below the market price. We will keep this point in mind when the regulations are being framed.

Mr. McCOIG: If the minister assures the producers of tobacco that there will be regulations governing those cases, it will largely assist in increasing the acreage which may be put under tobacco in Ontario this year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can assure my hon. friend that due provision will be made to cover the case he points out, and I would be obliged if he would write a letter covering the point fully, to the Minister of Excise and Customs.

On section 2—license to grow tobacco; fee; excise duty; exemption if tobacco grown for personal or family use; limited quantity free of duty; regulations; penalty:

Mr. COPP: I would like to draw the attention of the minister to subsection 6. He stated that regulations would be made in regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig). I doubt if he has power under that subsection to make those regulations. The subsection says:

> The Minister charged with the collection of the tax imposed under this section shall have power to make such regulations as he deems necessary or advisable for carrying out the provisions of this section.

I do not think he has any general power to make regulations.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It says:

> The Minister charged with the collection of the tax imposed under this section shall have power to make such regulations as he deems necessary or advisable for carrying out the provisions of this section.

Mr. COPP: I do not think that is definite enough to give the minister power.

Mr. McMASTER: The point is that the tax of 20 cents a pound is imposed under section 279 of the Inland Revenue Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The tax of five cents per pound is under subsection 3, of section 2, of the Bill. I think it is clear enough.

Mr. McMASTER: Under section 279 of the Act, subsection b, on common twist tobacco, Canadian grown, there is an excise duty, or tax, of 20 cents a pound actual weight. The hon. member for Kent has drawn the attention of the Committee to the fact that often the tobacco which is grown is so much damaged that the crop will only realize five or ten cents a pound, which would be half the amount of the tax. The minister says that he can obviate that injustice by availing himself of the power under subsection 6 of section 328a; but subsection 6 of 328a only allows him, according to my reading of the provision, to make regulations regarding the collection

of the taxes imposed under this section, 328a, while the tax of 20 cents a pound on common Canada twist is imposed under section 279.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, but that is manufactured tobacco, and that could not relate to tobacco that had been damaged. One refers to the tobacco leaf and the other to common twist tobacco that is manufactured. I read it so; I do not think there would be any damaged Canadian leaf in it.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think there should be any doubt about this. It seems to me that the tax which is referred to in subsection 6 of section 328a is the tax imposed by subsection 3:

> There shall be levied, collected and paid an excise duty on all tobacco grown in Canada for consumption therein of five cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established.

That appears to be the tax that is referred to in subsection 6 of the same section, and not the tax that is referred to in subsection b of section 279.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is quite correct, but the hon. member for Kent was referring to Canadian leaf tobacco under subsection b of section 279.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think he was.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCoig) referred to the Canadian grown leaf, which is subject to the excise tax of five cents a pound, and he inquired if, when the leaf was damaged or destroyed, there might be a remission or rebate of duty, and I answered him that the regulations would contain such power. The Inland Revenue Act, which, however, I have not before me, contains a stronger provision even than this, also enabling the department to make regulations which would cover the point.

Mr. DEMERS: Does subsection 6 of section 328A apply to section 279?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. DEMERS: So, there is no answer to the question asked by the member for Kent?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The tobacco to which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) referred had reference to Canadian tobacco leaf, on which there is imposed a tax of five cents a pound. That is what is referred to in section 328A.

Mr. COPP: The point I wish to make is this: Paragraph 3 of section 328A provides:

> There shall be levied, collected and paid, an excise duty on all tobacco grown in Canada for consumption therein of five cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established.

Subsection 6 provides:

> The Minister charged with the collection of the tax imposed under this section shall have power to make such regulations as he deems necessary or advisable for carrying out the provisions of this section.

Now the section which I have quoted provides that five cents a pound must be collected on leaf tobacco, and the power given under subsection 6 to make regulations has to do with the collection of that tax. The minister has no power to make a regulation for granting a rebate on damaged tobacco. That is the point I make. I have no particular interest in the subject because my province does not grow tobacco, but I submit that the minister is not authorized by subsection 6 to make such a regulation as he suggests can be made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am advised by the officials of the department that the Inland Revenue Act contains a section which, beyond doubt, gives power to the department to frame regulations covering that point.

Mr. COPP: If there is some other provision, all right.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: The tax of five cents a pound to be imposed under subsection 3 of section 328A is a general tax. Now I am raising tobacco, which I sell for fifteen or twenty cents a pound, and my neighbour raises a higher quality of tobacco for which he receives thirty-five cents a pound, it is not fair that I should be called upon to pay the same amount of tax as he does. There should be a distinction made, and in my opinion it would be more just to base the tax upon the value of the tobacco. The Quesnel tobaco raised in the county of Montcalm brings thirty-five or forty cents a pound, whereas Blue Briar, or Comstock fetches much less. There should be a difference in the scale of taxation based on the selling price. I drew the minister's attention to that fact.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am instructed that there is no country in the world where there is an ad valorem duty on tobacco. I do not quite see how you could impose taxation of that kind.

Mr. DEMERS: What about cigars?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The duty is specific. I do not see how you could fix a rate of duty upon the selling price.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the Customs Department you have gaugers who test the wines and liquors. Could you not have experts to determine the quality of tobacco?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am afraid we would have to have tobacco tasters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend knows there are tobacco experts all over the country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose the manufacturer has persons to determine values.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are experts in the United States also.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) raises an inferior quality of tobacco on which he pays so much a pound. Perhaps he raises more of that inferior quality than his neighbour.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: No.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If not, why does not the hon. gentleman take a leaf out of his neighbour's book and go in for growing tobacco of better quality, which will realize a higher price.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: The reason I am not raising tobacco of better quality than my neighbour is because the soil is not the same. His soil will produce Quesnel tobacco, mine will not.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is a fair answer.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Therefore I have to raise another quality of tobacco.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think that anybody can complain of this tax upon Canadian grown leaf tobacco. It is a very small excise tax indeed, and I think there will be no complaint. The producer of the Canadian leaf enjoys very high protection, and it is only fair that he should pay something in the nature of an excise tax.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: We do not complain of the tax of five cents. We have been fairly treated in this instance by the Government, and I tender them my best thanks on that account. But is it just that I should be required to pay the same tax as my immediate neighbour, who produces a much superior quality, and gets a higher price for it? It is generally recognized that there must be some sacrifice, and that the duty of five cents a pound is a fair one, but there should be a distinction made in the rate of duty paid as between the man who realizes thirty-five or forty cents a pound on his tobacco, and the man whose tobacco only brings him in from fifteen to twenty cents a pound.

Mr. McCOIG: Tobaccos are graded into classes 1, 2 and 3, so it can be easily determined by any one making an adjustment what amount of tax different sections of the country should be required to pay. As to one farmer having a better crop than another, to which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) referred, let me draw his attention to the trouble that is experienced on account of frost. Frost may be experienced in one particular section, and half a mile away there may be no frost. One man's crop of tobacco may be seriously affected by frost, whereas another man's crop may not receive any damage at all from that cause.

That is where the injustice would come in. It would not be the fault of the owner, but that his crop happened to be damaged on account of the peculiar situation of the land or the quality of the soil, which might attract frost more quickly than would other sections close to the water or to the lake in my district, and whose crops would not be damaged by frost, while those further inland would be. It is no reflection on the farmer who has his tobacco frosted so far as his ability as a farmer is concerned, but it is due to where he is situated. If the acting minister will give us some assurance that his regulation will cover such cases I feel satisfied that it will be some encouragement to producers to go into the tobacco industry.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I drew the attention of the acting minister the other day to the effect of the tax on tobacco. I asked if the tax of 5 cents per pound was to be paid by the manufacturers of cigars, and I understood the minister to reply that it was. The manufacturers already pay an excise tax of 20 cents a pound, and if they have to pay the additional 5 cents they will be taxed 25 cents a pound.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is for cigars made purely from the Canadian leaf.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I said the other day that this tax would be too heavy on the 5 cent cigars. I understood that many of these were made from Canadian leaf. I very strongly urge that this tax should not apply to 5 cent cigars made from Can-

adian leaf, so that the manufacturers and retailers can still sell to farmers and labourers, a cigar for 5 cents. As it works out, the only tax which will really be paid by the people at large will be on the 5 cent cigar. The man who smokes a 10 cent cigar will still pay 10 cents for his cigar, because there is a sufficient margin in the price of the 10 cent cigar to permit the retailer to sell it still for 10 cents, while the 5 cent cigar costs the retailer 4.6 cents. It is quite impossible then for the retailer to sell the 5 cent cigar at the old price under the new tax, and his customers, the common people, will have to pay 6 or 7 cents, while the rich people will still get their cigars for 10 cents. This is an important matter. Smoking is not a luxury but a necessity in this country. It is the custom of our people, so it must be treated as a business matter. We should encourage the production of good tobacco in our country. Some years ago measures were taken by the Liberal Government under the minister of the day, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, if I mistake not, to encourage the tobacco industry. I maintain that the tax of 5 cents should not apply when it can be demonstrated to the excise inspectors that the cigars will be made from Canadian leaf. I think the minister was impressed the other day by the representations of some hon. gentlemen on this matter, and I hope this somewhat drastic measure will not apply to the cheap cigar.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: In answer to what the hon. gentleman has just said, I am in principle opposed to the tax of 5 cents upon farmers who grow tobacco. I remember when the tax of 28 cents per pound was imposed on foreign raw leaf tobacco that the eastern and western tobacco growers sent a very important delegation to the Capital asking for a further duty of 10 cents a pound on American leaf to protect the Canadian growers. We discussed the matter with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), and the Minister of the Interior, and they were convinced at that time that an additional duty of 10 cents was necessary to protect the Canadian grower. We left the Capital fully satisfied that we had made our point, but on the following day the cigar manufacturers came to Ottawa and did their utmost to induce the Government not to impose the tax of 10 cents that we were asking. Our contention then, as to-day, was that the 28 cents per pound tax on American tobacco was not sufficient. But in the new tariff the Government has raised the excise on American tobacco from 28 cents up to 40 and to 60 cents per pound. That leaves a margin of 12 cents in our favour, and we are only called upon to pay a tax of 5 cents. The difference between 12 and 5 cents is 7 cents, therefore the tobacco growers have an advantage now in their favour of 7 cents. It being admitted that all must do their duty, I am satisfied that the 5 cent tax should be imposed upon Canadian tobacco growers, because there is now a very large difference in our favour. That is why I do not oppose the new tax of 5 cents, because really we now have 35 cents per pound protection against American tobacco, and our growers are able to compete with it. Of course, it would be better still if we had no tax to pay at all, but everybody must bear his share of taxation at this time.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the Bill?

Mr. McKENZIE: Before you report the Bill, Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that complaint has been made in various parts of the county from which I come that since the importation of liquor has been prohibited the Department of Customs has not taken much interest in the protection of the community generally with regard to the manufacture of liquors in illicit stills. It is said that officers of the department have been withdrawn, that these liquors are being illegally manufactured and sold in a great many places and that considerable damage and disturbance is resulting. I am sure that the minister will not be less vigilant in suppressing this illegal manufacture simply because its suppression will not bring any money into the coffers of the country. Active steps should be taken to suppress this evil. Complaints also come to me from my own county and from other parts of Eastern Canada about the indiscriminate granting of customs warehouse licenses to people who have liquors. No man who is engaged directly or indirectly in the sale of liquors should be given a license to store liquors on his premises. No matter how innocent he may be, the temptation thereby put in his way is extraordinary and should not exist. I have no personal knowledge of it, but I understand that a great many licenses have been granted within the last two months to persons in eastern Nova Scotia who are engaged in the sale of liquor. I have not

closely followed the different Orders in Council which have been passed—

Mr. SIFTON: Does my hon. friend refer to persons engaged in the legal sale of liquor under license from the Provincial Government?

Mr. McKENZIE: No liquor is legally sold in the province except by a few vendors who are specially appointed in different places.

Mr. SIFTON: My hon. friend does not refer to these vendors?

Mr. McKENZIE: No. There is only one vendor in the Island of Cape Breton—I know him personally—and he has no warehouse. But a great many of these warehouses in eastern Nova Scotia have been stored largely with liquors within the last few weeks. A good deal of agitation prevails among the people of eastern Nova Scotia on this account. I have not the reputation of being much of a temperance man—

Mr. SIFTON: I am sorry to hear it.

Mr. McKENZIE: —although I may be a temperance man in a general way. But this Government should do everything in their power to co-operate with local governments in enforcing the law. When a local Legislature and the local Government has done everything possible to stop the sale of liquor, no assistance to the contrary should be given by any department of this Government.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am afraid the minister has not given sufficient consideration to the objection made to subsection (c) of 279 regarding the tax on cigars. It is provided that the tax on cigars of all descriptions made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor shall be $6 per thousand. It is not reasonable that all cigars should be included in the same class. I have no expert knowledge of the matter, but I assume that all cigars are manufactured from raw leaf tobacco either imported or grown in the country. The price of cigars varies from 5 cents to $1 each. I never smoke the $1 cigars, but I have no doubt that some hon. gentlemen on the front benches opposite do so. The tax on these $1 cigars is just the same as the tax on the poor man's cigar, which sells at 5 cents or even less. Unless the minister amends this clause, I wish to enter my protest against its being past in its present form.

Mr. SIFTON: The matter mentioned by the member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) has already come to the attention of the Government through telegrams from the temperance associations and other organizations in Nova Scotia. Attention has been given to it, and a telegram recently received from the mayor of Sydney stated that the regulations now being carried out are entirely satisfactory. Instructions were immediately given that no liquor of any kind or description should be removed from an Inland Revenue bonded warehouse or a Customs warehouse in Nova Scotia except for export purposes under the supervision of an officer of the department; and it was pointed out that if these instructions were not observed, a change would be made of all the officials in Nova Scotia.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have already given consideration to representations similar to those which have just been made by the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair).

In order to impose upon tobaccos an excise tax according to the selling price, it would be necessary to revise all our excise resolutions upon cigars and tobaccos. That principle has never been adopted in this country, and I do not deem it wise, at least at the present time, to introduce any such change. The tax upon cigars, as I have already stated this morning, amounts to two-thirds of a cent for each cigar.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My point is that it should be an ad valorem tax in place of a specific tax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see how you could have an ad valorem duty upon tobaccos. You might have a specific duty upon the selling price.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: In the United States there is a specific duty upon quality, not upon quantity.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think so. That is a specific duty upon the selling price. I promise my hon. friend (Mr. DuTremblay), and some of his friends who interviewed me the other day as a delegation on behalf of some of the tobacco manufacturers in the city of Montreal, that I shall discuss this matter with the Minister of Finance upon his return, and also with the Minister of Customs during the recess, and if we find that this particular tax operates unjustly upon the trade interested in the cheaper cigars, we shall at the next session of Parliament ask for a revision of this particular tariff.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: It might be done before by Order in Council.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Bill is reported, I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the motion to report a Bill is not debatable, and, therefore, the final debate which has just taken place has, as I understand it, taken place with the unanimous consent of the committee. I do not wish it to be taken as a precedent, because hon. members, on reading rule 17 (a), will see that while the preamble or the title of a Bill is debatable, a motion that the committee rise and report is not debatable.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAR REVENUE ACT, 1915, AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 83, to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—tax on berths and parlour car seats increased:

Mr. MURPHY: How are these amounts collected by the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: From the railways.

Mr. MURPHY: Monthly?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Quarterly.

Mr. MURPHY: What revenue was derived last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: $130,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I would direct the attention of the acting minister to a mistake which, I think, underlies all these specific taxes. There is, for instance, no attempt made by this tax of ten cents for a chair in a parlour car to differentiate between the man who travels twenty-five miles and the man who sits in the car all day and travels three hundred miles. They each pay ten cents. There should be some difference. The difference between five and ten cents seems trivial; but the principle is something, and it would be well to start right in regard to these taxes, because I do not contemplate the removal of any of these taxes for many years to come. This kind of taxation will have to exist for years, and it should be started on a just and fair basis. It is neither just nor fair to charge one man ten cents for travelling 25 miles in a parlour car and another man ten cents for travelling 300 miles in a parlour car.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—proprietary and patent medicines:

Mr. STEELE: I should like to bring to the attention of the minister a matter which has been the cause of a good deal of trouble and confusion amongst the manufacturers of a certain line of medicines and the medical profession of the country. I feel that those who drafted the original Act which was passed in 1915, were not very familiar with the drug business. There is a line of preparations which are very largely manufactured to-day and which do not strictly come under the definition of proprietary or patent medicines. They are not patent medicines; they are not strictly speaking, proprietary medicines, but they are termed pharmaceuticals—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are they mentioned in the pharmacopœias?

Mr. STEELE: They are preparations made by the manufacturers for the convenience of the physicians. The old style of preparing medicines in the doctor's office, using the crude drugs, and preparing them and the noxious mixtures that most of us received when we were younger, has largely passed away, and the preparation of medicines is now largely in the hands of those manufacturers who prepare them under the term "pharmaceutical preparations." They prepare them under scientific methods, and they have succeeded in presenting preparations which are fairly palatable, yet using just the drugs that would be used by the doctors if they were following the old method of preparation.

This is a development for the convenience of the medical profession. The medicine is put up in pound lots, half-gallon, gallon, or five-gallon lots, according to the requirements of the individual physician. It was generally understood for a time after the passing of the Act in 1915 that these did not come under that Act, and many manufacturers sold them under the impression that they were not included. I might add that on the labels of these preparations the dose and the purpose of the medicine is generally shown. It was held by the department that the fact of the dose and the purpose of the medicine being given brought the medicines under the Act. There is no quarrel on the part of the manufacturers or the physicians as to the payment of taxes. What they desire is a clear understanding on this point so that the confusion which has hitherto existed may be removed. An effort has been made in the

Bill now before the House to correct that to some extent, but even now I do not think it is going to make it very clear. For instance, the new definition of consumer is, "Consumer means any person who uses or purchases." Now, this difficulty will arise. The physician purchases from the manufacturer and therefore, as I understand it, he will be a consumer and will have to pay the tax as he prescribes these medicines. He may fill an eight-ounce bottle from a half-gallon jar and give it to the patient; the patient then becomes the consumer and the user, and will also be liable to a tax on the same preparation. If my impression is not correct I should be glad to hear from the minister. Paragraph 2 does not make clear the point which has caused confusion in the past. It says:

> Any preparation manufactured for sale exclusively for the medical profession and on the labels of which no claim is made that the preparation has medicinal or curative powers or any directions with respect to the amount that constitutes a proper dose.

It is almost necessary for the manufacturer to put the dose on the label. It is also very convenient for the label to state whether the remedy is a diuretic or stomachic, telling what the preparation is useful for. If the words "intelligible to the public" were inserted after "claim" it might remove the difficulty which has arisen in the past and which I feel will arise under the Bill as now drafted. I only desire to clear up the confusion. The physicians of Ontario have been bothered a good deal by inspectors coming around and taking samples of medicines from their offices which the physicians considered exempt from the tax. This confusion exposed the physicians to the danger of being fined $50 and costs for violation of the law I merely draw these matters to the attention of the minister, hoping that some change may be made to clarify the whole matter and relieve the manufacturers and the physicians from the dangers to which they were exposed under the old law.

Mr. FOURNIER: I believe the whole tax on patent medicines is wrong. I happen to know something about the drug business, and I think it is a shame to make the consumer pay the tax. I should like to know how much revenue has been obtained from this source during the last year.

[Mr. Steele.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is impossible to tell, because ordinary postage stamps may be used.

Mr. FOURNIER: The manufacturer should pay the tax. At present he goes scot-free, and so does the wholesaler and the retailer. I think the tax should have been divided amongst them. We have an army of men going around the country now to see that stamps are put on patent medicines and drugs of different kinds, and these men cost the country $96,000 last year. I think the manufacturer should put the stamp on the bottle.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He would have to break open every package in his warehouse to do that.

Mr. McMASTER: Put the stamps on in the first place before the packages are made up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Due consideration was given to that point long ago. When this Bill was introduced in 1915 it originally provided that the tax be paid in the manner suggested by my hon. friend, but after consideration of the Bill in the House the Minister of Finance felt obliged to amend it, and adopted the procedure found in the present Bill.

Mr. FOURNIER: I think the present system is very unbusinesslike. The manufacturer should put the stamp on the bottle. Then we would have revenue from three different sources, from the manufacturer, from the wholesaler, and from the retailer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That might be worked out so far as the manufacturer is concerned, but not in the case of the importer.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Did the stamp tax on patent medicines bring in more than $96,000 last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Very much more than that, but it is impossible to tell exactly.

Mr. FOURNIER: I speak for the druggists. They are bothered to death with men coming into their stores to see that the stamps are put on. What has been the revenue from the druggists under the old law? I think about $26 was collected in fines last year for violations of the law. How much was paid to the lawyer who prosecuted? It is a shame; it is unbusinesslike. When the law was put in force every bottle of patent medicine should have had a stamp put upon it. This would have done away with the army of men who are spending

the country's money. An expenditure of $96,000 for this purpose is ridiculous. My hon. friend would have had three sources of revenue then and such a system would have been preferable. I call the minister's attention to the fact that the druggists are complaining. They are bothered with it. They would much prefer to buy the bottle already stamped. Naturally we know that the consumer would pay for it. The manufacturer could put the stamp on the bottle.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

At three o'clock the committee resumed.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at one o'clock we were considering Bill No. 83 to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and clause 1 had been adopted. Clause 2 had been read and was being discussed. Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. FOURNIER: When the committee rose I had not concluded my remarks. I have stated that this tax was unbusinesslike because the Government cannot state how much money it expects to derive from these sources. As hon. gentlemen are aware, it is the consumer who will ultimately pay this tax, and he is the one who has to pay always. I suggest that the Acting Minister of Finance reconsider the form in which this tax has been proposed before it goes into operation, that instead of four per cent the tax be made one per cent and that the manufacturer be required to pay it. It is the manufacturer we should endeavour to reach because he makes the largest profits. At present there is an army of men going round the country endeavouring to find out whether "pain-killer" and other preparations are properly stamped, and these men are entailing an expenditure to the public of about $96,000. Now that prohibition is in force I think we should endeavour to save this big amount. The Acting Minister of Finance, who used to be so straightforward and fair in his criticism of taxation when he sat on this side of the House, is, I am afraid, learning bad tricks and instead of getting after the manufacturer seems to want to protect the big interests. The manufacturer should be made to shell out a little money; should be made to pay his share of taxation and not let the burden fall upon the consumer. I make that suggestion to my hon. friend because I think it is a fair one.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: From the standpoint of administration my hon. friend (Mr. Fournier) is perfectly correct, and in the preparation of the amendments to the Special War Revenue Act I was personally very much impressed with the same view. I want to assure my hon. friend that I tried in every possible way to devise amendments to the Act along the lines which he suggests, but I was unable to do so. It would be infinitely cheaper to collect the tax from the importer and the manufacturer, but there were difficulties in the way, such as I pointed out this morning and I could not see any way of overcoming them. It is unfortunate that we are unable to determine exactly the amount of revenue which will be derived from this particular source. That is largely due to the fact that the Special War Revenue Act, when first introduced, was amended upon the suggestion of Parliament to permit the use of postage stamps as well as inland revenue stamps. It is quite possible to devise a particular stamp to be used in the sales of drugs, but it would be very inconvenient to the public at many points. It is not always easy to obtain inland revenue stamps, whereas in all sections of the country postage stamps are available to the public. It was in the interest of the public generally that the amendment was made at the time of the introduction of the Bill in 1915, and permission given to use postage stamps as well as inland revenue stamps, but I think that now it will be inconvenient to the public to restore the Bill to its original form in so far as this particular point is concerned.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—tax on matches and playing cards:

Mr. McMASTER: I rise again to draw the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance to the way in which this tax of eight cents on playing cards will work out to the prejudice of the poor. Now the people who are accustomed to buy inexpensive cards, and can afford none other, at from fifteen to twenty cents a package, will find they will be paying a tax of about fifty per cent, while those who buy more expensive playing cards will escape with a comparatively light tax. This is a matter as to which I may tire the ears of the minister, but he may hear me on account of my importunity, as in the case of the widow in the Scriptures. I do press very strongly upon the Government the advisability of placing these small taxes—these small direct taxes —on an equitable basis, in which the ad valorem principle will enter. The answer may be that these are only

trifling taxes, that they amount to very little in each individual case. I grant it is a small tax, but if we are going to have a large number of these taxes, in the aggregate they will amount to something, and should be based on the principle of justice. I am sure the Government of this country would not wish those blessed with a very small portion of this world's goods to have a feeling of injustice against the Government, and I fear that feeling may be created if a large number of these small taxes are imposed which will operate to the disadvantage of the poor as compared with the rich. And where you have such a tax as is found in this section, of eight cents a pack on playing cards, that is a heavy tax on a cheap pack of cards and it is a light tax on an expensive pack.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You can lose the same amount of money with a cheap pack as with an expensive one.

Mr. McMASTER: The Acting Finance Minister is wrong. The man earning fifteen dollars a week is unable to lose as much money on cards for which he has paid but a small amount, and which will be required to pay eight cents tax, as the man of large means.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: Of course, the acting minister means that as a joke. We all understand that. But I am not joking; I am perfectly serious in bringing this matter before the House, that these specific taxes work out unjustly, and an attempt should be made by the Government to place these small taxes on an ad valorem basis, so that the people will be taxed in proportion to their means. That is the principle on which even these smaller taxes should be based.

Section agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In order that the Prime Minister may make his statement in connection with railway matters, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 97, respecting the Halifax Relief Commission.

Bill No. 98, to amend the Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914.

Bill No. 99, to amend the Act of the present session intituled an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act.

[Mr. McMaster.]

THE RAILWAY SITUATION IN CANADA.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER AS TO THE CONTEMPLATED POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

On the Order:

House in committee on Bill No. 87, an Act supplementary to chapter twenty-four of the Statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway system.—The Minister of Finance.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): It seems desirable in connection with this Bill to make a statement of a more or less general nature with regard to the whole railway situation in Canada at the present time, and especially as it has developed during the past fifteen years.

I need not do more than refer to the proposals brought down by the Government of the day in 1903, and amended by a subsequent Act in 1904, under which the National Transcontinental railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific have been constructed. At that time the Canadian Northern railway had attained considerable development in the Prairie Provinces, and had begun to feel the necessity of some connection with the East, or some expansion in the East, in order that it might gather up eastern traffic for its western lines, and in order that its western traffic might be transferred to lines in the East which it owned or with which it had connections.

It seems beyond question—and I am not saying this by way of criticism—that if an arrangement at that time could have been consummated between the Grand Trunk railway in the East and the Canadian Northern lines in the West, if they could have been connected by a new railway passing north of lake Superior, the combined railway system thus created would have been in a splendid position to-day. During the past four or five years it would, if it were necessary, have been able to lend money to Canada instead of coming, both in the East and in the West, to Parliament year after year for the purpose of obtaining such aid as would prevent these roads from going into liquidation. However, that course was not adopted. Possibly on account of the conflicting views of those who were entrusted with the management of those two railway systems, it may have been impossible to adopt it. As to that I do not know.

The project of the National Transcontinental railway, including the Grand Trunk Pacific, proceeded after the legislation of 1903 and 1904, and shortly afterwards the

Government of the day extended to the Canadian Northern railway such aid as was designed to enable it to have the desired connection in Eastern Canada. By chapter 11 of the Act of 1908, a guarantee of bonds by this country to the Canadian Northern railway was authorized at the rate of $13,000 per mile in respect of 609 miles of railway in the Prairie Provinces. By chapter 6 of the Acts of 1910, Parliament authorized the guarantee of bonds for 150 miles to be constructed by the Canadian Northern Alberta Company, 50 miles at $13,000 per mile, and the remainder at $25,000 per mile. By chapter 6 of the Acts of 1911, Parliament authorized a guarantee of bonds for the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company at the rate of $35,000 per mile for 1,050 miles, which were to connect the western lines of the Canadian Northern railway with the lines which it had acquired in the East.

There was a new Administration in 1911. Very shortly after that Administration had been formed, it became abundantly evident, not only to Parliament but to the people of this country, that neither one nor the other of these two undertakings could be carried to completion unless the country granted further aid.

The Government had then to decide whether these railways should be permitted to go into liquidation, with all the consequent confusion and apprehended detriment to the public interest, or whether the Government and Parliament should evidence strong confidence in the future ability of the country to sustain those railways when completed. After very careful and anxious consideration, it was determined to give such aid as would enable the two undertakings to be carried to a conclusion. In 1912 and 1913 certain aid was given to the Canadian Northern Railway company, and in 1913 and in 1914 certain aid was granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company. I shall, however, at a later date, go more in detail into the aid afforded to the latter railway.

By chapter 7 of the Acts of 1912 the Canadian Northern Railway company was granted a guarantee of bonds at $35,000 per mile for 115 miles. By chapter 10 of the Acts of 1913 a subsidy was granted on 250 miles from Toronto to Ottawa at $6,400 per mile, on 910 miles from Ottawa to Port Arthur at $12,000 per mile, and on 260 miles from Edmonton to the British Columbia boundary at $12,000 per mile. In consideration of the subsidies so granted the Canadian Northern Railway company was called upon by the terms of the statute to transfer $7,000,000 of its capital stock to the Government. By chapter 20 of the Acts of 1914, founded upon evidence presented to Parliament of the inability of the Canadian Northern Railway system to complete its undertaking without a further guarantee of bonds, it was provided that a guarantee of $45,000,000 should be made, in consideration of which $33,000,000 of the capital stock of the company was to be transferred to the people. The capital stock at that time was increased to $100,000,000, and the net result of the transaction, apart from the guarantee itself, was that for the future the former proprietors of the railway were to own $60,000,000 of the stock and the people of Canada $40,000,000.

I expressed the opinion at that time—and I think my colleagues concurred in it—that under ordinary conditions that guarantee of bonds would enable the Canadian Northern Railway company to complete its system, and that there would be no further application to Parliament for assistance. But the war broke out in the beginning of August, 1914, and it became apparent in the following two or three years that the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific would require further assistance if they were not to be forced in liquidation. We had before us the same consideration as that previously presented to us, and, taking into account all the elements entering into the situation at that time, we reached the conclusion that the road should be sustained; that there should not be liquidation. Ultimately, that view—which, if I remember correctly, was shared on both sides of the House—was confirmed by the report of the commission of inquiry, to which I shall call attention later. So by chapter 4 of the Acts of 1915 a loan of $10,000,000 was made to the Canadian Northern Railway Company and by the Appropriation Act No. 2, page 36 of the statutes of 1916, a further loan of $15,000,000 was made to the same company, a total of $25,000,000.

The conditions induced by the war; the very greatly increased cost of fuel, material, and labour; the consequent falling off of net earnings; the inability to market securities which had been guaranteed by the Parliament of Canada and by provincial Legislatures, made it impossible for the Canadian Northern Railway Company to complete its undertaking, and to meet its fixed charges, even with the assistance to which I have referred. Consequently, at the last session of Parliament, we were once more faced with the problem in respect to

both systems, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Government of the day had said in 1916 that it could not possibly entertain any claim for further assistance to the Canadian Northern Railway so long as that road remained in the ownership of its then proprietors. So when the situation had to be considered by the Government in 1917, we reached the conclusion that the road should be sustained, that further aid should be given, but only upon condition of acquiring all the remaining capital stock, at a price to be determined by arbitration. By the arbitration agreement subsequently made it was provided that the price should not exceed $10,000,000. That legislation, after a somewhat prolonged discussion in Parliament, was passed, and proceedings have since been taken to carry it out by the arbitration therein provided for.

I have spoken of the aid afforded to the Canadian Northern Railway. As I intend a little later to refer to the Grand Trunk Pacific, perhaps I may with advantage set forth what has been done for that railway during the same period. The enactments of 1903 and 1904 did not make, as was subsequently shown, sufficient provision for the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway; so that company, or the Grand Trunk company on its behalf, came to Parliament in 1909 and asked for assistance by way of a loan of $10,000,000. After considerable discussion the legislation authorizing that loan was enacted, and the loan was made. In 1913 the Grand Trunk Pacific again came to the Government and, after very carefully considering the situation we reached the conclusion that the undertaking could not be carried out without further aid; and so, by chapter 23 of the statutes of 1913, a loan of $15,000,000 was made to the Grand Trunk Pacific. In the same session, chapter 24 was passed for the purpose of enabling the Government to carry out a decision of the Privy Council with regard to implementing the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific so that the full amount of one hundred cents on the dollar should be realized by the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Government being called upon to pay the difference between the amount actually realized and the full value of one hundred cents on the dollar.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company again came to us in 1914. It was increasingly apparent that the road could not be completed without further aid, and, accordingly, by chapter 34 of the Acts of 1914, the Government was authorized to enter into a guarantee of bonds amounting to $16,000,000 for the assistance of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. In 1915, the Grand Trunk Pacific management came to the Government once more, and a loan of $6,000,000 was authorized by chapter 4 of the Acts of that year. In 1916, they came to us once more, and by the Appropriation Act, No. 2, chapter 29 of the Acts of that year, a loan of $8,000,000 was authorized to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

I should state for the information of hon. members that, for each of these loans, whether to the Grand Trunk Pacific or to the Canadian Northern, a mortgage was taken on all the property and undertakings of each company, so that a lien upon that property, for whatever it was worth, was secured to the people.

In 1917, the Grand Trunk Pacific once more came to the Government and demonstrated to us that they could not carry on their undertaking; that there would be default unless further aid was granted; so by Appropriation Act No. 4, chapter 41 of the Acts of 1917, a loan of $7,500,000 was authorized to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

It seems to me desirable that this full information as to the aid afforded to these two great systems, and this brief statement of the reasons on account of which that aid was so afforded, ought to be placed before this new Parliament, in order that hon. members may understand and take fully into consideration the present situation.

I omitted to mention that after the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway had come once more to this Government in 1916 for further aid, it seemed to the Government desirable—and their conclusion met with the approval of Parliament,—that there should be a practical inquiry by the best available experts in order that the whole railway situation in Canada might be reviewed, and in order that the Government might be guided by expert advice in dealing with it in the future. It was a matter of no small difficulty to secure the services of men to whom that duty might with reasonable confidence, be entrusted. In the month of June, 1916, I made a personal visit to the city of New York, where I got in touch with men associated with the management of a number of the largest railway systems in the United States. After a great many conferences and a good deal of negotiation, I asked Mr. A. H. Smith, President of the New York Central Railway, to become a member of the proposed commission of inquiry and to act as its

chairman. We also selected, as two other members of the commission, Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. W. M. Acworth, a gentleman who had a good deal of association with and who, I believe, had studied to a considerable extent, the railway systems not only of the United Kingdom, but of the United States. The commission proceeded with their inquiry in the summer and autumn of 1916 and in the winter of 1917, and they made their report about a year ago. I do not intend to make an elaborate analysis of that report, but I should like to refer hon. gentlemen to a review of it which is to be found in the pages of Hansard of last session. Sir Thomas White, in his speech upon the introduction of the resolution respecting the Canadian Northern Railway, gave a somewhat elaborate and thoroughly exact analysis of the report, and his speech is to be found commencing at page 4011 of the Hansard of 1917.

I may, however, briefly allude to the leading features of the report. There were two reports; a majority report, which was signed by Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. W. M. Acworth, and a minority report, which was signed by Mr. A. H. Smith. At the commencement of the volume which embodies their report, there is a short report which is signed by all three commissioners and which contains this passage:

> We have taken the situation as it is and find ourselves in agreement as to the necessity for constructive aid to bring the railways through the present crisis. We differ, however, as to the extent and method of Government help desirable, and as to the increase and character of Government liability and interest now and for the future.

The commissioners were unanimous in their view that the great railway systems to which I have alluded should not be passed into liquidation. I quote from the report of Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth as follows:

> If the two companies went into the hands of receivers, we cannot doubt that investors outside Canada would believe, however erroneously, that the Dominion Government had treated them badly and that the result would be serious injury to the credit of the Canadian Government and indeed of all Canadian enterprises. And this result is one that, putting it on pecuniary grounds alone, the Canadian people should in their own interest spend a good deal of money to avoid. We, therefore, consider that Canada should assume the responsibility of seeing that the interest on these securities is met. This responsibility is in our opinion unavoidable. But we recognize that it is serious. It will involve considerable financial aid for some years. How much we will not estimate, as it depends in the main on the rate at which Canada develops.

A somewhat similar passage is to be found in the minority report of Mr. A. H. Smith, who has this to say on the situation:

> I see no safe alternative but the Government shall continue, with discrimination, and resort to all available safeguards, and under a policy of proper regulation and co-operation of effort, to aid the necessitous railroads of the Dominion until such time, which I hope and believe will not be far distant, when these will become self-supporting and the problem will be solved.

As to the main features of the report—the Drayton-Acworth report recommended the acquisition of the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, and Grand Trunk Pacific railways, and set forth the methods by which they should be acquired, as well as the methods by which they should be operated. That report favoured the acquisition of the entire stock of the Canadian Northern railway and recommended that compensation should be made therefor by an allotment to the proprietors of a certain proportion of the stock, which proportion was to be determined by arbitration. The report also contained recommendations as to allotting a certain portion of the dividends of a company to be called the Dominion Railway Company, the creation of which was proposed by the Drayton-Acworth report, so that the stock to be retained by the proprietors of the Canadian Northern Railway should receive dividends in the future whenever the earnings should justify it.

As to the Grand Trunk railway, Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth recommended the acquisition of the guaranteed stock, the first, second and third preference stock and the common stock of that railway, upon payment to the shareholders of a moderate but substantial percentage of $3,600,000 per annum, that sum representing the average annual dividends paid upon such stocks during a period of ten years before the report was made. They recommended that, apart from such an arrangement, the liability of the Grand Trunk railway in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific ought not to be released.

Coming back to the Canadian Northern Railway company the proposals embodied in the Act of 1917 have been carried out under the terms of an arbitration agreement made under the authority of that Act. My hon. friend for Russell (Mr. Murphy) the other day expressed a strong opinion with regard to the manner in which that arbitration is being carried on so far as the Government is concerned. It is proper that I should at once assure the hon. member that he is absolutely mistaken in the conclusions which he has reached

in that regard. I have conferred with those who have been present at the arbitration; I know what has been communicated to us by counsel in charge of the case on behalf of the Government, and I desire to assure not only the hon. member for Russell but every hon. member of this House that there has been the fullest and most absolute freedom to the Government of this country to have all information of every kind respecting that road, its properties, its assets, its earnings and its liabilities, that could have been afforded under any circumstances whatever. As a matter of fact I am told that the information prepared by those who were the proprietors of the Canadian Northern railway until the stock was vested in the Government has been submitted to counsel for the Government even before it was presented to the arbitrators.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not like to interrupt, but I hold in my hand a newspaper item giving effect to a complaint from Mr. Tilley that he had not received information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by an officer who was present at the arbitration that that particular complaint was made by reason of the fact that the information which had been asked for required considerable time to prepare; it was on its way to Mr. Tilley at the time he made the complaint, and it has been received by him in due course.

The time for making the award was originally limited to the first day of March last. It has since been extended, I think, on two occasions, and it is now extended to the first day of June. It is believed that the argument will be completed and the award made before that date shall have expired.

In the meantime the management of the Canadian Northern Railway has been left undisturbed to this extent. Three men nominated by the Government have been appointed to the board of the Canadian Northern Railway. They have been elected as directors of the road and have the fullest possible access to the proceedings of the directors and take part in their proceedings, and without their knowledge nothing can be done by the board of management of the railway. The reason for leaving the management undisturbed in this way until after the award has been made is that the Government has in the meantime absolutely full and complete access to all the documents and records of the company, and every opportunity for

necessary information has been available to the officers and counsel of the Government. That being so, it was not considered desirable that during the progress of the arbitration the Government should make itself responsible for the management of the railway; the reasons for this will, I think, occur to any hon. gentleman in this House upon reflection. Until the arbitration had reached a conclusion it would be desirable that the management of the company, as heretofore existing, should be held responsible for the condition and operation of the road during the period of investigation. There was no advantage in changing the management in the meantime, as all the books, documents and records of the company were fully available. Moreover, it was considered, and this conclusion was reached after very careful consideration, that any change made in the meantime might demoralize the staff, and that a permanent change ought not to be made until the Government would be in a position to make a permanent arrangement with the staff. On many occasions during the past six or eight months we have had deputations from the railway organizations of this country, representing the employees not only of the Canadian Northern, but of all the railways of this country. Representations have been made by these delegations to the Government as to the conditions under which that road ought to be carried on and operated by the Government, as to the continuity of certain arrangements made between the Canadian Northern Railway and its employees in the past, as to provision for pensions and the continuance of the arrangements already made in that regard. Various matters of this kind have been taken up and on the whole it was thought desirable that the Government should not make itself directly responsible for the management and operation of the road by appointing an absolutely new board of directors until after the award had been made and the proposals in that regard carried out. I cannot better express the view of the Government as entertained at the last session of Parliament than by quoting the words of the Minister of Finance on the first day of August, 1917, as follows:

> As to the Board we shall have to get in the stock first and complete the transaction, and then it will be open to the Board to determine what is the best course, having regard to the public interest, to pursue with regard to the

board of Directors and the general administration of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

It is proper, however, to observe, as this question seems to have excited some interest in the minds of hon. members on both sides of the House, that it is not intended that Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann shall be members of the board as reconstituted. As a matter of fact, Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann have expressed their desire to be relieved from further responsibility with respect to this railway after it passes into the hands of the Government, and after the amount of the award, whatever it may be, shall have been determined. They have also said, Sir William Mackenzie in particular has said, that he is very intimately acquainted with the development of the road, with its operation and everything connected with it from the very first, and if at any time he can be of any service to the board of directors without remuneration or compensation by giving advice or otherwise, he will be very happy to make his services available to them in any way that they may determine.

Now with regard to the operating of the road. Hon. gentlemen of this House will understand that this is a very large question indeed. On more than one occasion in the past I have spoken of the difficulties which confront a Government after the capital stock of a great railway enterprise such as this has passed into the ownership of the people of Canada. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I know we all have a common purpose in this, will agree that a great railway system such as that which is now being acquired ought not to be administered directly by any department of the Government.
I think we may start with that.

Another proposition which undoubtedly will be accepted by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House is this. While a road under the ownership of the people of Canada must be subject to the direction and control of the people in the highest sense, in the larger political sense; nevertheless, it is absolutely essential and vital that political influence in the lower sense—party political influence—shall be completely absent from the administration and operation of the road. These are two perfectly sound propositions. It is easy to lay down such propositions, accepted on both sides of this House, but it is a somewhat different problem to devise a scheme by which those two desiderata can be absolutely secured in the future operation of the State railways of Canada. That is the problem with which this Government has been confronted and with which it is now confronted. That is the problem which this Government and this Parliament must solve at the earliest possible moment. The problem is not concerned with the Canadian Northern railway alone. It is concerned also with the Intercolonial Railway, with the Transcontinental Railway, and, more than that, it is extremely likely that, in the not distant future, it will be concerned with the Grand Trunk Pacific and with the Grand Trunk Railway itself. Thus, it is a very comprehensive problem in its scope and it is exceedingly difficult for the Government and Parliament to find an adequate solution.

As to the immediate future, I have already said that we do not intend to operate the Canadian Northern Railway system directly under a department of the Government; it is our intention to operate it for the present through the corporate machinery by which it has been operated in the past. There will be a reconstituted board of directors. We shall endeavour to get the best men we can and we shall not interfere with them. We shall leave the administration and operation of that road to be carried on absolutely under that board of directors and we shall use every means available to the Government (and if necessary, we shall come to Parliament for that purpose) in order that anything like political influence, political patronage, or political interference—I am using the word political in its narrower sense—shall be absolutely eliminated from the administration of that road.

But, more than that, we have under consideration the question as to whether it may not be possible in the immediate future to bring the Transcontinental Railway, which is the property of the people of Canada, and the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, which are also the property of the people of Canada, under corporate management. I do not desire to commit the Government to what I am mentioning just now, because we have had no opportunity in the very great stress and hurry of this session to give the proposition mature consideration. It may be possible, and, more than that, it may be desirable, to bring the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways under the ownership of the corporation which will control the Canadian Northern. The people of Canada will own absolutely the entire stock of the Canadian Northern

Railway system. If the Transcontinental railway, the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway were amalgamated into one system with the Canadian Northern railway and were operated with it as one system and under one corporate management, it might, and doubtless would be, very greatly in the interest of efficient administration and operation. That suggestion is before the Government. It is a suggestion upon which I invite an expression of opinion from hon. gentlemen in this House. As far as I have been able to give it consideration, it commends itself very much to my judgment.

Now, I come to speak of some matters upon which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) desired information in connection with the Canadian Northern railway. I shall go into that first, and afterwards I shall have to say something about the financial position of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. But just one word before I deal with that.

It is only right to explain that conditions in regard to railway operation, expenditure and income which have prevailed in Canada since this war and which have necessitated frequent applications for aid by the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific are to-day finding their parallel in some portions of the United States. The Pennsylvania Railway system in the United States is one of the greatest railway systems in the world. Under ordinary conditions it has a net revenue over operating expenses of from $50,000,000 to $64,000,000. I have learned from authoritative sources that during the month of January last the Pennsylvania Railway system failed to meet its operating expenses by $2,816,909.76, and that in the month of February last it failed to meet its operating expenses by $3,354,258.56.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What percentage would that be?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really could not tell but I am pointing out that this road, which ordinarily has a revenue over operating expenses of about $60,000,000 a year failed, in January and February last to meet its operating expenses by the amounts mentioned. In the month of March it recovered somewhat and had a surplus of $1,428,526.28. The conditions with which the Pennsylvannia system has been confronted during the winter months have been pretty general among the railways of the United States east of the Mississippi, as I am informed. There has been a difference between the East and the West because of the very great congestion which has prevailed in the Eastern States, partly by reason of priority orders as to freight, which have led to great delays. The United States Government has stated, through a circular sent out on the first of May, 1918, that up to the 30th April, 1918, it has been obliged to assist the railways of the United States—I think practically all of them are eastern railways, to the amount of $90,614,000, and that all these advances were in the shape of loans excepting $13,000,000 advanced, on account of rentals for the first quarter of the current calendar year, to the New York Central lines, including the New York Central, the Michigan Central, the C. C. and St. Louis, and the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie, and $1,300,000 similarly advanced to the Wabash railway.

Now, I am coming to some item of information respecting which inquiry was made yesterday when this Bill was under consideration. Information was asked as to the use that had been made of $25,000,000 provided by Parliament at its last session for the purpose of sustaining the financial affairs of the Canadian Northern. An Order in Council was passed on the 15th of November, 1917, upon a report of the Minister of Finance, and it is as follows:

> The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 15th November, 1917, from the Minister of Finance, representing that, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 24 of the Statutes of Canada for the year 1917, an agreement has been entered into between His Majesty the King, represented by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Owners and Pledgees, of not less than five-sixths of the 600,000 shares of the Capital Stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, as referred to in the said Act.
>
> The minister further represents that an application has been made by the Canadian Northern Railway Company for the assistance authorized in Section Three of the said Act, for the purpose of settling indebtedness incurred or to be incurred in the Canadian Northern Railway System, or for postponing the payment thereof.
>
> The minister recommends that for the purpose of giving the assistance provided in the said Act, he be authorized on and after the transfer of the shares above mentioned, to make advances out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, up to and not exceeding the sum of Twenty-five Million Dollars ($25,000,000.00), such advances to be for such amounts and to be made from time to time to such company or companies included in the said system and for such purposes as may be certified by the Financial Comptroller of the Department of Railways and Canals as correct and approved by the Minister of Finance.
>
> Further, such advances are to be for the purpose of paying and settling any indebted-

ness of any company comprised in the system, including principal of outstanding loans, interest on securities, instalments of principal of equipment securities, also, including betterments and new equipment and construction; the whole of said advances to be secured by a mortgage or charge upon the undertaking and properties of the Canadian Northern Railway Company; and so much of said advances as may be applied for the benefit of any other company included in the system to be additionally secured by a mortgage or charge upon the undertaking and properties of such company; all such mortgages and charges to be respectively in such form and to contain such terms and conditions respectively as the Minister of Finance may approve.

The minister further recommends that he be authorized to approve from time to time on behalf of the Government of any additional arrangement made or desired to be made by the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company for the purpose of obtaining renewals of existing loans to any company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System, whether such loans have heretofore been or hereafter are obtained by or in connection with the issue of collateral trust notes of the said Railway System, or otherwise.

The Committee concur in the foregoing and submit the same for approval.

So authority was taken by the Minister of Finance upon the report and recommendation of the Financial Controller of the Department of Railways and Canals to make advances from time to time out of the sum of $25,000,000, authorized by Parliament, and the amounts have been paid out under three heads, as follows:

First head, on account of construction loans—loans that were effected by the Canadian Northern railway for construction purposes, which had to be repaid or reduced,—there was paid:

To the Central Trust Company of New York, in full repayment of loan, $1,750,000.

To the Guarantee Trust Company of New York, in reduction of loan, $300,000.

To the Columbia Trust Company of New York, in reduction of loan, $1,500,000.

Then, coming to the rolling stock securities, there was paid in the first instance:

On account of principal of equipment bonds, $4,976,500, and for interest on equipment bonds, $1,075,002.50.

Then there were, of course, the fixed charges to be met—interest upon the funded debt of the company and upon loans secured by the deposit of the company's securities. In that respect there were paid for interest and sinking fund on mortgage securities, ranking prior to Canadian Northern railway four per cent debenture stock guaranteed by the Dominion Government the following amounts:

Canadian Northern Railway....	$9,136,083 18
Canadian Northern Pacific Railway	2,117,301 76
Canadian Northern Alberta Railway	165,374 91
Canadian Northern Western Railway	622,619 83
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway	202,056 00
Duluth, Winnipeg and Pacific Railway	570,552 87
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway	1,028,063 80
Central Ontario Railway.....	57,012 99
Bay of Quinte Railway	90,500 00
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Co., Ltd.	582,741 58
Canadian Northern Quebec Railway	420,359 76
Quebec and Lake St. John Railway	172,363 32
Halifax and South-Western Railway	233,467 50

These amounts, making in all $25,000,000, were paid out upon reports of the Financial Controller of the Government Railways of Canada as follows:

November 19, 1917.....	$12,500,000 00
November 28, 1917.....	2,540,421 97
December 10, 1917.....	54,750 00
December 27, 1917.....	1,983,503 47
January 9, 1918.....	1,250,000 00
January 18, 1918.....	2,000,000 00
January 24, 1918.....	2,000,000 00
January 30, 1918.....	2,017,460 77
February 4, 1918.....	653,863 79
Total	$25,000,000 00

I should observe that in respect of every one of these payments the financial comptroller of the Department of Railways and Canals visited Toronto, investigated the purposes for which the proposed payment was to be made, and thoroughly satisfied himself by the clearest possible evidence that the purpose to which the money was to be applied was within the terms of the statute. More than that, he saw also that the money, when paid over, was applied to that purpose.

Now, I come to the need of making a clear statement of just what the Canadian Northern Railway system does owe at the present time. I am bound to confess—and doubtless I share this feeling with a great many hon. members in this House—that balance sheets made up according to the methods of expert accountants are not always absolutely clear to me. Therefore, I desired to obtain a statement with regard to the liabilities of the Canadian Northern Railway system in such form as I could myself understand, and I felt thoroughly confident if it were so made that every hon. member in this House would be able to grasp its meaning without the slightest difficulty. So I have had such a statement

of the liabilities made up, and it may be regarded as supplementary to, or ancillary to, the information given by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance, which contains a great many details not given in the statement, I now present to this House.

Liabilities of Canadian Northern Railway System.

Funded Debt	$285,795,420 61
Equipment, Trust obligations	13,526,000 00
Demand and short term loans secured by collateral	58,056,961 11
Due to other companies on construction account, secured	30,502,392 04
Current liabilities	19,408,495 79
Accrued interest, etc.	4,730,069 93
Reserves for taxes and insurance	1,245,038 19
Total	$413,264,377 67

I add to that total the amount of the 5 per cent income charge convertible debenture stock, $25,000,000, making a total of $438,264,367.67. The income charge convertible debenture stock does not carry interest unless and until the surplus earnings, after payment of fixed charges, are sufficient to meet it.

There is one item in the list which needs a little explanation. It is the item of $30,502,392.04 due to other companies on construction account. I am informed by the Financial Comptroller of the Department of Railways that this amount represents securities which were handed over in payment for construction, and which are still held in that way.

It should be further explained that the statement I have just read is made up to the latest date available for this purpose, 30th September, 1917, and it corresponds, approximately speaking, with the date at which the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway was acquired under the Act of 1917.

Then comes a question, and a very proper question, as to what the assets of the Canadian Northern Railway may be. We are undertaking a liability of over $438,000,000, of which $25,000,000 is composed of the 5 per cent income charge convertible debenture stock to which I have alluded. What is the country to receive for this liability, seeing that there may be added to it a sum not exceeding $10,000,000, for the $60,000,000 of capital stock still outstanding in the Canadian Northern Railway system? It seemed desirable that I should procure a correspondingly intelligible statement as to the assets, and it has been prepared for me by the Financial Comptroller of the Department of Railways and Canals. It is of the same date, 30th September, 1917, as the statement of liabilities which I have just given, and it has been reduced to seven items.

Assets of Canadian Northern Railway System.

Cash, materials, supplies and accounts receivable	$ 30,759,013 95
Land assets	29,044,790 74
Insurance paid in advance	823,708 51
Deferred charges	860,113 95
Estimated cost of reproduction of property at pre-war prices, per Prof. Swain's report	398,627,272 00
Equipment valuation by Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Chadbourn.	56,590,418 00
Capital expenditures January 1, 1917 to September 30, 1918	11,732,568 59
Total	$528,437,885 74

Explanation should be made respecting the items which I have just read, and in making this explanation I shall deal with both liabilities and assets. In stating the liabilities I have taken the funded debt at its par value, but it must be borne in mind that owing to the low rate of interest at which the securities covering this item were issued, the Government, if it were thought desirable to do so, could go out in the open market and purchase those bonds at a very large discount. It should be further borne in mind that the interest on the $25,000,000 of income convertible debenture stock is only a charge against surplus income and is non-cumulative. It is, therefore, apparent that this stock could be purchased at very much less than its face value, if it were thought desirable to acquire it; in fact, it is quoted on the market to-day at less than 70 per cent.

In the statement of capital value of the property of the Canadian Northern railway the estimated cost of reproduction is given without depreciation. It should be borne in mind, however, that the cost of reproducing it to-day would be very much greater than the amount which I have mentioned. The same reasoning applies to the equipment. I am told by those who have had actual experience that the cost of railway equipment to-day is about double what it was four years ago. Box cars, which at pre-war prices were worth from $1,200 to $1,400, to-day cost from $2,600 to $3,000; rails, which cost from $28 to $32 before the war, are to-day unobtainable at $60; and the cost of locomotives to-day is more than double what it was four years ago. The difference between the two statements which I have just read is, in round figures, $90,000,000, in favour of the property; but one must bear in mind that this does not determine the value of the capital stock,

which depends upon a great many other factors than the cost of replacement. A road, however valuable, is controlled, in respect of the value of its capital stock, not only by the factor to which I have alluded, but by the earning power; and no doubt the earning power, the strategic position of the road with regard to acquiring business in the future, the possibilities of development and other considerations, control the situation very considerably, though in what proportion I should not care to say.

A further explanation should be made with respect to the item of $398,627,272, the estimated cost of reproduction. That is given in the Drayton-Acworth report, in the estimate prepared by Professor Swain, at $397,441,563. Taking into account the fact that the Canadian Northern railway did not own the entire capital stock in all the subsidiary companies, Professor Swain places the cost of reproduction without depreciation at $385,533,473. I am informed by the financial comptroller of the Department of Railways and Canals that after the report had been made Professor Swain sent letters to the department in which he pointed out that certain omissions had been made; so that the amount which I have mentioned, taking into account all allowances for stock not fully owned by and vested in the Canadian Northern Railway system, does to-day amount, without depreciation, to the sum included in the statement which I have read, namely, $398,627,272.

I have pointed out the total indebtedness of the Canadian Northern Railway system. Let me remind hon. gentlemen that the system comprises nearly 10,000 miles of railway. Nearly 9,700 miles are in actual operation. If one could speak of that in round numbers as 10,000 miles, the indebtedness to which I have alluded, $438,264,377, would represent a capitalization of between $43,000 and $44,000 per mile. Many hon. gentlemen know much better than I do the location of the road and its opportunities for gathering up traffic in Western Canada. It has been represented to me—and my own observation accords with that representation—that no railway in the west of Canada is so favourably situated for gathering up traffic or has so efficient a system of branches for the accomplishment of that purpose in the three Prairie Provinces as the Canadian Northern Railway system.

In this connection I submit a statement of capitalization of other railways that have passed into the ownership of the Government and of one or two that may do so in the future. The Intercolonial railway, 1,518.39 miles; the Prince Edward Island railway, 275.20 miles; the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, 36.05 miles, and the International Railway of New Brunswick, 111.30 miles, comprise a total of 1,940.94 miles, which have been hitherto spoken of as the Government system of railways. That system represents a capitalization, not including interest upon the investment made by the country in the railway, of $137,184,199.62. But even without interest, hon. gentlemen will see that the Canadian Northern railway will be acquired at little more than half the capitalization per mile which is represented by the construction and acquisition of the Intercolonial and the other railways which I have mentioned.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the amount per mile?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not figured that out; but the financial comptroller informs me that it works out, without interest, at about $65,000 per mile. With added interest it would, of course, run to at least $100,000 per mile. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway consists of the Mountain Section from Prince Rupert to Wolf Creek, 833 miles, and the Prairie Section from Wolf Creek to Winnipeg, 915 miles, a total of 1,748 miles. I have under my hand a statement of the expenditure upon the road itself and for rolling stock. The last available, that of Sir Collingwood Schreiber, is $135,698,615.64, but that does not include equipment and rolling stock. If you add what has been expended for equipment and rolling stock, you will find that it brings the expenditure for construction and for equipment and rolling stock (which I have included in the liabilities of the Canadian Northern) up to about $180,000,000, a capitalization for the Grand Trunk Pacific of $100,000 per mile, instead of $44,000 or $45,000 per mile, the capitalization for the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Would that include the hotels and all the terminals?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It includes the hotels and terminals, and so does the capitalization for the Canadian Northern.

The capital expenditure on the Transcontinental railway should next be considered. That line has a mileage of 1,811.28 miles from Moncton to Winnipeg. The actual cash paid out, without including one dollar for interest, is $163,797,783.66, and if you add interest, it will bring the amount considerably over $200,000,000 for 1,811.28 miles.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is that per mile without interest?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Without interest, it works out to $92,000 per mile, and with interest it would work out, the financial comptroller tells me, at about $110,000 per mile. I thought it desirable to give these comparisons to the House and to the country in order that they might realize that we are not buying a pig in a poke in acquiring the Canadian Northern railway, and that, so far as property owned by the State is concerned, the future holds out greater prospects for the Canadian Northern Railway system than for any other railway that is to-day within the control and disposition of the Government of Canada.

I come now to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I regard it as inevitable that, for many reasons, that road should be taken over by the Federal Government. It is a national enterprise to which the credit of the Canadian people has been committed, and, in my judgment, it is expedient to sustain it and not permit it to go into liquidation. It is intimately connected with the Grand Trunk Railway system in the East. The Canadian Northern branch lines in the West can, in many instances, as I am informed, be made available as feeders for the Grand Trunk Pacific without great expenditure. The road, as it is at present, is not self-sustaining. It pays a little more than operating expenses, although I am bound to say that, during the past eight or twelve months, it has rather exceeded anticipations in the return which it has made. The House and the country will be glad to know that the prospects of its traffic seem to be improving, and I very sincerely hope that they will improve still more in the early future. That railway cannot be successfully operated without suitable arrangements with the Canadian Northern Railway and with the Grand Trunk Railway in the East. It cannot pay its interest charges, and it is utterly impossible for the Grand Trunk to meet the obligations which it has undertaken in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That has been publicly stated. It is stated in the Drayton-Acworth report. Therefore, as the Grand Trunk Pacific is not self-sustaining, as it pays little more than operating expenses, and as it cannot be expected, for many years to come, to pay its fixed charges, especially if it is divorced from co-operation and association with other railways in the West, it is manifest that only one of two courses is open. The Government must either year after year ask Parliament to vote seven or eight or ten million dollars in order that the fixed charges of the road may be paid, or it must take over the road, connect it up as effectively as possible with the Canadian Northern and with the rest of the Government railway system, and endeavour to make it part of a profitable system of Government railways in the early future. I think, therefore, it is absolutely inevitable that the Grand Trunk Pacific must be acquired. As to the terms of its acquisition, I can only say that the Grand Trunk would no doubt be willing to hand it over to us to-day if we would relieve the Grand Trunk of all its obligations in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific; it would hand over to us the capital stock and be glad to get out of its own obligations in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific. But there are several conditions to be taken into account before any such proposal can be entertained, and so we are at the present time discussing the whole situation with the Grand Trunk management. As an additional reason, which I did not previously mention, if we permitted the Grand Trunk Pacific to go into liquidation, we should have to take care of all those obligations which are prior to our own, and that would in the end mean that we would simply have to take care of all the obligations of that railway. Thus, there is no object whatever in permitting it to go into liquidation. It would merely mean additional expense, dislocation of traffic and the exciting of public alarm, without any good result that I can anticipate.

Now it seems if we take over the Grand Trunk Pacific, that practically involves the taking over of the Grand Trunk Railway as well. I am of that opinion for this chief reason, that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, both in the West, if acquired by the Government would otherwise lack eastern connections, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would dominate the whole situation. In the second place, the Grand Trunk might have a great deal of difficulty in carrying on unless it should be released from its obligations to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Further than that, while the present condition of the Grand Trunk is not prosperous for many reasons, some of which doubtless it could not control, I believe that it would have reasonable prospects for the future if amalgamated into one system with the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. I would further emphasize the consideration that,

while the Grand Trunk cannot carry out the obligations necessary for its retention of the Grand Trunk Pacific, on the other hand it has no bright future prospects without that connection. Hon. members of this House who recollect the report of Mr. Hays, upon which the National Transcontinental enterprise was largely founded, will remember that he pointed out the anomalous situation in which the Grand Trunk found itself. It gathered up traffic all over Eastern Canada and handed it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which earned very large carrying charges for transporting that traffic to the West. The same condition would confront the Grand Trunk to-day unless it had that western connection to which Mr. Hays, then general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, looked forward with so much anticipation of good results.

It is very easy to say that this country ought to acquire the Grand Trunk Railway, but when one comes down to the practical proposal of how it is to be acquired the problem is not quite so simple. Of course we might take advantage of a situation which to some extent has developed out of the disturbed conditions of the world, and say to the management of the Grand Trunk Railway, "We have you in our power in certain respects, and you must do precisely what we insist upon." But on the other hand, we must remember not only in this connection but in many other connections, that Canada is a country which for many years to come will require to borrow large amounts of capital from other countries. If the Federal Government or any provincial government in Canada lays itself open to the reasonable charge of acting unfairly or unjustly towards those who in good faith have invested their capital in business enterprises of this character in Canada, the country in the end will pay much more than it will gain by any such injustice; there is absolutely no doubt about that in my mind. So we must act reasonably with the Grand Trunk railway, and we have endeavoured to act reasonably with them. But more than that, if we undertake to force the situation against the Grand Trunk railway, we must also remember that a considerable portion of that system lies in the United States, with two great terminals in the West, I believe, and one great terminal in the East. The ownership of these lines is vested in United States companies, of which the Grand Trunk controls the stock, and that makes their acquisition even with the consent of the Grand Trunk railway, a matter of no little difficulty and complexity. So I think the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway must depend upon negotiation. We could, of course, cut these lines off at the border and expropriate them, dislocating the system; but we would do ourselves no good and the Grand Trunk railway irreparable harm by attempting such a course.

I may say that we have negotiations outstanding with the Grand Trunk railway. For the present they are confidential. We have made what we regard as a reasonable offer, somewhat along the lines suggested in the Drayton-Acworth report, but somewhat more favourable to the Grand Trunk than the proposal made in that report. They have replied to us by making a counter offer, which was of such a nature that we did not consider we could ask Parliament to accept it. For that reason we had to decline it, and we then made the suggestion to the management that, failing any agreement between the Government and the company, we would be prepared to submit the amount of the annual payment to arbitration, and we would do that without fixing any limit as we did in the case of the Canadian Northern railway. It seemed to us that the two cases were distinguishable in that respect, and that we ought not to insist upon a maximum as we did in the case of the Canadian Northern. We proposed to follow the Drayton-Acworth report in this respect, that whatever sum should be paid by the Government of this country for, let us say, a lease of the Grand Trunk Railway lines, should be distributed among the holders of the various stocks of the Grand Trunk Pacific by the directors of the Grand Trunk themselves, and that we should not attempt to interfere with or control that matter. It is anticipated that some members of the Government will have the duty of proceeding to Great Britain during this summer. A sub-committee of Council has been appointed, and during the past six months has been dealing with general railway problems in this country, assisting in that regard the Minister of Railways and Canals, who is primarily responsible, and who had asked me to have such a sub-committee appointed in order that he might, without a formal meeting of Council, have the advice of some of his colleagues in respect of matters of importance. Two members of that sub-committee of Council will be in England during the summer. They have given attentive study to the questions which are involved, and I have some reasonable hope that when Parliament is again summoned, the Govern-

ment may be in a position to place before it proposals which will involve the constitution into one State-owned system, the chief railways of Canada, except the Canadian Pacific. It may be possible, indeed I think it is probable, that at some later date, but not in the immediate future, all the land transportation facilities of Canada in the shape of railways may, so far as operation is concerned, be amalgamated into one system carried on under one management. The enormous waste and duplication, which have proved to be such a burden upon this country in the past, would be eliminated, for the future at least, in that way; and they have been eliminated to some extent during the past six or eight months as I shall demonstrate by a report which I propose to read before I sit down.

I should also say to the members of the House, before I leave that branch of the subject, that the Government have not been unmindful of their duty to see that adequate rolling stock and motive power should be provided for all the railways of Canada as far as possible during the past twelve or fifteen months. The Department of Railways and Canals, during that time, assisted the Grand Trunk in the matter of motive power to a very considerable extent. They provided for them 47 Mikado engines. The department has at the present time under order for the Grand Trunk railway 75 Mikado engines, 20 switching engines and 15 Pacific type passenger engines. The total outlay for these engines is as follows:

No. Type.	Cost Per Engine.	Total.
47 Mikado	$48,750	$2,281,250
75 Mikado	62,000	4,650,000
20 Switching	41,000	820,000
15 Pacific type passenger	60,000	1,000,000
Total		$8,751,000

Hon. gentlemen will observe the remarkable jump in the price of these engines. The 47 Mikado engines which we secured at $48,750 each were ordered about six months before the 75 Mikado engines which are to cost us $62,000 each. It is necessary to have these engines to keep the railway systems of the country up to their full power for transportation purposes, and while providing very amply for the railways under the direct control and administration of the department, we have also found it necessary to come to the assistance of some other railways in such matters. The Grand Trunk pays a reasonable charge for the use of these engines.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

I spoke a moment ago of the necessity of avoiding waste and duplication. We have made, I think, a reasonable and, certainly, a bona fide effort, to bring that about during the past year. The report which I am about to read is lengthy; but I think it worth while to read it so that hon. members and the people generally may know that something substantial has been accomplished under the direction of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) in avoiding waste and duplication during the past year. One report is dated the 26th day of March. I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals early in that month to get for me a statement from the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence of what they had accomplished during the eight or nine months in which they had been in operation. From reports which had reached me I came to the conclusion that they had accomplished a good deal but I was equally of the opinion that not only the people of the country but the members of this House were largely ignorant of what had been done. Mr. W. M. Neal, by whom this report has been prepared, is the secretary of this association. The association itself is composed of representatives of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway, the Government System of railways and the New York Central. It has organized its work under six heads. There is a special committee on war and national defence, an administrative committee, a commission on car service, a committee on passenger transportation, a committee on tariffs and statistics and a committee on materials and supplies. The report is as follows:

In addition to the information embodied in our communication of the 21st inst., relative to the work of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, it will no doubt be of interest to you to learn of the details of the organization of the Association itself.

In accordance with arrangements which were made at preliminary meetings of representatives of the Dominion Government and the railways, an invitation was issued to railways operating in Canada to attend a conference at Montreal on October 23rd, 1917, for the purpose of formulating a Central Railway Organization and outlining its working policies. This conference was held on the date mentioned in the offices of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Windsor Street Station, Montreal, all of the principal and a number of the smaller lines being represented.

After explaining what was desired in the way of co-ordinating the facilities and efforts of the various lines so as to permit of the efficient handling of the extremely heavy volume of traffic which it was expected the railways would be called upon to move during

the winter and conservation of fuel, motive power and man power, it was decided to appoint a Committee composed of the executives of some of the larger lines who would direct the policy of the new organization, which was to be known as "The Canadian Railway Association for National Defence."

A Special Committee on War and National Defence was formed, with the following personnel:—

The Right Honourable Lord Shaughnessy, K.C.V.O., President, Canadian Pacific Railway; Sir William MacKenzie, President, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. Howard G. Kelley, President, Grand Trunk Railway; Mr. A. H. Smith, President, New York Central Lines.

Under the Executive Committee was appointed an Administrative Committee, whose duties include general supervision of the operations of all railways in Canada embracing such matters as Distribution of cars and engines amongst the various lines, Diversion of Traffic from one line to another. The railways elected the following as an Administrative Committee:—

Mr. U. E. Gillen, Vice-President, Grand Trunk Railway; Mr F. F. Backus, General Manager, Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Railway; Mr. J. H. Walsh, General Manager, Quebec Central Railway; Mr. D. B. Hanna, Third Vice-President, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. C. A. Hayes, General Manager, Canadian Government Railways; Sir George Bury, Vice-President, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. E. D. Bronner, Vice-President and General Manager, Michigan Central Railway.

Mr. A. E. Warren, Chief Operating Officer, Department of Railways and Canals, was later added to the Administrative Committee to represent the Minister of Railways and Canals, having authority to speak for the Canadian Government Railways and the Canadian Northern Railway in the absence of Mr. Hanna or Mr. Hayes.

The Administrative Committee was authorized to appoint Sub-Committees to handle the details of the work of the Association, analyse local conditions, deal with complaints or suggestions of the public and make recommendations to the Administrative Committee. The following Sub-Committees were appointed:—

Commission on Car Service, composed of:—Mr. A. Hatton, General Superintendent Car Service, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. J. E. Duval, General Superintendent Transportation, Grand Trunk Railway; Mr. W. N. Rippey, Superintendent Car Service, Canadian Government Railways; Mr. A. E. Lock, Superintendent Car Service. Toronto, Hamiliton & Buffalo Railway; Mr. W. S. Moy, Car Accountant, Quebec Central Railway; Mr. E. Crawford, Superintendent Car Service, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. W. A. Griffin, Superintendent of Traffic, Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway.

The duties of the Commission on Car Service are to supervise in detail the handling of freight traffic, car movements and car supply; to see that all lines and districts receive a fair proportion of the available equipment; to watch the interchange of freight cars as between Canada and the United States with a view to establishing and maintaining equalization. It was also allotted to this Committee to increase freight car efficiency by bringing about heavier loading of cars and more expeditious movement, elimination of practices such as the avoidable light running of freight trains, which has a tendency to increase the consumption of coal.

Committee on Passenger Transportation, whose personnel is:—Mr. C. S. Sims, Resident Vice-President, Delaware & Hudson Railway; Mr. G. T. Bell, Passenger Traffic Manager, Grand Trunk Railway; Mr. J. E. Duval, General Superintendent Transportation, Grand Trunk Railway; Mr. H. T. Malcolmson, Superintendent, Toronto, Hamiliton & Buffalo Railway; Mr. G. C. Martin, General Freight and Passenger Agent, Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Railway; Mr. H. H. Melanson, Passenger Traffic Manager, Canadian Government Railways; Mr. A. C. Barker, Assistant to General Superintendent, Canadian Government Railways; Mr. A. Price, Assistant General Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. C. B. Foster, Assistant Passenger Traffic Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. J. Balkwill, Superintendent, Michigan Central Railroad; Mr. L. W. Landman, General Passenger Agent, Michigan Central Railway; Mr. W. A. Kingsland, General Superintendent, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. R. L. Fairbairn, General Passenger Agent, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. J. T. Reid, Superintendent, Quebec Central Railway; Mr. G. D. Wadsworth, General Freight and Passenger Agent, Quebec Central Railway.

This Committee was directed to analyse passenger services on all railways in Canada with a view to cutting off duplicate or other unnecessary services so that coal might be saved and more motive power made available for handling of freight.

Committee of Tariffs and Statistics, composed of following:—Mr. Guy Tombs, Assistant Freight Traffic Manager, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. R. J. Foreman, Assistant to Vice-President, Grand Trunk Railway; Mr. H. E. Macdonell, Assistant Freight Traffic Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. D. A. Storey, Freight Traffic Manager, Canadian Government Railways; Mr. G. C. Martin, General Freight and Passenger Agent, Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Railway; Mr. George H. Clark, General Freight Agent, Ottawa & New York Railway; Mr. N. J. Ferguson, General Freight and Passenger Agent, Quebec, Montreal & Southern Railway.

This Committee supervises questions of rates arising from diversions of traffic from one line to another, re-adjusting system of advices to the public as to the movement of freight, elimination of delay to cars at junction points, where it had been the practice to hold shipments for rebilling, and similar matters.

It was the original intention to appoint a Committee on Materials and Supplies, but subsequent developments showed it to be unnecessary to appoint a permanent committee to look after this branch of the work, conferences of the Officers of the lines interested being held for the discussion of matters such as the supplying of fuel, rails, ties and labour, about some of which the Association has corresponded with you.

The Organization in Eastern Canada was practically duplicated in the West, where an Administrative Sub-Committee was appointed reporting to the Administrative Committee at Montreal. The duties of the Sub-Committees in the West conform to those of the Eastern Committees, as outlined above. The personnel of the Western Sub-Committees is as follows:—

Administrative Sub-Committee:—Mr. Grant Hall, Vice-President and General Manager,

Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. F. P. Brady, General Manager, Canadian Government Railways; Mr. W. P. Hinton, Vice-President and General Manager, Grand Trunk Pacific; Mr. M. H. MacLeod, General Manager, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. C. E. Dafoe, General Superintendent, Midland Railway; Mr. J. M. Gruber, Vice-President, Great Northern Railway; Mr. Geo. T. Slade, Vice-President, N. P. Railway; Mr. J. W. Mulhern, General Superintendent, Kettle Valley Railway; Mr. W. R. Smith, General Manager, Edmonton, Dunvegan & British Columbia Railway.

Sub-Committee on Freight Traffic:—Mr. W. B. Lanigan, Assistant Freight Traffic Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. Geo. Stephen, Freight Traffic Manager, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. A. E. Rosevear, General Freight Agent, Grand Trunk Pacific; Mr. P. H. Burnham, General Freight Agent, Great Northern Railway; Mr. W. C. Hartnett, General Agent, N. P. Railway; Mr. O. E. Fisher, Traffic Manager, Kettle Valley Railway; Mr. C. Dowling, Traffic Manager, Edmonton, Dunvegan & British Columbia Railway.

Sub-Committee on Car Service:—Mr. J. P. Driscoll, Superintendent Car Service, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. T. P. White, Superintendent Car Service, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; Mr. E. D. Cotterell, Superintendent Car Service, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. P. B. Robb, Car Service Agent, Canadian Government Railways; Mr. C. E. Dafoe, General Superintendent, Midland Railway; Mr. A. G. Sutherland, Superintendent Car Service, E. D. & B. C. Railway.

Sub-Committee on Passenger Transportation:—Mr. H. H. Brewer, General Superintendent, Grand Trunk Pacific; Mr. D. C. Coleman, Assistant General Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. Geo. A. Walton, General Passenger Agent, Canadian Pacific Railway; Mr. W. E. Duperow, General Passenger Agent, Grand Trunk Pacific; Mr. R. Creelman, General Passenger Agent, Canadian Northern Railway; Mr. C. E. Dafoe, General Superintendent, Midland Railway; Mr. C. Dowling, Traffic Manager, Edmonton, Dunvegan & British Columbia Railway.

Offices were opened by the Association in the Eastern Townships Bank Building, Montreal, and a general secretary and staff appointed to look after the routine work of the Association.

Very full and complete information as to what has been accomplished is contained in the report of March 21, 1918, to which I shall now give attention. It is addressed to the Minister of Railways and is as follows:

As requested in your letter of 18th inst., following is statement of the operations of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence:—

Summary of work done by Canadian Railways working under the direction of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence.

October 23rd, 1917, to March 20th, 1918.

I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to what has been accomplished, because it strikes me that the result really does indicate that this association, and the methods which it has followed, have been of great advantage to us during the past autumn and winter.

Fuel conservation.—Saving through reduced passenger services and heavy loading of cars and trains during ensuing year under practices now in vogue (estimated), 500,000 tons.

Increased movement of freight by diversions during congestions arising from unusually severe winter weather, 516,565 tons.

Increase in delivery of empty box cars from United States to Canada under arrangements made by association, 14,260.

Estimated increase in car efficiency during current year through improved handling and heavier loading of cars equivalent to 300,000 car trips.

Freedom from serious congestion in both eastern and western Canada such as was experienced in the winter of 1916-1917 and in the United States during the winter now coming to a close.

Prompt filling of requirements of overseas transports at ports served by Canadian Railways.

Increase in coal deliveries to Canada from United States, 285,000 tons.

Increases in freight traffic by diversion of cars from over-burdened routes.

On orders issued by the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence and arrangements made with the railways interested, a total of fourteen thousand seven hundred and fifty-nine loaded cars have been diverted from congested routes to others which were comparatively free. These cars, many of which were loaded with grain and coal contained approximately five hundred and sixteen thousand five hundred and sixty-five tons of freight.

Included in the diversions were twenty-one hundred and eighty cars which were billed eastbound via the Canadian Pacific Railway through Fort William for points in Ontario and Quebec and diverted via the Soo Line from Emerson to Sault Ste. Marie, being returned to the Canadian Pacific Railway at the latter point, thus relieving the heavily taxed line east from Fort William.

Diversions of freight routed via Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William for Eastern Canada points and overseas were made to the Canadian Northern Railway at Port Arthur, the cars being returned to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Sudbury and Ottawa. These diversions via Port Arthur total up to date four hundred and three cars and the arrangement calls for continued diversion as necessary up to forty cars per day.

One result of these two switches in the movement of eastbound freight is an increase in the movement of grain by rail from the head of the lakes of approximately three and one half million bushels, in addition to avoiding congestion at the terminals in that territory, and expediting the general movement of cars through that gateway.

The handling of traffic from the Niagara Frontier to Ontario points during the winter months, when the entire burden is thrown upon the railways operating between Buffalo and Toronto owing to the suspension of ferry service across Lake Erie, up to this year caused a great deal of delay to freight and cars and interfered with the requisite coal deliveries for consumption in Ontario to such an extent as to have been partly responsible for the fuel short-

age in that province during the winter of 1916-1917.

This year, at the first hint of trouble, the Administrative Committee of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, after going over the situation in detail, delegated one of their members, Mr. F. F. Backus, General Manager of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, as the representative of the Association to take full charge of operation of lines between the Frontier and Toronto, with authority to switch traffic and engines from one line to another as the conditions day by day might demand.

Under Mr. Backus' direction, cars were diverted from the overburdened Grand Trunk railway route to the joint line furnished by the M.C.R.R., T.H. & B., and Canadian Pacific railway, to the number of five thousand and eighty-one, which means that the total movement of freight from the United States to Canada via the Niagara gateway was increased to that extent. These diversions extended over the period from January 6th to March 6th when conditions became practically normal and the necessity for further transfer of cars from the routing prescribed on the billing disappeared.

About sixty per cent of the five thousand and eighty-one cars by which the movement from the Frontier was increased as described above contained coal so that the coal receipts in Ontario during the two months mentioned were increased by approximately one hundred and fifty thousand tons.

Arrangements were made with the United States railway authorities at Washington whereby empty box cars ordered to Canada to assist in making up the number of cars due us on the interchange with United States lines were diverted to the Delaware and Hudson railway where they are loaded with coal, principally for points in the province of Quebec, thus increasing the coal receipts in this province, as well as providing box cars for the movement of exports to the United States. Under this arrangement five thousand eight hundred empty box cars were turned over to the Delaware and Hudson railway, and up to date three thousand eight hundred and thirty-five have been loaded with coal as above, containing approximately one hundred and thirty-five thousand tons of coal. It is the intention to continue this arrangement as long as empty cars are being sent to Canada as at present.

During the past few weeks the movement of shipments from points in Ontario to Quebec and the Maritime Provinces has been increased by the diversion of 1,641 carloads from the Canadian Pacific railway and Grand Trunk railway to the Canadian Northern railway at Toronto, in order to relieve the lines of the former between Toronto and Montreal and hasten recovery from conditions arising from the series of severe storms from which the railways suffered in Ontario during January and early February.

Another object sought by the Association was the avoidance of a repetition of the shortage of foodstuffs which existed in the Maritime Provinces during the winter of 1916-1917 owing to the heavy movement of overseas supplies which had to be given preference over the lines east of Montreal and tended at times to crowd out domestic shipments. With this end in view cars were transferred from the heavily burdened Canadian Pacific railway route from Montreal to St. John to the Canadian Government railways at Quebec and Ste. Rosalie, the movement of freight to the Maritime Provinces being increased in this way by 1,565 carloads or approximately 45,000 tons of freight.

Diversions of cars from one line to another similar to those given in detail above were made at Sudbury, Ottawa, North Bay, Winnipeg and Saskatoon.

Handling of Grain, Flour and Coal, Western Canada.

In Western Canada the activities of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, or the "Railways War Board" as it has come to be popularly known amongst the shipping public, were directed chiefly to keeping up the deliveries of grain and flour to the East, both for domestic consumption and shipment overseas and maintaining the requisite movement of cars from the mines in Alberta. It is admitted that, in the face of a winter of operating conditions of almost unprecedented severity, when engines froze up on the road, water supplies disappeared overnight and at times the men remained on duty only at greatest hardship, the demands of the transports and Eastern millers were met and coal was delivered to the prairie cities and towns with a regularity and promptness that could hardly have been expected by the uninitiated had they been able to foresee the obstacles which had to be overcome. Preparations which are being made in the west now for improvements during the coming summer it is anticipated will permit of a still better service being provided next winter.

The views of the western public on the accomplishments of the railways in Western Canada, are, perhaps, voiced in the following extract from an editorial appearing in the Moosejaw Evening Times of March 11th, in referring to one of the bulletins issued by the Railways War Board:

> This winter we (The Canadian Railway Association) are determined to keep Canada's traffic rolling smoothly and with speed even though last year's conditions repeat themselves. (extract from bulletin).
>
> Well, last year's conditions did repeat themselves with a vengeance and Canada's traffic has been handled more smoothly and efficiently in spite of even a greater scarcity of labour.

The arrangements made by the Western Committee of the Association included the distribution of grain and coal cars between lines as they were required regardless of ownership and the same action was taken in the case of water cars when water supplies failed on account of the severe weather and water for locomotives had to be hauled long distances.

Car Supply.

When the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence was formed on October 23rd, 1917, one of the first tasks with which it was confronted was the recovery from the United States railways of some 20,679 Canadian owned freight cars located in the United States in excess of the number of cars of United States ownership in this country, that is, the Canadian lines had less than ninety per cent of the number of cars owned by them and required to handle traffic currently. The railways individually had been pressing their American connections to return their cars but had been unable to make satisfactory progress.

After numerous communications had taken place between the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence and the headquarters of the United States railroads at Washington without the desired result, a committee representing this association proceeded to New York and Washington in an endeavour to establish a working arrangement which would provide for a constant return movement of empty cars from the United States to Canada of sufficient magnitude to offset the Canadian losses which had taken place during the previous spring and summer and balance the southbound movement of loaded cars. A result of this conference was an immediate increase in the movement of cars to this country which continued until the United States lines became involved in the aggravated traffic congestions resulting from the unusually severe winter difficulties. The movement was resumed for a time with the advent of more favorable weather and continued until the pressure from Western States, which had millions of bushels of potatoes, corn and grain awaiting cars, became so great that the United States Railroad Administration felt it necessary to issue a preference order for movement of empty cars to the lines west of Chicago, which again had the effect of curtailing the deliveries to Canada. Some progress continued to be made however as congestions at United States terminals were worked off and delayed cars with freight for Canada reached us.

We are now advised by the Car Service Section of the United States Railroad Administration that they anticipate a general resumption of the movement of empty cars to Canada within the next two weeks.

Following is a table giving particulars of the adverse car balance against Canadian railways on interchange with the United States at various dates since October last:

	Box Cars.	Other Cars.	Total Cars.
October 1, 1917....	19,000	1,679	20,679
December 15, 1917..	19,872	2,247	22,119
January 15, 1918..	19,898	774	20,672
February 15, 1918..	16,681	108	16,789
March 1, 1918.....	14,907	3,118*	11,789

*Balance in favour of United States lines.

The balance of 3,118 "other cars" in favour of United States railways is accounted for by the heavy receipts of coal cars, principally via the Niagara frontier, many of which cars had accumulated on United States lines during the severe weather and were moved in abnormal numbers when weather conditions improved. These cars have not yet had time to be made empty and return to the United States in sufficient numbers to offset the heavy receipts.

As a result of the negotiations between the association and the United States railway authorities at Washington, 14,500 empty box cars have been ordered to Canada to date, in addition to empty cars received in the ordinary course of interchange and distributed principally in Eastern Canada where the demand for equipment for loading to United States is heaviest. It is expected that cars remaining due on these orders, namely, 4,075, will be received within the next two or three weeks in view of the requirements in the Western States having been fairly well filled for the present.

In addition to empty cars ordered and received as described in the preceding paragraph, 5,800 empties were ordered to the Delaware and Hudson Railway to be loaded with coal for Canadian points, making the total number of extra cars ordered to Canada, 20,300. Of the 5,800 cars, 3,835 have been received to date, the total number of the specially ordered cars received therefore, being 14,260.

Aside from the orders which have been issued by Washington to the United States railways covering the movement of empties to Canada as above, we have requests placed at Washington for 11,770 cars which have not yet been confirmed to the United States railways by the Director General's staff, but which they expect to begin to place in about two weeks' time.

The heavy demand placed upon our railways during the past winter for transportation of foodstuffs and other supplies for overseas has made it extremely difficult to furnish shippers of hay, pulp, pulpwood, newsprint, lumber and other commodities for export to the United States with all the cars for which they have asked. The imperative demand for providing an adequate number of cars for war materials and the continued holding of Canadian cars in the United States made it necessary last fall to prohibit the use of Canadian owned box cars for loading to points beyond the Canadian lines and for our American shipments we are dependent upon what United States owned cars are obtainable. The situation as regards equipment for shipments going to the United States was further aggravated with the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence river and the Great Lakes on account of the larger number of cars required to handle war supplies the greater distance around Lake Superior and between Montreal and the Atlantic seaboard, which meant that a certain number of American owned cars had to be placed in this traffic which prior to this time had been available for loading to the United States.

The opening of navigation this spring will permit of the withdrawal of these cars from overseas business and they will be available for loading to points south of the boundary.

Increased Car Efficiency.

The car shortage with which shippers and railways alike were confronted last fall, and up to the present time, inability to obtain sufficient additional cars, longer haul of freight during the winter season, increasing traffic, shortage of locomotives and men and necessity for saving coal called for economy in the use of cars to the greatest possible extent. The Canadian Railway Association for National Defence therefore immediately inaugurated a campaign amongst both shipping public and railways to ship goods in larger units and thereby reduce the number of cars, engines, men and amount of coal required to move a given amount of traffic.

What has been accomplished in this department of the Association's activities is outlined in the following figures:

Average weight of contents per loaded car handled on Canadian railways.

Year 1916	20.91 tons.
October, 1917	20.76 tons.
January, 1918.....	23.71 tons.

Taking the Dominion Government Statistics of Railways for the year 1916 as a basis, the increase of approximately three tons per car means that if the record is maintained during the year 1918, as we have every reason to expect it will, if not improved upon, 260,663 less car trips will be required this year to handle the number of tons of freight loaded on Can-

adian railways equivalent to that loaded in 1916 than were required in the latter year. The haulage of that number of cars less to handle the same amount of freight means a saving of approximately 79,000 tons of coal, 13,271 less trains, the use of 122 locomotives and the time of 360 enginemen and trainmen during the year.

Further effects of reduction in the number of cars to be handled will be seen in more expeditious handling of traffic in terminals and a general improvement in transportation conditions in this country, which even now are admitted to be better than in any other country of size engaged in war work.

The campaign for increased loading of cars embraces not only carload traffic which is controlled to a very great extent by shippers, but to less than carload shipments as well, the handling of which is performed by railway employees.

A few months ago a revised plan of handling of this class of traffic was inaugurated with a view to not only reducing the number of cars required but eliminating rehandling at intermediate points which took place under the old methods, and at the same time delivering the goods at destination in less time. Under this system it is anticipated that the average weight of contents of L.C.L. cars will be increased from about eleven thousand pounds as it was formerly, to at least 14,000 pounds. For the month of January, when the new system was but partially adopted the record was 12,459 pounds. This improvement in car service will mean a saving of approximately ten thousand cars per month.

The general use of interline billing of cars received attention. Under this system a car moving over two or more lines may travel through from shipping point to destination on the original billing instead of having to be held at junction points for the preparation of new papers. The adoption of the new system, while meaning radical changes in the accounting methods of some of the railways, is being placed in operation. It is estimated that the delay to cars at junction points which will be avoided is about five hundred thousand car days per annum and the elimination of this delay represents the service of 44,754 cars.

Fuel Conservation.

The efforts of the individual lines to economize in the use of coal were co-ordinated at the formation of the Association and advantageous methods which had existed on one line were circulated amongst others so that the saving in consumption might be increased.

The greatest room for fuel conservation, however, was to be found in connection with passenger services which, during a period of years, had grown through competition, and to that phase of transportation special attention was directed.

Frequent conferences of the Association's Committee on Passenger Transportation have been held, and this Committee has painstakingly analysed the services throughout the Dominion so that unnecessary or duplicate services might be dispensed with and trains on the various lines re-arranged so that reductions made would cause the minimum inconvenience to the travelling public.

Further savings in coal were made through the reduction of speed of both passenger and freight trains, discontinuance of the operation of special passenger trains, discouraging of extra passenger travel by elimination of reduced rates and excursions, fully loading freight trains and cars.

As a result of arrangements made up to this time, on a per annum basis, the reductions in passenger trains are equivalent to eight million passenger train miles, representing about four hundred thousand tons of coal, in addition to one hundred thousand tons additional through increased efficiency in the handling of freight.

Yours truly,

The Canadian Railway Association,
for National Defence,
General Secretary.

In conclusion, let me say that I have taken the committee into the confidence of the Government to the fullest extent compatible with the confidential considerations which, of course, attend communications such as those with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I have done so in the hope that the proposals which the Government has under consideration may commend themselves to the judgment of the members of this House, and not less in the hope that hon. gentlemen who may have something to suggest from their experience, from their knowledge of conditions throughout the country, and from their observation, will be good enough, either during the consideration of this Bill, or through private communications, to place those suggestions before us. We are most anxious to review the situation with all the information available at our disposal, and from every possible standpoint that may suggest itself to any hon. member.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Chairman, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, in his exposition of the railway situation of the country as it is at the present time, went back to the initiation of the policy of the Transcontinental railway in the year 1903. To be exact he should have gone much further, because the situation that we have to face to-day is very serious, not on account of the policy which was adopted in 1903 for the creation of a second transcontinental railway, nor the policy that was adopted of having a third transcontinental railway, but, as the right hon. gentleman from his very remarks showed, the situation is serious on account of one of the oldest—in fact, the oldest railway—that we have, the Grand Trunk railway itself. The Prime Minister, in his review of the situation, should have gone as far back as the year 1850, when the Grand Trunk railway was introduced in Canada. At that time railway construction in the world was still comparatively new, in fact,

it had only been in existence for something like twenty years. Railway construction commenced in the world about the year 1830, in England. From that country it rapidly passed to the Continent, where it was chiefly adopted in France and the neighbouring countries, and from England and the continent of Europe it passed over to the United States. The conditions, however, between the two continents were very different, and that was shown at once in the results. In Great Britain, as well as on the continent of Europe, the distances are short and the population compact, and from the first the railways were a profitable investment, always paying more than their expenses, and yielding a large profit to the promoters. In the United States the distances were long and the population very scarce at that time, the occupied country being confined between the Atlantic ocean and the Mississippi river, and even in that territory, which now would be regarded as comparatively restricted, the population was small, over a very large area.

It is a matter of history that while construction went on very rapidly, it was always at a loss to those who ventured on these enterprises, and it is a fact borne out by history that practically the whole of the capital invested in railway construction between the Atlantic and the Mississippi river was lost over and over again. It is easy to understand that, because the population of the United States at that time was still sparse it could not furnish the traffic for the enormous mileage that it was necessary to construct. Yet the advantage of the railways to the country was always such that, though company after company went into the hands of receivers, the construction of new railways was never postponed until the new centres had been connected with the older settlements. And so it went on.

The same conditions which existed in the United States existed in Canada in an accentuated degree. We had as large a territory, and a still sparser population. In 1850, under the Hinks Administration, the Grand Trunk railway was conceived. At that time Canada consisted of Upper and Lower Canada, and extended practically between two centres of population, Quebec and Toronto. It was felt at that time that the new union of these two provinces could not be kept together unless there was railway communication, so the Grand Trunk railway was conceived and carried out. At once a condition of things

came about which never existed in the United States until that country began to construct its transcontinental railways. Up to that period all railways had been constructed by private capital, without any government assistance. But it was felt in Canada that the Grand Trunk enterprise could not be carried out unless there was government assistance. The Government of the country, that is to say the people, had to put their hands in their pockets to help to construct the railway. That was the first initiation on this continent of government assistance towards railway construction. Looking back at those early events, nobody would find fault with the government of that day for having initiated the system of government assistance, because everybody realizes that unless that assistance had been given the Grand Trunk railway could not have been constructed. And not only would the country not have advanced, but it is questionable whether the country itself would have endured as a political entity or whether our population would not have drifted away to the United States. The political effect of the construction of the Grand Trunk railway was immediate. It is a matter of history that for some years before that, there had been great discontent in the provinces of United Canada. There was an annexation movement in swing, and this movement was checked largely by this first initiation of Canadian development. Shortly after that, Confederation was brought about, and one of the conditions upon which the Maritime Provinces came into Confederation was that there should be a railway connecting them with the centre of Canada. That was the initiation of the Intercolonial railway. My right hon. friend has given figures to this House of the cost of the Intercolonial railway. There is one fact which he did not state, but which is a matter of notoriety: that as a commercial enterprise it is doubtful even to-day if the Intercolonial is a financial success; and it is a matter of history also that for the first years of its existence it never paid its running expenses. Nevertheless I maintain, and nobody will dispute it, that nobody regrets the money spent on that railway, because we look at it not only from a commercial but from a national point of view, and we know that unless the Intercolonial railway had been constructed Confederation could not have been established. That was the second stage of our railway development.

Then we come to the third stage which was the construction of the Canadian Pa-

cific railway. It was also one of the conditions of British Columbia's entry into Confederation that she should be connected with the East by a highway, and the people of British Columbia did not ask more at that time. When they came into Confederation in 1871 they requested that they should be connected with the East by a highway. But the Canadian people were not satisfied that we should have only communication by highways over the mountains, they demanded a transcontinental railway, connecting the waters of the Pacific with the tidal waters of the Atlantic. The Canadian Pacific railway was therefore undertaken and built. Though built by a company it was, in fact, built altogether at the expense of the Canadian people. The terms granted to the Canadian Pacific railway by the Government of that day have been deemed extravagant. Yet it is a fact which cannot be doubted that but for the very large aid given, the Canadian Pacific railway could not have been constructed. And, indeed, although it is claimed that the terms given to the Canadian Pacific railway were extravagant, upon more than one occasion the enterprise was near collapse, and for many years after its completion it had a very precarious existence. It has developed since largely through its good management and owing to the development of the country.

The question arose afterwards as to whether or not the country would be satisfied with only one transcontinental railway. The country was developing very fast, especially on the prairies. Settlements were opening in all directions right and left, north and south, east and west. There were settlements on the boundary and there were settlements on the northern branch of the Saskatchewan river. There were settlements in all parts of British Columbia. The Government of that day, of which I was Prime Minister, came to the conclusion that one Canadian transcontinental line would not be sufficient for the development of the country. I heard a statement made in the House some few years ago that there was no necessity for two transcontinental railways, still less for three. I beg to dissent altogether from that proposition, and my view is to compare the American situation at the present time with our situation. The United States from the Rio Grande to the Canadian boundary, extends, roughly speaking, from the 30th degree of latitude to the 49th degree of latitude. The territory of Canada extends from the 49th degree of latitude to the mouth of the Mackenzie river, in the 70th degree of latitude. That is to say, both Canada and the United States extend practically the same distance from north to south. There are in the United States to-day how many transcontinental systems? There are no fewer than seven transcontinental systems; there is the Union Pacific, which was the first to be constructed; the Northern Pacific; the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe; the Southern Pacific, and three others whose names I have not before me. At all events, I am satisfied that there are seven transcontinental systems.

Mr. CAHILL: The Great Northern is another United States transcontinental line.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman is probably right, but I have not that road in my list.

If the United States has seven transcontinental systems, can it be said that three are too many for Canada? I submit that we require these transcontinental systems, but I shall refer to that more particularly in a few minutes. We may be told that the climatic conditions are not the same in the two countries. That is true, but which country suffers the more from adverse climatic conditions? To those hon. gentlemen on the other side who are dubious as to the necessity of three transcontinental railways in Canada, I would point out that between the Mississippi river and the Pacific ocean there is the great American desert, constituting a disadvantage at least equal to that which we are subjected to in Canada by reason of our climatic conditions. Moreover, we have not yet a proper conception of the vast nature of Canada's resources. We are surprised when we find trade good and resources existing where we had not expected to find them.

I direct attention to the statement made a few moments ago by the Prime Minister regarding the condition of traffic on the Transcontinental railway. It was supposed that the Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg would be absolutely unproductive—and we are surprised that it has yielded so much. In fact, the results have been a revelation. We were under the impression that north of the Laurentian mountains, between the St. Lawrence and the Hudson bay, there was nothing but an unproductive and a barren country. It has now been established beyond doubt that this district is one of the most productive sections of the American continent, and that we have north of these mountains a new Ontario and a new Quebec. I am glad

to say that settlement is going in these very rapidly; indications are that the traffic in that district will become more and more extensive.

The Transcontinental railway has not been as great a success as it might have been, and one of the reasons why the traffic on that road has not expanded more rapidly than it has is found in the death of Mr. Hays, the late general manager of the Grand Trunk railway, to whom is due the credit of the initiation of the enterprise. He was a man of great energy, resource and ability, and had he lived the railway would be more prosperous than it is at present. Indeed, his death was a national calamity.

The construction of the Canadian Northern railway was not entered upon as a national enterprise; it grew from a local undertaking until it matured into a transcontinental system. The Prime Minister said a moment ago that that railway had as great a future as any railway in Canada. I say that it has as great a future as any railway on the continent of America. That may be a broad assertion, but it is to be remembered that there is no better land on the whole continent than that between the cities of Edmonton and Winnipeg; every foot of the Canadian Northern line between those cities is revenue-producing. From Winnipeg to the head of the lakes, the railway, after leaving the city of Winnipeg, passes through a marshy land which may not be productive now, but which will be productive later on. Then it enters the valley of the Rainy river, one of the best sections of country on the continent. Leaving the head of lake Superior the line does not follow the lake, because of the district being barren and rocky, but enters the clay belt, which will probably be productive. From Sudbury to Ottawa, from Ottawa to Montreal and from Montreal to Quebec the line passes through a good country. Undoubtedly, therefore, the Canadian Northern railway system has a great future. I am not disposed to criticise the promoters of this enterprise, Mackenzie and Mann. They displayed great energy and great enterprise, and I firmly believe that but for the war they would have brought the road to satisfactory completion. When the Government proposed to acquire the road I did not object, because I thought that the property was a good one; the only question was as to the terms under which it should be acquired. That is the view which I take of the whole situation.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

The Government now proposes to launch into a new enterprise, that of acquiring the Grand Trunk railway itself. The history of the Grand Trunk railway is not a satisfactory one. The Grand Trunk has been in existence about sixty years. It passes through one of the best parts of the American continent, undoubtedly through the best part of Ontario; it ought to be and it is productive. If it is not as profitable or prosperous an enterprise as it should have been, that is due to two things. First, the management has always been in London, England. In my judgment, no greater mistake could have been made. It is inconceivable that the management of a great railway system, covering almost the whole of this continent, could be satisfactorily carried on from the city of London. Second, the system has been overloaded with bad securities. That the Grand Trunk railway system can be made a profitable enterprise I have no doubt. I do not pretend to be an expert in these matters, but, applying the ordinary principles of common sense; looking on the advantages enjoyed by this railway, its splendid location, its line from the great centre of Chicago to the fine harbour of Portland, I think that the Grand Trunk railway system should be productive of good results and profitable returns. For the present I do not condemn the idea of taking this railway over; everything depends on the terms. But I warn the members of the Government that if they acquire that property they will find it loaded with absolutely unproductive and utterly worthless securities. In this condition may be found the great danger of such negotiations as my right hon. friend has suggested. But since the Government contemplate taking this step, I shall not condemn it at this time. The idea is one which deserves consideration, and I, therefore, would not go further than that.

The only thing as to which I am disappointed in the statement made by my right hon. friend is that the has been very vague in regard to the organization under which he is going to place the present Canadian Northern railway. We heard yesterday that the Government, before re-organizing the Canadian Northern railway, were waiting for the receipt of the report of the arbitrators as to the price to be paid for the stock of that enterprise. Why wait for that? What more information than the Government has to-day will it have when it receives the award of the arbitrators? To-

day, under the terms of the Act which was passed last year, the Government is the absolute owner of the Canadian Northern railway. We purchased the stock. The purchase price was not paid because the amount had not been fixed. The question as to the amount of the purchase price was referred to arbitration by the two parties, to the contract. But the contract was made by the two parties, and, therefore, to-day we are the absolute owners of the Canadian Northern, and the question whether the amount that we have to pay for the stock be large or small, is of no concern whatever. As the owners of the Canadian Northern railway, if we are to make full use of it, we ought immediately to re-organize and operate it. I cannot see that it is good or sound policy to wait until we know how we stand as to the price we have to pay. We should go on with the reorganization at once. The Prime Minister, in speaking of the re-organization, spoke upon a subject which everybody has in mind, that is to say, that we should keep that enterprise free from political patronage. Political patronage has been the bane of railway administration in Canada. I do not blame one party more than the other for that. The former Liberal Government did their best to eliminate political patronage, and while I do not say that we succeeded completely in eliminating it, we made a good deal of reform. If political patronage is to be eliminated from railway administration in Canada—and my right hon. friend has particularly insisted upon that point,—the plan which he has suggested does not seem to be conducive of that result. If you have any board of directors which is appointed by the Government, you will not eliminate political patronage.

May I make a suggestion to my right hon. friend, and to the other members of the Government, as to a method of eliminating patronage? The city of Washington, district of Columbia, is federal property; it is not a state. It does not form part of the Union; it is independent territory. It is, I understand, extremely well administered. I have never heard of graft of any kind, nor have I heard of political patronage, in the administration of the city of Washington. In years past I frequently had to visit that city, and my right hon. friend has in recent years had to go there very often, but I have not heard, and I do not think he has ever heard anything but commendation of the administration of the city of Washington, D.C. How is it administered? It is administered by a commission composed of three commissioners, one appointed by the party in office, the second by the party in opposition, and the third is an officer of the army. The Uunited States army was never a very numerous body, but it is well known that its staff of officers is a very highly cultured and fine body of men with a high sense of honour and absolutely honest. I do not know by whom the third commissioner, an officer of the army, is appointed. I think he is appointed by the President. Be this as it may, this is a body which is absolutely non-political. As to the elimination of patronage from railway administration in Canada, if patronage is to be eliminated—and every hon. member in this House either wants or, because the opinion of the people behind him is so strong, at least pretends that he wants to eliminate patronage,—I do not know of any system which would come nearer to the elimination of patronage than such a system which I have just suggested.

I have this observation to make in regard to the financial part of the information which has been given by my right hon. friend. He stated that he wanted to have a balance sheet which he could understand. Balance sheets of every kind are always somewhat difficult to understand by those who are not initiated into the business, but I do not believe the balance sheet that my right hon. friend has laid before us gives us much more enlightenment than the balance sheets we have had before. They may be understood by the initiated, but I do not understand them. The figures which have to-day been given by my right hon. friend may perhaps agree with the figures which have been given before, but I see some discrepancies which I cannot reconcile, and which, I hope, will, in the course of this debate, be reconciled. The other day the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) gave a statement as to the necessity of the Bill, which we now have before us for our immediate consideration, to provide for the payment of passing liabilities which are maturing during the present year. The Acting Minister of Finance makes this statement which is to be found at page 1772 of Hansard:

> I have already given a list of the short term maturities for this year, but in order that it may be before the House in a complete and consecutive form, I shall read the list of securities of the railway maturing this year:

Canadian Northern Railway System,
Statement of Short Term Loans,
March 1st, 1918.

No.	Maturity.	Loan made by or through.	Amount.
1.	Demand.	Dominion Government, Canada	$10,000,000
2.	Demand.	Can. Bank of Commerce, Canada	5,889,066
3.	Demand.	Can. Bank of Commerce, London	10,074,408
4.	Demand.	Can. Bank of Commerce, Canada	1,250,000
5.	Demand.	National Trust Company, Ltd., Canada..	115,000
6.	Demand.	Dom. Sec. Corporation, Ltd., Canada..	150,000
7.	March 31, 1918.	British Empire Trust Co., London	929,533
8.	April 9, 1918.	Lazard Bros., London	1,472,167
9.	April. 15, 1918.	Lazard Bros., London	2,919,026
10.	April 15, 1918.	Lloyds Bank, London	5,201,407
11.	June 9, 1918.	Nat. Bank Scotland, London	486,667
12.	July 10, 1918.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York	2,700,000
13.	July 10, 1918.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York	3,000,000
14.	Sept. 1, 1918.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York	10,000,000
15.	Jan. 10, 1919.	Wm. A. Read & Co., New York	1,250,000
			$55,437,274

These are short term loans, I understand, coming due this year. I have not studied very closely the blue book that was laid on the Table last year entitled "Financial Statements respecting the Canadian Northern Railway System and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway" but in a cursory examination of it I have not been able to find any amount owing to Lazard Brothers, Read & Company, and so on. Are these new loans or old loans, and when do they fall due? Have they been contracted within the last year or before that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are old loans. Some of them have been renewed. The indebtedness is the same.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I repeat, I am unable to find in the statement of liabilities of the Canadian Northern any amount due to Lazard Brothers or to Read & Company. If I am mistaken, I should like to be corrected. Yesterday I complained that the information we had was very insufficient. It has been supplemented to a certain extent, but we require more yet. In the Bill that passed this House last year the same authority was given to the Government that is now sought, of

> Paying and settling any indebtedness of such company or postponing the payment thereof on such terms as may be agreed upon, and for such purposes may make advances out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; Provided, however, that until authorized by Parliament, the total of such advances shall not exceed the sum of twenty-five million dollars.

But no limit is set in the Bill before us this year. We are told that $55,000,000 is to be provided in the way of renewals or payment of loans, but there is no hint of this in the Bill. Let me read the clause:

> The five-sixths of the shares mentioned in section three of chapter twenty-four of the statutes of Canada for the year 1917, having been transferred as required by said Act, the Governor in Council may from time to time assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company or any Company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System in renewing or postponing the payment of any indebtedness of any such company, on such terms as may be agreed on, by guaranteeing in whole or part the payment thereof with interest on the notes or obligations given for such renewal or postponement: Provided that the amount of principal to be so guaranteed from time to time shall not exceed the amount of the indebtedness the payment of which is from time to time renewed or postponed.

That sets no limit on the amount the Government is authorized to pay.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not authorize us to pay anything.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It authorizes the renewal of notes or the postponement of the payment of indebtedness. What are the liabilities which are to be renewed or postponed? Are there others beyond what are mentioned in the statement I have here?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Liabilities which come due between now and the next session of Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What are they?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are given on page 1772 of Hansard of this year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is all?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is nothing more, I understand. The liabilities amount to $67,000,000 altogether.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Bill then simply provides authority for renewals on terms that may be agreed upon?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Upon the best terms that we can make.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that all these items are contained in the statement given by the Minister of Finance, and that the total amount of the short-term loans to be renewed is $55,437,274.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend will find that some further maturities are mentioned just after that statement, bringing the total up to $67,360,607.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not quite clear. What is it that we are committing ourselves to? The first item on the list is a loan made by the Dominion Government of $10,000,000. There will be no renewal of that, I suppose. I want to take exception to a statement my right hon. friend made in the course of his observations, when he said that we had limited the award to be made by the Board of Arbitration inquiring into the value of the Canadian Northern Railway stock to a maximum of $10,000,000. I would observe that that statement was not accurate. There is nothing to that effect in the statute, which simply provides that we shall pay the amount determined by the arbitrators.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But not more than $10,000,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not in the statute. My right hon. friend has since had an Order in Council passed limiting the amount to $10,000,000, but no such provision appears in the statute and my right hon. friend had no authority to pass such an Order in Council.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That provision is in the arbitration agreement.

Sir WILFID LAURIER: That may be, but I was going on to say that we had not been informed of that. I have seen the Order in Council limiting the maximum to $10,000,000, but by what authority did the Government arrive at that figure? What right had the Government to say that the award shall be for $10,000,000 or less than that? The stock may be worth $20,000,000 or only $5,000,000. I repeat, the Government had no authority whatever to pass that Order in Council or to make such an agreement as that. It was a violation of the statute by which the Government was bound to accept the award of the board of arbitration. If the Government thought the award should be limited to $10,000,000, they should have received authority to set that limit, and I submit very respectfully that under the statute they had no authority whatever to fix any limit at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was a very wise thing to fix a maximum beyond which the country should not be called upon to pay. I might observe to my right hon. friend that we fixed it at just one-third the amount he proposed four years ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Nothing of the kind. That is an old story.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An old story, but a true one.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the Drayton report which said the stock was valueless?

Mr. CAHILL: In the statement of liabilities of the Canadian Northern given by the Prime Minister he quoted among other items $25,000,000 of debenture stock. I understood him to say that the country was not liable for that amount if the railway company was not earning interest on it. Am I correct in that assumption?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is correct. When there are surplus earnings they have to be paid.

Mr. CAHILL: That is, not a direct liability of the company?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not cumulative.

Mr. CAHILL: What would be the meaning of this: In addition to the maturities just mentioned there are securities maturing in August and January amounting in all to $12,000,000 debenture stock. The debenture stock, included in this item is as I understand to be paid out of earnings unless there is some provision about which we do not know.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is a different stock.

Mr. CAHILL: Where does this different stock appear in the balance sheet?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the funded debt.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the difference between the stocks? Why is one put in the funded debt and the other not in the funded debt?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One is a liability and the other is only a liability in the sense that I mention.

Mr. CAHILL: Of course, it is a liability in every sense. If it is not cumulative as to the interest obligation it comes in

prior to the common stock and, therefore, if the Dominion Government own the common stock of the Canadian Northern railway, they naturally are liable for this $25,000,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If they earn it.

Mr. CAHILL: If they do not earn the interest on that $25,000,000 the holders of that stock, unless there is some special arrangement, which I doubt very much, would become the proprietors of the road if they so desired. They have a first lien ahead of the common stock of the company and in that case they would become owners of the road. Am I correct in that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought I made the matter pretty plain. Of course, that stock is ahead of the common stock; it is perpetual stock. The interest on it is payable if there are earnings sufficient for the purpose. If there are not earnings sufficient for the purpose then it is not cumulative.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there provision made to pay the interest on this stock now? Has the interest been paid? If it has not been paid, of course it is understood that the holders of this $25,000,000 worth of stock would control the road if they so desired. They either demand payment from the common shareholders, or they take control of the road unless the stock has some special contract attached to it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that up to two years ago the interest was paid, because the earnings of the road were sufficient.

Mr. CAHILL: So that the Government, as owners of this road, will have to take care of the interest on this $25,000,000, or pay off the debt; otherwise these people will come back on the owners of the road and say: "If you do not pay the interest we will take the road."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not understand what my hon. friend means by saying that they will become the owners of the road. If the Government fulfils the conditions upon which this stock was issued, the persons who hold it have no complaint. If the earnings are enough to pay the interest, the interest must be paid. If the earnings are not enough, then the interest is not paid. The persons who own the stock have no remedy. Further than that the interest is not cumulative, as I have explained more than once.

Mr. CAHILL: If the interest is not paid, as prior stockholders, they must come in as owners of the road.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CAHILL: We were discussing the relative value of debenture stock when the House rose at six o'clock. I have here a statement of the annual meeting of the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in which the president, Lord Shaughnessy, says:

> In order to avoid this undesirable situation the Company decided, with the consent of Parliament, to utilize consolidated debenture stock for the purchase or conversion of existing bonds, and to provide funds for building or acquiring such additional mileage as might appear to be required from time to time for the advantage of the country and the company. This consolidated debenture stock is perpetual and irredeemable, differing from a mortgage bond in that it gives no right of foreclosure in the event of default. The holders have a first claim on the revenues of the company for their semi-annual dividends after the working expenses and taxes or fines have been paid, and the contract demands of existing bondholders have been satisfied. If by any chance the company failed to pay, within a fixed period, the dividend accrued on the consolidated debenture stock the holders of that stock would become the Shareholders of the company and would control its affairs until the default was made good, when the property would automatically pass back to the preference and ordinary shareholders.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be in this case that there is an agreement between the makers of this debenture stock and the holders on some special basis, or some special arrangement may have been made, but there is no question but that the debenture stock is a liability of the company, and such being the case the total liabilities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company would stand at $438,000,000. The Prime Minister this afternoon, if I heard him aright, made the statement that the road was valued by the Drayton-Acworth Commission at $497,000,000. I have here the report of that commission and it is strange that we can find so many conflicting figures in the same report. The Prime Minister explained this afternoon that he is not familiar with figures, and had a statement prepared which is practically the same as the one I gave to the House yesterday as to the liabilities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, but he did not quite agree with me as to the cost of the road. The Drayton-Acworth report states:

The property investment of the Canadian Northern Railway System is stated in the balance sheet of June 30, 1916, at $494,112,489.34. This figure admittedly has been written up to include $100,000,000 of capital stock. And this stock, as we have already said, was issued without any cash consideration. We have endeavoured to ascertain the actual cost of the system. From the company's official reports and special statements supplied to us we have ascertained that the actual cash investment that can have been made in the property is $383,302,451.33.

From this total maximum of $383,302,451 we deduct the following items, which the company has included in cost of road and equipment, but which do not represent investment in property:

1. Advance to controlled companies to pay indebtedness for interest subsequent to construction and operating deficits which were capitalized when the system was put together, not less than ..	$10,000,000
2. Interest during 1916 overcharged to construction, not less than.	3,000,000
	$13,000,000

I would like to point out to the committee this particular item:

Leaving for investment in road and equipment and in securities of constituent and subsidiary companies, $370,302,451.

The Prime Minister pointed out this afternoon that the cost of reproduction was found to be $479,000,000, but we are told there was a depreciation of $40,000,000. The Prime Minister did not use the same figures as quoted, but adopted the item of $397,000,000, and added to that the cost of equipment. According to the Drayton-Acworth report, the total investment in the undertaking was $370,000,000. I will read a little further from the Drayton-Acworth report:

Physical basis.

But money cost is not all. We decided also to ascertain the approximate value, on the basis of reproduction cost, of the property as it exists to-day. And we rely on Professor Swain's valuation for this purpose. This valuation is, in his opinion, a liberal estimate of the fair cost of reproducing new, at pre-war prices of labour and material, the system at present existing.

It includes property belonging to the system at its estimated cost, if it had to be acquired or constructed to-day.

That is, allowing the unearned increment or the increase in the probable cost of the land as if purchased at this date.

And therefore it not only gives the company credit for lands which it in fact owns, even though it obtained them as a grant; but it also credits the company with the increment of land values since the date of the original acquisition. And these two items are quite large.

Prof. Swain's method of arriving at his results are fully explained in his report, which is printed as an appendix hereto. He makes the total cost of reproduction new, $397,441,567. From this he deducts for depreciation $40,031,889, making the cost of reproduction of the property in its present condition $357,409,678. This, however, does not include equipment. The equipment was inspected by Mr. Buchanan, and, on the basis of his report as to quantities and condition, a valuation has been made by Mr. W. H. Chadbourn, C.E., chief engineer of our valuation staff. He finds the cost of reproduction new at pre-war prices to be $56,590,418, and the depreciation to be $11,250,433, making the present value $45,339,985. Putting the two valuations together, we have $402,749,663 as the fair cost of reproducing the entire physical Canadian Northern system in its present condition. Now the outstanding liabilities (bonds, debentures, notes, and bank and other loans) of the company exceed $400,000,000.

Reckoning on this basis, it appears that the liabilities are practically equal to the reproduction cost of the physical property.

In the statement which I furnished to the House yesterday, I said the liabilities represented $437,000,000. The Prime Minister this afternoon said they were $438,000,000. The maximum possible cost according to the Drayton-Acworth report is $370,000,000. Now the Dominion of Canada gave to the Canadian Northern subsidies of land and cash of about $75,000,000, of which $38,800,000 was in cash. Deducting the amount of subsidies from the $370,000,000, we find that the total investment has been $295,000,000. Setting this off against the liabilities, there would be left a promoters' profit of $142,000,000. The Prime Minister states the mileage at 10,000 miles, which, divided into $437,000,000, would be about $44,000 a mile. But the mileage is not actually as great as 10,000 miles, and the actual cost is about $46,000 per mile. In giving his statement of the cost of other railroads, the Prime Minister did not see fit to give the valuation of the Canadian Pacific railway, which I think would be a better criterion. The Intercolonial railway, as hon. gentlemen know, was built as a political proposition, the purpose being to join up the several provinces. The total capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's transportation system, comprising 13,400 miles of railway in Canada operated directly by the company, with the rolling stock equipment and steamboat craft on inland waters, its splendid terminal stations and facilities, and other accessories, is $623,000,000, or $46,000 per mile.

I think it is quite apparent, at least to all the western members, that the Canadian Northern in no way compares with the Canadian Pacific railway as a going concern or as a railroad proposition. The Cana-

dian Pacific railway from the head of the Lakes westward has a thousand miles of double track. It has magnificent hotels, excellent terminal facilities, ample yard room at Quebec, Ottawa, Montreal and other cities; there is no comparison between this railway and the others in the matter of terminals, roadbeds or rails. Yet we are asked to assume a liability equal to the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific; we are asked to assume $46,000 per mile.

I do not believe members of this committee wish to go back into the political history of the railroad situation in this country. We have a situation here to face. The previous Parliament assumed obligations of $437,000,000, and there is a farce being carried on in Toronto to-day, called an arbitration board, to arrive at the value of a worthless stock, a stock that is not only worthless, but which carries with it a liability of something like $147,000,000 of unguaranteed securities. We have been asking for the names of the people who are getting this money. It would appear from the statement that there is a profit of $140,000,000 to the promoters. There is also over $140,000,000 of unguaranteed securities. We are furnished with a statement of the $25,000,000 which was paid last year to the Canadian Northern. That furnishes no information whatever to this Committee. We paid out of one pocket into the other. But we want to know where this money finally landed, who got it, who are the people holding the unguaranteed securities; what relation do they stand in to the promoters of this road, to the Mackenzie and Mann people. It is not furnishing information to the Committee to say that we paid to the Canadian Northern $25,000,000, and paid it out in amounts of $2,000,000, $12,000,000 or $15,000,000. That is simply playing the same old game. The Canadian Northern paid to Mackenzie and Mann, and Mackenzie and Mann to the Northern Construction Company, and the Northern Construction Company back to Mackenzie and Mann. We do not want that condition to continue. If we have assumed the liabilities of the Canadian Northern Railway system, let us put the cards on the table, take our loss, and proceed to have this railroad organized in a business way, so that we can run the road to the best possible advantage to the country and to the railroad itself. Mackenzie and Mann cannot possibly have any interest in the proper operation of this road; they have no interest whatever in making dividends on this road now. I cannot conceive how the Government are taking away from a certain syndicate a railroad system, and at the same time leaving the same people in charge of its management. We are told we have acquired the stock and the ownership. The question of the details of settlement of what we are to pay, not exceeding $10,000,000 for 600,000 shares of stock, has nothing whatever to do with the management of the road. If the Government are sincere in the matter, the first thing they should consider is the management. The question of arbitration has nothing whatever to do with Mackenzie and Mann. As soon as the decision to take it over was arrived at, there should have been put in control of the road independent people, who would take it and develop it for the benefit of the country. I do not know what the directors of this road get, but I can easily understand that the Mackenzie and Mann ring would be willing to pay not less than $1,000,000 a year to be left in charge of it, for the side issues, the subsidiary companies. Where do they buy coal? Who is doing the construction? We were told there was $11,000,000 expended last year in extensions. There was no mention made of that until to-day.

We were told by the Minister of Railways that there were no extensions and no new undertakings. The cost of the road to the country has increased from $13,000,000 to $15,000,000 within the last year. It would have been better if we had paid the Mackenzie and Mann outfit $10,000,000 last year and got rid of them and put some person in charge of the road to manage it as a going concern. If the Prime Minister thinks that the people are willing to maintain Mackenzie and Mann in control of that road he is very much mistaken. There is great value in the road; it runs through good territory and can be made a paying concern, but if we leave it in charge of men who exploit it for their own personal gain the country will have to stand the loss. I cannot understand why we should wait for an arbitration board to determine whether we are to pay $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 for this road, and still leave the same people in charge of it. Before any member of this committee would make an investment in any undertaking he would want to know who the management were and what their policy was. In this case we are paying out money and taking no interest whatever in the management of the undertaking. As a matter of fact, I do not know what we are voting this money for; no explanation has been given. The first item is for a payment to the Dominion

Government, and there is another item for payment of debenture stock. I always understood that debenture stock was not redeemable; that it was perpetual. If there is an understanding with the owners of the stock that $12,000,000 of it is to be redeemed this year we should know who these owners are, what their relation is to the Mackenzie and Mann outfit, and on what terms this money is being paid. I do not believe that a cent has ever been paid for this debenture stock; most likely it has been given as a bonus to some bondholders, who should be willing to wait for the interest on their investment. Let us work this proposal out to the best possible advantage on behalf of the people. Let us quit trying to fool ourselves or any person else with regard to our obligation in the matter. It is useless for us to say that this is not a direct obligation; of course, it is an obligation on the country, which will add just so much to our debt. We should have a full detailed report with regard to the company and its liabilities and with regard to the subsidiary companies and their liabilities, so that we shall know what we are doing.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I believe that I voice the feelings of the men from the West when I say that we received with a great deal of satisfaction the declaration of the Prime Minister this evening. We regret, however, that he was not more pronounced in certain respects. We should have been better pleased had he stated outright that it was the policy of the Government to adopt the principle of public ownership, not only of railways but of all other great means of transportation. We regret that we must wait until a time which is not defined for the Government to take control and operation of the road in question. I do not doubt that these matters have received serious consideration and that the ministers must be worried about them, but the people are also worried; they are wondering what the end of it all will be. Instead of waiting for any commission to declare that the stock of these gentlemen is worth $10,000,000 or less, I would declare that they are entitled to a ten-year penitentiary sentence. I do not know why they should be retained in the service of the country for any great length of time, unless it be for the benefit of succeeding ages; that is, to allow these gentlemen sufficient time for their financial morality to become so corrupt that it will cease to be contagious. We have heard a number of statements about the calamitous circumstances which have brought about the present railway situation, but nothing has been said in a definite way as to why we should adopt the principle of the public ownership of railways and of the great means of transportation in Canada. We find the railway situation to be deplorable, indeed, and we propose that the Government shall do certain things, not because any principle has been enunciated because a set of circumstances makes it impossible to do otherwise. I wish to deal this evening with the principle of public ownership. I shall endeavour to show that it is the right principle to adopt for western conditions, and I will defy contradiction so far as the principle is concerned. I shall, at the same time, endeavour to show that this is the method which ought to be adopted in order to bring the East and the West closer together.

First, it is necessary thoroughly to understand the reason there is for the adoption of the public ownership of railways. We are convinced, having regard to the whole economic condition of Canada and the enormous freight and passenger rates which prevail, that the proportion of wealth which passes into the hands of private corporations is altogether too great. That fundamentally underlies the adoption of the principle of public ownership of railways, and it is our duty to examine that principle and see whether it will accomplish the object in view.

It is evident that there are two ways of reducing the cost of living, especially to the western people. These two methods differ essentially. The first I call patriotic, and the second I call unpatriotic. The one which I have designated as unpatriotic is the one which was advocated by the Opposition when they were in power, but which they did not dare to carry out during their whole period of administration. I refer to the abolition of protective tariff, upon which the industries of the East exist, and without which they cannot exist. A protective tariff which operates to the advantage of the eastern manufacturers operates equally to the disadvantage of the western farmers. But there is a compensating advantage to the western farmer. It creates for him a national, a Canadian, market, for his western produce. The removal of the protective tariff system which has been so successful in building up the eastern provinces, would be a betrayal of the confidence of those who have invested their capital in protected industries. What-

ever modification may in the future take place in the tariff, it must be based upon the consideration of existing industries and be fair to the interests of both the producer and the consumer. That, however, would be one method of reducing the cost of living to the western farmer; of increasing the reward paid to the man on the plains who forms the basis and foundation of the growth and progress of the West. That is the method which I have designated as unpatriotic, because it involves the placing of East and West in opposition, and creating economic factors of the people east and west of the lakes.

The other method of decreasing the cost of living is by cheapening transportation facilities, and it is here that I believe the declaration of the Premier lacks strength. He told us there would be public ownership of certain railways now. He indicated that, at a time not far distant, the Grand Trunk Pacific would become part of the Government Railway system. He also stated that the Grand Trunk would also, at some future time, become part of that system, and he gave us the idea that in the very distant future the Canadian Pacific must also necessarily be one of the railways included in that system of public ownership. The principle of public ownership is the cheapening rates in transportation, both passenger and freight, and I cannot see how, unless we declare for public ownership of all means of transportation in this country, we shall arrive at the object of public ownership of railways. The second method, therefore, of reducing the cost of living, and particularly to the western man, is Government ownership, and Government ownership of the great vehicles of transportation is one which has for its end a more patriotic and beneficial object than the abolition of the tariff. I want to deal with the principles underlying Government ownership and operation of railways, and to show how a Government is far better situated than a private corporation to supply the transportation needs of a people. Those who have evinced disbelief in public ownership usually speak as though the present operation and control of railways were the most perfect conceivable, and they imply that the utter corruptness and dishonesty of politicians make the control of a vast number of men and the working of a great department out of the question. All such arguments are against the dishonesty of our politicians and not against the principle of public ownership of railways. Let us first consider this issue. Are our politicians at Ottawa more corrupt and dishonest than the heads of our great corporations? I deny utterly that they are, and this afternoon the Prime Minister stated that, in order that political patronage might be removed, an independent board would be constituted, and he emphasized the fact that it would be absolutely separate and that there would be no interference with it whatever. I deny that our politicians at Ottawa are more corrupt than the heads of private corporations. We apply to our men in public life tests far more searching than those which we apply to our great so-called captains of industry. If we turned upon the heads of corporations the same light that we turn upon politicians, the result would be something astounding. To digress, I may say that all I have to do is to point to what has happened in the United States in recent months, or in the last year and a half, and you have the answer there—private corporations and scandals. As for the patrons of industries who are supposed to be so honest, their contribution to the advancement of this country has mainly consisted in gazing sleepily through the windows of a private car at the laying out of stations and town-sites by the actual railroad pioneers, and in abstracting profits which rightfully belonged to the people of Canada. In addition to this consideration of their usefulness, there has been a tremendous amount of land subsidies and money subsidies, and other assistance of one sort or another, and that is what has brought about the condition which exists to-day and which compelled the Premier to make the declaration which he did this afternoon. Consequently the proposition before us is this—had we not better build and operate our own lines of transportation than furnish the financial strength and backing to others to do it, and permit them to rob us unduly and deny us any say as to what the rates shall be?

No one really believes that the operation of railways by private corporations is a perfect policy. Between cheap freight and passenger rates and large dividends there is a wide divergence, and the creation of a railway commission is sufficient proof that the Government is aware that private corporations cannot serve their own interest and that of the people at one and the same time. The creation of the Railway Commission was a virtual declaration in favour of state control of railways.

I wish to give the House a few facts as to why we should stop pursuing the policy

which has been adopted by both parties in Canada, and why it is time that we should now adopt a policy of public ownership of railways. Up to June, 1916, assuming that the money represented by bonds and consolidated debenture stock was actually invested in railways in Canada, the total would be $1,045,608,331. This information is to be found at page X11 of the Blue Book for 1916. The figures for 1917 have been prepared, but not printed, and the information which I received from Mr. J. L. Payne, the comptroller, was that the figures for 1917 would not be materially altered, except to increase the bonded indebtedness of railways by about $50,000,000, which is a mere trifle in these days. The amount of common stock outstanding in 1916 was $848,269,448. This information is also to be found at page X11 of the Blue Book of 1916. The total is $1,893,877,819. This is without taking into consideration the $50,000,000 of which I spoke a moment ago. In addition to these sums, the Dominion Government, provincial governments, municipalities and other sources have given cash aid as follows:

The Dominion	$184,719,627 88
The Provinces	37,437,895 68
The Municipalities	17,914,836 40
Total	$240,072,359 96

These figures do not take into consideration the purchase of the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds, aggregating $33,116,000, by the Government, nor do they take into consideration that the Dominion has constructed and now operates the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, upon which, up to March 31, 1916, there had been an expenditure of $156,701,210. It would be interesting to know the difference between these billions of capital and the actual cost of the roads, with a fair profit for promotion and construction. Hearsay evidence establishes that about twenty-five per cent goes to promotion; that is to say, that Canadians are paying, in the shape of freight and passenger rates, interest on a tremendous amount of money which never went into the actual building of railways.

It has been the claim of the Liberal party that competition in transportation facilities is the cure for all evils of rates which appear to be too exorbitant. To this I desire to take exception. Competition only aggravates the existing evils of western transportation. Let me explain. Canada possesses more mileage in proportion to its population than any other country in the world.

One mile of steel exists to every twenty-seven inhabitants of this land, and when we consider that this includes the more densely peopled provinces of the East one naturally wonders what the country consisting of the four provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia possesses in the way of miles of steel per head of the population. The figures of these provinces is given in this volume of statistics, pages 25 and 26, as follows:—

	Miles.
Manitoba	4,309.59
Saskatchewan	5,378.33
Alberta	3,894.18
British Columbia	3,604.00

Despite these astounding figures, however, the West has less railway mileage to its area than any other part of the country. And it is right here that the waste of competition is apparent. Great tracks of country lie untapped by railway service while our uneconomic friends, the Liberal party, preach the policy of constructing duplicate tracks paralleling one another for miles. Where the entire country might be served by one line, we have three, and a difficulty with regard to reasonable freight rates is created by the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific which will not be overcome for generations. The fault of railway companies in this country has not been alone that they overcharged for their service, it is a fault far more subtle than that, it is the fault that railroads are not constructed with a view to supplying the country's needs, but are largely constructed on guaranteed loans or money subsidies with an insane idea as to competition.

Let us consider further this question of competition. Mill, the great English economist in his famous and monumental work Principles of Political Economy, in what is considered the best chapters of that work, The Cost of Production, lays down the proposition that there is a limit, sternly and rigidly defined by economic law, to the extent to which competition can cheapen the commodity. That limit, he declares, is the cost to produce the commodity, paying a living wage to the labourers involved, a rate of interest to the capital invested equal to what the average of the money market will afford, and the cost of the maintenance of the capital involved. Below that economic line it is impossible to go, for should it be exceeded, capital is at once withdrawn from the production of the commodity, and the condition rights itself by the scarcity of the commodity due to that withdrawal.

Now this applies to the transportation cost in the West. The price of freight

cannot sink below the cost of the maintenance of the roads, plus the wages of the labourers employed, plus a fair rate of interest on the invested capital. It stands to reason, therefore, that railway competition, which means the striving of two railroads for traffic which one of them can easily accommodate, is no cure for the railway question in the West.

Right here I wish to take exception to the attempt made by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this afternoon to justify three transcontinental lines in this country by calling attention to what has taken place in the United States. First of all, we have no evidence as to what conditions were in the United States when those roads were constructed, as compared with the conditions in Canada when our transcontinental lines were constructed. But what we do know is that so far as Canada is concerned the principle enunciated by Mill has not been followed in the construction of our railways but the same principle applied then as applies now. We have three roads to carry the traffic which one road could very well carry. Furthermore, if my information is correct, only two roads in the United States received financial assistance from the State, all the other roads having been built by private enterprise. In this country, financial assistance has been given to all the roads.

What the West wants is control of rates, and an abundance of freight and passenger traffic going over one line, for the greater the freight to the mile of railway, the easier it will be to meet all the necessary costs, and reduce freight rates. Control of freight rates, the reasonable construction of railways, with a view to tapping the widest exent of country, can only be effectively accomplished by Government ownership.

I come now to the great and supreme reason for the Government ownership of railways. First, I desire to say, as I have in a more or less indefinite way already said, that private ownership has not given us the railways which traverses our widely stretched territory to-day. All we have in the nature of railway accommodation to-day we have in virtue of the collective credit of the people, by the will of their appointed representatives. The Canadian Pacific, by far the most creditable railway undertaking in the country, was an impossibility but for the money loan of $29,880,912; the land grant alone was 31,762,054 acres.

I desire to give a few facts regarding the Canadian Pacific railway, inasmuch as the Liberal party at all times refers to it as the colossal and outstanding offence of the Conservative Administration. It is not difficult for me to show otherwise, and I tackle the task gaily. When the Hudson's Bay Company turned its rights to Prince Rupert land over to the Dominion Government, the area now comprising the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, was relinquished for the sum of £300,000 sterling, or $1,500,000. Our Liberal friends thought the price was enormous. The territory comprised at least 500,000,000 acres. The Canadian Pacific railway received a fraction of that, one-twentieth about, for the colossal work of building a railway into an unpeopled country. Some years later 6,793,014 acres of the most valuable and best situated sections were exchanged by the company for $1.50 per acre, or a total sum of $10,189,014. The total of it all is enormous, and taken in conjunction with the grant of 31,762,054 acres of land, given to the Canadian Pacific railway alone, shows what a sane and timely proposition the plank of government ownership of railroads really is.

Added to these considerations there is grave danger to the people in having the transportation facilities of the country in the hands of private ownership. We all owe our very existence, directly or indirectly, to transportation. An army of 150,000 men are employed on the railroads of this country. If we accept the usual statistical method of reduction, that number constitutes one out of every eighteen adult males in the country. The volume of freight per capita in the country is 15.3 tons and is steadily increasing, which is an evidence that the wealth production of the nation is progressing, and the aim of the legislators of the land is to see that only a minimum of that wealth is lost in wasteful competition. To do this, an endeavour should be made to scientifically lay out the necessary routes for our future railroad ventures. These should be chosen with a genuine conception as to the future needs of the country, and so as to make it possible to tap the great natural resources of the land.

I understood the right hon. leader of the Opposition to say this afternoon that the roads which had been constructed in this country had tapped great natural resources which had never been dreamt of. I submit that if the roads were constructed on that principle they were constructed in the wrong way. The policy of the Government should be to decide what country is to be tapped, and if proper supervision is exer-

cised the roads will be built in the proper direction so as to tap our natural resources. Furthermore, wise and economic supervision is necessary to reduce the vast number of railway servants, or rather to prevent them assuming any larger proportion to the other industrial factors in our population than at the present. I, therefore, believe that the transportation needs of the country can alone be thoroughly and cheaply met by the observance of the following principles:—

First, by a careful study of the country by surveying experts, as to the best routes for trunk and branch lines. The present method of paralleling and competing lines being utterly wasteful and inadequate to meet the real needs of the country.

Second, by construction by contract, aiming at efficiency to meet all weather conditions in the country, such contracts to be given by tender with rigid regard to the conditions.

In fine, Government ownership of railways has for its object the cheapening of transportation facilities, as I believe I have shown, making the shipment of freight, outgoing and incoming, so cheap that the results will be of greater advantage than the preceding method, and will consist in binding the peoples of East and West more closely together, of harmonizing the seemingly divergent interests, a policy which alone must be the policy of any governing body, the aim of which is to retain this vast land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, one nation and ultimately one blood.

I have already stated that so far as we have had ownership of railways by the Government the principle has not been attacked, but the objection has been raised that such ownership cannot be successful financially because of the dishonesty of politicians. This brings me to the consideration of the essentials of good government. We all admit that if a government is composed of rascals nothing which they can accomplish will be of any good. Therefore, the great and supreme essential of good government in every part of the world, no matter what country, no matter what the party of the policy concerned may be, is integrity of character on the part of the politicians who are entrusted with the power of government.

This evident truism is one which no one will gainsay in word, but which is unfortunately too frequently gainsaid in action.

Lying underneath every great national question, more important than any secondary question of national policy, there is this ever present query of the greatest moment: Are we sincere, are we honest, do we intend to use the power vested in us by the nation for the benefit of the nation or for the benefit of ourselves; are we more anxious to acquire surreptitiously a little wealth for the sake of the material comfort it brings than to indelibly impress the history of our land by an honest life and a career of unflinchable and undeviating integrity? The question involved is one which we hear frequently. It has become the stock-in-trade of those members of the preaching profession, who desire to awaken the slumbering fires of the nation's morality. We are in danger of losing its point and missing its reality and truth by hearing it only too frequently, but it is impossible for us to consider any great national question without starting out from it as a first premise, that is if we desire any valuable light and seek to arrive at any permanent conclusion.

Whatever may be the conclusions reached in this address later on, I feel that all present will agree with me as to the accuracy of this first.

No honest and sincere man believes that any executive should possess such power as the spoils system implies, and inasmuch as the promise of spoil to the party worker implies any insidious form of corruption, I believe that from the natural acceptance of the first premise, we are forced inevitably to adopt the second, which is this: Under any Government, Liberal or Conservative, the spoils system places a great difficulty in the way of political honesty, and must be reprobated by every patriot, whether Liberal or Unionist. I think that from this second principle no one among my hearers will dissent, and I believe that so far we all have a common basis of belief. I believe it is in accordance with the view of the members of this House that there is no difficulty in making the choice of a board which will be free from political influence. I regret that my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has made out such a poor case for himself during this debate by asking continually what we intend to do with the money that is to be voted. If the hon. gentleman went back a little into the history of the railway policy which has been pursued in this country, he would find his answer to the question, which is: We propose to vote money to cover the mistakes of the party then in power, which is represented in part by the Opposition of to-day, of which my hon. friend is a member. I believe that the right hon. the

Prime Minister has taken a most important step towards absolute public ownership, and I trust it will be a shorter time than he has given us reason to believe before some plan is worked out to take over all the railways in Canada, so that we in the West may be able to live in closer union with the people of the East as a result of cheaper freight and passenger rates.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada, in 1914, lent the Canadian Northern Railway $45,000,000, and took as security $40,000,000 of the common stock of that company, out of its total capital of $100,000,000. In 1917 the Government purchased the balance of the common stock of the company, namely, $60,000,000, at a price to be fixed by arbitration, the arbitrators being bound not to pay more than $10,000,000. The Government, by thus becoming owners of the whole of the capital stock of the company, should become absolute owners of the property. But a considerable portion of the mileage comprised in the Canadian Northern railway was acquired by that company through the purchase of the stock, and in some cases only the majority of the stock, of other companies, which had built smaller roads, such as the Halifax and Southwestern, the Quebec and Lake St. John and the Great Northern of Canada.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) recognized this situation when he introduced the legislation in 1917 to purchase the balance of the Canadian Northern stock. Speaking of the mileage represented by subsidiary companies—Hansard, page 4807—he said that the stocks of these companies held by the public, in which Quebec people are interested, included:

Canadian Northern Quebec (including Great Northern of Canada and Northern Consolidated Holding Company) for	$2,405,400
Quebec and Lake St. John Railway	521,200

A further examination of this shows:

Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Stock.

The total issue of stock by that company is	$ 4,524,000
Which is held by	
MacKenzie and Mann interests	$4,019,140
City of Quebec	220,500
English shareholders	152,800
Quebec people	131,560
	$4,524,000

The city of Quebec originally held $450,000 of this stock, for which it paid par, but surrendered 51 per cent of its holdings in 1900 to London people, so as to help the company to obtain new capital.

Great Northern Railway of Canada.

Total capital seems to be	
95,500 shares of $100	$9,550,000
Viz:—	
Great Northern Common Stock	$ 913,000
Great Northern Debenture Stock	650,700
Canadian Northern Quebec, Common Stock	5,637,000
Canadian Northern Quebec, Statutory stock	2,349,300
	$9,550,000

The holders are:

Northern Consolidated Holding Company, Toronto	$5,064,600
National Trust Company, Toronto; British Empire Trust Company, London	1,990,000
City of Quebec	200,000
Shareholders in Quebec, Boston, New York and other places	2 295,400
	$9,550,000

But, of the capital of the Northern Consolidated Holding Company, which holds in trust the majority of the above stock, only 45,759 shares are held by the National Trust Company. The paid up capital of the Holding Company being 61,815 shares, there remain 16,056 shares, which are held by people in Quebec, Boston and other places. These 16,056 shares are 25·97 per cent of the capital of the Holding Company, so they should be entitled to 25·97 per cent of its assets. Therefore, 25·97 per cent of the $5,064,600 of stock of the Canadian Northern Quebec, held by the Northern Consolidated Holding Company, are the property of individual shareholders outside of the Toronto interests. This would amount to $1,315,200. If to this we add the stock held by the city of Quebec, $200,000, and that held by individual shareholders not in the Holding Company, $2,295,400, the result is $3,810,600. These figures prove that of the total stock issues of the Great Northern of Canada and the Canadian Northern Quebec, amounting to $9,550,000 of paid up stock, representing the ownership of these roads, no less than $3,810,600, or nearly 40 per cent, is the property of individual shareholders, outside of the Toronto interests. From the foregoing it would seem to be equitable that the city of Quebec and the individual shareholders who own the minority stock of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway for $504,800, and of the Great Northern of Canada and Canadian Northern Quebec for $3,810,600, making a total of

$4,315,400, should share ratably, as stated in their petition, in what the Government may pay or may have paid, for the common stock of the Canadian Northern Railway, of which these roads now form part. Otherwise the minority shareholders should be entitled to a separate accounting by the Government, and share of annual profits for the mileage of the actual sections represented by their stocks, the mileage being about 500 miles.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, a very proper question to ask: The Government having purchased the majority shares of the Canadian Northern, why could not they have purchased the minority share for which the citizens and the city of Quebec subscribed? These shares, as it stated in the petition to which I have just referred, were purchased by private individuals and by the city of Quebec, and instead of acquiring them, the Government limited themselves to acquiring the shares held by Mackenzie and Mann. I submit, therefore, that the Government should give the most careful consideration to the request that has been made on several occasions for the purchase of this minority stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In answer to the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Lavigueur) I would say that the Act passed last session provides for the acquisition, not only of the majority shares, but of the minority shares as well. But it is only the majority shares that are included in the purview of the agreement between the holders of them and the Government and that are now the subject of arbitration. However, the Act provides that the Government may pay to the minority shareholders the same proportion which, under the arbitration, they will be held to pay to the majority shareholders. There are outstanding shares of the Canadian Northern Quebec, the Quebec and Lake St. John, and the Duluth, Winnipeg and Western railways that we did not acquire. The minority shares that the hon. gentleman refers to are minority shares in the Canadian Northern enterprises which are held overseas, and these minority shares can be acquired under the terms of the statute of last session. As to the minority shares outstanding in the smaller lines referred to, there is as yet no provision for their acquirement.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I know that no provision has been made to purchase the minority shares of these three subsidiary companies, but why should the Government have purchased the majority shares in other provinces, and left unacquired the minority shares of the three companies referred to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason is this: The Canadian Northern Company held among its assets only the majority shares, not the minority shares, in the three companies. Now the $100,000,000 of stock of the Canadian Northern of which we had already acquired $40,000,000, and which we acquired the other $60,000,000 last session, embraces only the property of the Canadian Northern. Consequently what the hon. gentleman refers to, not being the property of the Canadian Northern Railway Company at all, is not within the purview of this legislation. Perhaps later on the Canadian Northern Railway may decide to acquire those outstanding minority shares, but they have never as yet belonged to that company.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Only the importance of the transportation question would induce me at this late stage of the session to project myself into the present discussion. On the Budget debate I spoke at considerable length with reference to that question, and I crave the indulgence of the House to-night while I present a few figures, and refer in a brief manner historically to the subject of transportation.

I am sure it must have been gratifying not only to the members of the House, but to the country at large to have the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden) make the very important statement which he made this afternoon. I could not help but think that after all it may have been due to the pressure that has been exercised—at least to some extent—and undoubtedly to the uneasiness of the House generally with reference to this great question, as well as to the feeling that exists throughout the country as to the necessity of solving this problem, that the Prime Minister made this speech. Personally, I was extremely gratified, because Canada, in spite of herself, is face to face with the necessity of administering a large system of railroads under public ownership. As I remarked in the House the other day, I thought the courteous and able Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) probably slipped a linguistic cog when he said that Parliament last session as well as the country seemed anxious to take hold of the Canadian Northern. I was under the impression, and still am of the opinion, that that statement on the hon. gentleman's part does not represent the real condition of affairs. I do not think the House and the country have been anxious to take over the

Canadian Northern, or to take over any system of railways, in view of the conditions under which that taking over has to be done. The Prime Minister told us this afternoon that had Parliament not come to the rescue the road would have been forced into liquidation, and he expatiated on the injury that would have resulted to the public credit if this road had been allowed to go into liquidation and into the hands of a receiver. The Prime Minister's speech must have inspired the House with confidence in his earnestness and good intentions. But I say, with all due deference to him and to the late Parliament—if Parliament was responsible, but I prefer to put the blame on the shoulders of the late and old governments; I do not think the policy pursued with regard to the Canadian Northern was the right policy to adopt in the case of that railroad or of any other in a similar situation—it is not because of the action of Parliament or of the country that these roads find themselves in difficulties. The Canadian Northern for the last twenty or twenty-five years have been applying to this Parliament and to the Provincial Legislatures for aid to build mileage, and the reason they usually urge for that was that the people were clamouring for this accommodation. In my judgment, whenever a squeak was uttered by a settler for assistance, or for railway accommodation, the big noise and the real pressure came from the proprietors of this railroad. They were the ones that were anxious to build these lines of railway; they were the ones that besieged and badgered the federal and provincial Governments. They have been knocking at the doors of the Provincial Legislatures and of the Dominion Parliament for almost two decades and a half, and, in my judgment, the responsibility for the present situation rests with them.

If as the result of their manipulations, or of their failure to make a success of the road, they find themselves in great difficulties, find that they are unable to meet their obligations, on whom should the blame rest? Not upon this Parliament, not upon the provincial parliaments, not upon the people of Canada, but upon the railroad manipulators themselves. Then should they not have been obliged to take the consequences of their own folly? As a publicist, I have grown pretty tired of that old cry: "We must guard the credit of Canada." When the Byron Walkers and the other great "financiers," and the exploiters get into trouble they hold up their hands in alarm and say: "Lest the credit of Canada shall suffer, in Heaven's name, come to our rescue." And we, the people of Canada have been coming to their rescue for the last thirty or forty years. I am sure that as the House listened this afternoon to the words of the Prime Minister when he told of the campaign of raids that had been made on the public treasury by these exploiters, we must have almost blushed when we recalled that year after year these exploiters came and raided, and raided, and raided the public treasury. Are WE, therefore, to blame if, as a result of their own folly, they find that they have reached the end of their financial tether? Rather in my judgment would it be better, and I believe it to be the judgment of all thoughtful Canadians who have studied this question, that an example should be made of them, and that they should be obliged to take the consequences of their own folly. Why should this Parliament and this country be obliged to come to the rescue on every possible occasion to bolster up, say, the Bank of Commerce, and to help this or the other corporation to escape from the results of their own improvidence and folly? No. I say that this Parliament and this Government should stand solid and say: "Gentlemen, you have committed this folly yourselves, you alone are responsible, therefore you must take the consequences." Canada can take care of its own credit. Canada is a great nation, with marvellous resources, and we can afford to let one of these corporations go into liquidation, take the consequences of its folly, and by so doing we will put an end to a repetition and to all that kind of thing. We were under no responsibility, moral or legal, to take over the Canadian Northern Railway under the conditions that we have acquired it. Members of this Parliament—and we have not been very long in session—will recall debate after debate on the question as to the liabilities of the Canadian Northern railway. One day we are told that the liabilities—and it is spoken under your breath—are $300,000,000. A few days later we are told that the liabilities of this corporation have risen to $350,000,000, and, tell it not in Gath, we were supposed to stand aghast when we were informed still later that they were $400,000,000. And now, does the Prime Minister tell us from his seat in this House this afternoon that the liabilities are $300,000,000, $350,000,000, $400,000,000? No, they have risen in one jump to the astounding figure of $438,000,000. The right hon. leader of the House tells

us that we are to get this system of railroads at a price that will not be more than $44,000 per mile on the ten thousand miles which constitute the system. I can tell the Prime Minister that the system which the people of Manitoba constructed some twenty years ago, and which some years ago was acquired by the Canadian Northern, cost only $9,000 per mile to construct. Yet we are asked to rejoice over the great bargain that we are going to make in acquiring this system at a capitalization not greater than $44,000 per mile. The Prime Minister gave us figures to indicate that, while the liability was $438,264,377.67, the assets we would receive would amount to $528,427,000. Now, where that argument does not hold water in my judgment is here: If we take over the Canadian Northern system—and we have to take it over—the baby, as I said the other day, has been put on our lap to nurse; we were not the authors of the baby; we did not bring it into existence, yet it is going to sit squalling on our lap for the rest of time, and we must take care of it for all time to come. If we take over this system, as we must, what is the situation? Owing to the folly, the criminal folly of the exploiters who have manipulated railroads in this country for the last twenty-five or thirty years, we find that we have to take over this and other systems with an approximate mileage probably anywhere from a thousand to three thousand miles, which will not be of any practical use to the country at the present time, and which may not be of any practical use for a long time to come, if ever. Take the road built through the Mountains by the Canadian Northern. I suppose some hon. members are here who went over that railroad on that celebrated excursion two years ago. They must have been convinced of the folly it was to build through the Yellowhead Pass a railroad to parallel the Grand Trunk Pacific; at this stage of the country's development. And then to go down to Kamloops, down the valley of the Thompson river and parallel the Canadian Pacific system to the coast. In my judgment some of those duplications will not for a long time, earn enough to pay for the stationery to set down the quantity of axle grease that will be required on them. Then you have the other railroads built around the north shore of Lake Superior, which, of course, are for the present entirely superfluous, and in the case of the Canadian Northern railway, will not be a productive portion of the road, for, perhaps, years to come. Years ago, when my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in office and proposed the construction of the Transcontinental railway, I was very strongly opposed to that, and took a constituency and opposed his then Minister of the Interior, Hon.—now Sir,—Clifford Sifton, because I felt that that road was entirely premature,—and I hope to come back to that point later on. I then believed in the policy of my right hon. friend the leader of the present Government (Sir Robert Borden). He then announced, and took that position before the country, that what was required was not another road around Lake Superior or another road through the mountains, but that we should double-track the Canadian Pacific railway, take it over and establish it as a railroad highway, giving all railroads running rights over that portion of the road. You see the prudence of a proposition of that kind is that it would have eliminated the vast expenditure necessary to construct this Transcontinental railway, and while on this point let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the Transcontinental railway which we were assured by the Government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would only cost the country $13,000,000, has already cost $200,000,000. And while the people had nothing whatever to do with bringing this child into existence, we also were obliged to have it dumped upon our lap, and there it will squall for many decades. So that we have these systems unloaded upon the country, regardless of our desires and of our necessities. That is where the tragedy of our transportation problem comes in. It would be idle for me to enlarge upon this matter, although perhaps I may a little later on in my remarks refer to the responsibilities of different parties in the country for the unenviable position in which we find ourselves. I listened to a member of the Opposition the other day rail at this Government and at the former Government for the vast mistakes that had been made with regard to our transportation system. I could not help thinking that if hon. gentlemen opposite who took that view would look up the records of the Federal Parliament and of the provincial legislatures, they would find that in the matter of the responsibility for pouring money into the lap of these railroad exploiters and for establishing the present deplorable condition "honours" have been carried off by the other side. I am not specially referring to this present "other side" because there is not a very important "other side" here; most of the

Liberal party, as I said in a former speech, are indentified with this side. But it is not worth while indulging in recriminations against any particular set of politicians, because politicians—or "statesmen" if you will—on both sides have been equally responsible for the pouring of subsidies and subventions into the maw of exploiting corporations.

I should like to refer to one or two points made by the Prime Minister and by the leader of the Opposition. I will not say that the Prime Minister actually defended the arbitration proceedings now going on in Toronto, but he referred to them in a manner that led the House to conclude that he approved of them. At least he shares responsibility with the other side for the Act of the last Parliament under which the reference was made. I referred in a former speech to that arbitration. It did seem to me the height of folly. I could not conceive how public men, representatives of the people, with anything like a knowledge of the circumstances which have surrounded the building up of our transportation system, could agree—for I am sure the country does not agree—to a reference to arbitration of the question as to what amount should be paid to the Canadian Northern people for the crime that they, wittingly or unwittingly, have perpetrated against this country. They have unloaded upon us a system with a liability of $438,000,000—and that is far more than the system cost. They have the audacity—I do not know whether, Mr. Chairman, by consulting the dictionary you could give me a stronger word; if so, I should like to use it—to propose that the people of Canada shall contribute to them $10,000,000 as a reward for the outrage which they have perpetrated against the people. Perhaps I hold unusually strong views on this question, but I certainly hold that view, emphatically and unchangeably. If the decision is that they get $10,000,000 for the crime that they have perpetrated against the people, that amount will be added to the $438,000,000, making it $448,000,000; and we have only the financial figures of the Canadian Northern Railway up to last September; if you add interest and everything that may have developed since, God knows where we will be as to the actual liability when we meet in the next session of Parliament.

I said the other day that we were face to face with an appalling mess; but there it is; we have to face it. We have no option whatever in the matter. The babe is on our lap and we must nurse it. We must proceed in the most businesslike way in order to solve this difficulty. Here is the only way in which we can make any progress and success. We have the Canadian Northern system. We must take the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk. The leader of the Opposition warned us this afternoon that the old Grand Trunk was so loaded with obligations that we had better be very careful what we do with it. But the Grand Trunk is sponsor for the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we must take that child, because the Grand Trunk Railway cannot itself hold the babe much longer. I suggest that we make this experiment: never mind the credit of Canada and the financiers of Canada—the dozen or so alleged financial big-wigs who live in Toronto and Montreal; let them attend to their own business for a while and let the people who perpetrated this folly on the public take the consequence of their own actions. Let the Grand Trunk Pacific go into liquidation, and if the Grand Trunk cannot hold the babe let us take mighty good care that the Grand Trunk does not unload it on us at anything like the expense with which the Canadian Northern has been unloaded on us or with anything like the consequences. I reiterate this point about the credit of Canada. Personally, I have grown tired of hearing that oft-reiterated cry, and I think the people who do the paying—not who receive the dividends, mind you—are pretty well tired of it also. We want to settle this thing once and for all, We cannot borrow very much money in the markets of the Old Country now, anyway, because the war is on. We can do only what we are permitted to do by the British Government, and, perhaps, by the United States Government; so we need not fear anything about the credit of Canada suffering. Let the credit of Canada slide just for once, and let us have one showdown. Is it always to be a case of heads the exporters win and tails the people lose?

I do not know whether the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is perfectly satisfied. He asked me the other day to use my best endeavours to get the Government to adopt the recommendation of the Drayton-Acworth Commission that our national system of railways be operated by a commission independent of the Government, free from political interference and responsible only to Parliament, in order that patronage and political control or interference might be absolutely

eliminated. I said that I would use my best endeavour in the matter, and I have done so. I am not saying that because of anything I may have done to induce the Prime Minister to make the reasonably satisfactory announcement which he did this afternoon regarding the mode of management that shall be adopted. He came pretty nearly meeting my view. I hope he came as near to meeting the view of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). He did not say that the recommendations of the Drayton-Acworth report with regard to management would be adopted to the letter, but he came pretty close to it. He promised in unqualified terms that the Government would provide for a management and administration of that system that would be entirely free from political control or manipulation. I believe the Prime Minister is a man of his word, and I know this Parliament will hold him to strict enforcement of that statement. We must have no political management of that railway, no such management as has disgraced the administration of the Intercolonial Railway system ever since Confederation. I sometimes worry about my good friend the able Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). I have a good deal of faith in him. During my election campaign in the West I made strong use of his personality; I spoke about the stern old covenanter that would never strike his colours to the wrong, and yet, when I come down here, I find—and I hope I am not violating any private confidence—that he is not quite sound on this question of railroad management. I excuse him on the ground that he has lived in the Maritime Provinces probably all his lifetime.

Mr. CARVELL: I just want to put my hon. friend right. More than twenty times during the last fifteen years I have condemned the management of the Intercolonial railway. It is the most unbusinesslike proposition that I have ever known in my life. If the hon. member will look up the pages of Hansard, he will find I have gone further than he will in regard to the management of the road in the last twenty-five years.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me if he thought for an instant that I was impugning his position on the question. If he had given me time, I would have excited his delight that I had made the reference. I was only pointing out that while he had lived in Sodom and Gomorrah so long, he had, like Lot seen so much of it that he had become disgusted with the system and felt that it could never be improved under public ownership.

Mr. CARVELL: No, he has not.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. gentleman says that the Intercolonial Railway has been very badly managed, and he has not scrupled to denounce that management. Of course, it has been badly managed. You could not get anything worse on this side of Hades—if that is a parliamentary term. The whole trouble is this: The Intercolonial Railway was built as a condition of Confederation. When these scattered provinces were formed into Confederation in 1867, one of the conditions was that a railroad system should be constructed at public expense through the Maritime Provinces, and that it should be linked up with the rest of Canada, at least with Ontario and Quebec. In order to do that, it was necessary to construct the railway along the coast, touching a village here and there, and this, that and the other town, and it was built, not as a commercial enterprise, but as a condition of Confederation. Then it remained pretty largely, with an occasional inter-regnum when an effort for improvement was made, in the hands of politicians and under the control of a political department. Need I invite this House to look at the spectacle that was enacted in the last Parliament when the Chief Whip from Nova Scotia threatened to resign because the management, in its best judgment, appointed somebody to a position on that road, and the Whip had not been consulted, and because party considerations had not been paramount, as indeed they have been paramount all these years? Let him resign. We have had, as the Minister of Public Works says, and as everybody who has studied the question knows, about the worst possible mismanagement of the Intercolonial that could be conceived, but it has all been due to political manipulation and control, and that is how my good friend the Minister of Public Works got the idea that public ownership is a failure. The reason why the Intercolonial railway has not been a success is that it has not been managed by business men.

Mr. CARVELL: It has been a failure so far.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, but let me point this out to the House and to the country that, during most of these years, the freight of the people of the Maritime Provinces has been carried over the Intercolonial railway at about one-third of the

rates that have been charged by privately-owned railroads in this Dominion. It is well to remember that when we consider the deficits of the Intercolonial. Consequently the people of the Maritime Provinces have reaped enormous benefits from this viciously and villainously managed railway, but we hope to take it entirely out of the hands of the politicians. The Prime Minister this afternoon gave his solemn pledge to this Parliament and this country, when he intimated that the Intercolonial railway would be linked up with the Canadian Northern Railway system: that it would be placed under the management of efficient men, and that political control or manipulation would be absolutely eliminated from it. I believe the Minister of Public Works will agree with me that we can make a success of the Intercolonial in that way, and only in that way can we make a success of it. The only regret I had, although it is not serious, because I hope that will be the policy adopted, is that the Prime Minister did not state definitely that the Drayton-Acworth report with regard to the management and administration of the State system of railways would be adopted. If those recommendations were adopted, the country would be absolutely sure that no political manipulation could creep into the management of the Government railway system. If hon. members have studied the Australasian railway system, they will know that the system of public ownership of railroads prevails almost entirely in the Australasian colonies. Those railroads are managed by commissioners appointed by the parliaments, not by the governments, of the different states, and who are responsible only to the parliaments; they can be removed only for cause or by impeachment, just as we remove judges in Canada at the present time. The railway systems there have been made a splendid success. There has not been that absurd, stupid, criminal competition between exploiters in the construction of railroads in the Australasian colonies that we have witnessed and suffered from in Canada, but the governments of those colonies have done exactly what the Canadian people and the Canadian Government and Parliament should have done. They have built their trunk lines and they build branches wherever the branches are required, in the interest of the settlement of the country.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The railways of the different states have different gauges, and you have to change passenger trains at the boundary lines of the different states.

[Mr. Richardson.]

Mr. RICHARDSON:: Just the same as you have different gauges of members in this Parliament, they will cavil at pretty nearly anything you say. But the gauges really do not make any difference. Let them standardize their gauges, whether they be large or small, if they choose. I am not referring to gauges here; I am referring to the administration of the system. There is always somebody who can pick a little hole in anything that any one says. Even the great Master, the great law-giver of Nazareth, had holes picked in his utterances, so I do not expect to scape absolutely scot-free in this discussion. I say the system of managing the roads there has proved a fine success, and if it has proved a success in these Australasian colonies, which, of course, are British, why should it not prove an equal success in this great Dominion, which is also British? I dislike very much to mention the name of Germany in this British-Canadian House of Parliament, and yet I am going to state that the railroads in Germany are managed entirely by the State. Do the members of this House know that three-fourths of the people of Germany have travelled for years and years on the German system of railways at a quarter of a cent per mile, while in Canada we pay on an average of three cents per mile, and with the recent addition to rates it may even exceed that? France has public ownership of railroads; so has Austria-Hungary, and so has Italy, and yet we are told even by so good a friend of mine as the Minister of Public Works—he did not actually say it, but I am afraid he sometimes thinks it—that we in Canada have not sufficient inherent honesty in ourselves to manage a Government-owned system of railroads. I would suppose that on the average we are as honest as the people of other countries, although a great railroad man in this country once told me that the Canadian people were more dishonest than the Chinese; he may have been right or wrong, but at all events if we put sufficient guards around ourselves, take away from the Government the power of interfering with the commission, and if we absolutely prevent political manipulation and control, we ought to succeed and surely we can get railway experts like Mr. Shaughnessy—Lord Shaughnessy, I should have said, but as the mover of a resolution to abolish all titles in this country I may be forgiven for making that slip—D. B. Hanna, Grant Hall, Sir George Bury, and other excellent railway operators now engaged with our big railway systems to work for the country. Surely, if we pro-

tect their positions for them, pay them satisfactory salaries, and give them such assurances that they will be satisfied we shall not interfere with them, we can get them to serve us just as they serve the privately-owned roads. I have talked to some of these men as well as many other competent railway operators and I know they would just as readily—some of them have said they would more readily—serve the people of Canada than a private corporation, because most of these men as, indeed, most of our Canadian people, have at heart the idea of service. The average man would like to render service to his country but these men in the past could not be induced to serve publicly-owned roads so long as they were subject to political manipulation and control, and I do not blame them. But if we adopt the recommendations of the Drayton-Acworth report and put our publicly-owned system under the control of a commission of the best available men, and protect that commission from political control, I am satisfied we could get the best railroad men in the Dominion of Canada to serve us; and well it would be if we could engage such men, because we are bound to embark upon this system, it may not be of our own choosing, but we are nevertheless up against the necessity of embarking on a great publicly-owned system of railways.

In order to make such a system anything like a success, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon, and as I have already told the House, we shall have to take over certain roads. We have to remember that owing to the absurd competition among these railroad exploiters, subsidy hunters, and manipulators, railroads have been built throughout the country that are entirely unnecessary. Many of you who have travelled over the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and the Grand Trunk Pacific in the West know that these roads parallel each other at close range for scores, if not hundreds of miles. Now, if we are to take this great combination of systems over—and we must do so—we must co-ordinate all these roads. We must eliminate every unnecessary mile in the whole system. We must eliminate the mileage that parallels some other road, and in the interests of the country we must operate only that mileage that is necessary for serving the people of this country. If we did that, we could probably reduce the mileage of these publicly-owned roads by twenty-five, or thirty, or thirty-five per cent. Then we would be face to face with this proposition. The average man may say, "You must charge rates sufficient to produce interest on the entire capitalization." Are we to charge rates on the Canadian Northern sufficient to produce interest on $528,000,000? Not so, because we are not going to be able to utilize all that system. We must eliminate at least thirty or thirty-five per cent of the mileage of the roads we take over. Then what must be done? We must strike from the national capitalization at one sweep the entire capital representing the mileage we eliminate. There is nothing else for it, because in no other way could we make the system pay. If we left the capitalization at the enormous figure which the exploiters would present to us as the cost of the roads, we could never pay the operating and maintenance expenses and proper interest on the capital.

Mr. CARVELL: How are we to eliminate any portion of the $438,000,000 represented by securities?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I can tell my hon. friend in one word—just wipe it off your book.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a pretty easy way of paying your debts.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend knows that the people of Canada share to some extent in the responsibility for this folly because they supported Governments and parties who did the wrong. It is the people of Canada through their representatives in the provincial legislatures and in this House who have enabled these exploiters to commit this folly. Then let the people of Canada take their loss, as they will be obliged to take their loss. We shall have to wipe off $100,000,000, or $200,000,000, or $250,000,000 from the books, and that is where the iniquity of this bonusing system through all these years to exploiters comes in. But there is only one way to do it. It will just represent that much loss to the people of Canada, and it serves them right because they have gone on conniving at this thing. They have been warned many times against it, but they have gone on just the same, and the people of Canada will just have to take their loss great as it may be. Then we shall have a publicly-owned system of railroads in this country with a vast mileage capitalized at what the system would have cost to construct under sane conditions. I know of no other way of solving this great question. When you have reduced the capitalization to what it would have been if the system had been constructed under sane and rational conditions, then

and then only can you establish a rate that will be just to the people of this country. I believe that if we co-ordinated these railroads, if we eliminated waste and duplicate mileage, and reduced the capital to proper proportions, we could establish both freight and passenger rates on this nationally-owned system that would produce operating expenses and maintenance charges, as well as a good return on the capital that was actually required to produce the system; and in my judgment we could have a very much lower rate than we have at the present time.

My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) contrasted the cost of the Canadian Northern Railway system, which he placed at $44,000 per mile, with the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. The cost of the Intercolonial railway, he said, was $65,000 a mile, the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific was at the rate of $100,000 a mile, and the cost of the Transcontinental railway was at the rate of $90,000 a mile. If you add interest up to the present time on the latter it would increase that cost to $110,000 a mile. In connection with the Transcontinental, I would like to put a question to the members of this committee. Do hon. members recall that, after the completion of the Transcontinental railway, the late Government appointed a commission to inquire into the construction of that road? Do hon. members recall that that commission found and reported that there was $40,000,000 of graft money in connection with the construction of the Transcontinental railway? No wonder the cost of the Transcontinental was run up to $90,000 a mile and $110,000 a mile if you add interest. There were many crimes perpetrated in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. Hon. gentlemen know something of the town of Transcona. If hon. gentlemen go to Transcona they will see something that will almost sicken them of the methods that were adopted in connection with the manipulation of the townsite terminals and shops there. The town of Transcona is in my riding. I have not time to tell the story, but there are at that place great shops built by the Government led by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and I understand that those great shops are not being properly operated at the present time. The tragedy of the town of Transcona is one of the iniquities in connection with railway construction in this country. That is a long story and must be told some other day; I have not time to tell it to-night. In connection with the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, look at the hotels that were built, all at the public expense. It is our money that was used in this folly; it is our money that was used for the construction of these hotels. There is a great hotel in Edmonton and another in Winnipeg. I saw a report the other day that so great was the loss in the operation of these hotels that the Government contemplate closing them both down.

This country has been on a dreadful spree for the last twenty-five years or more in regard to its railway policy, an orgy that some day will have to be written up. We have had booms in this country and people have been too busy to pay special attention to the great transportation question. As a result these dreadful follies have been committed, and the country is face to face with the consequences and will be obliged to deal with the situation in the

10 p.m

sternest fashion. I have observed in this House, within the last few weeks, a feeling of uneasiness on the part of a great many hon. members in regard to the transportation question, and I believe that feeling only reflects the uneasiness that exists among the people. No wonder hon. gentlemen have risen in their places day after day and have wanted to know when the Government is going to take control of the Canadian Northern Railway system. No wonder we are anxious to see this road placed in the hands of an independent board of expert railway men, in whose integrity and ability we may have implicit faith. No wonder the country is anxious to see this great system placed under the control of such a board. I believe the people are beginning to waken up, and to waken up in a lively manner, to the real consequences of the folly that we have been indulging in for the last twenty-five years. I believe it is because the country is beginning to waken up that the Government is moving, is ready to acquiesce in, and to comply with, the wishes of the House and the country. It is because of that feeling in the country that I wish to raise my voice and to bring my influence to bear, to induce the Government to get to this question as rapidly as possible and to find a solution for it. That is the excuse I have for rising in this House as frequently as I have done in connection with this railway situation.

One word in regard to the position which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took in

his address this afternoon. He instituted a comparison between the Dominion of Canada and the great Republic to the South. He said he did not believe that three transcontinental lines were too many for Canada because the people of the United States had seven transcontinental lines. I could not help thinking that there is no parallel between these two cases. There is this point of difference, however, that the seven transcontinental lines that stretch across the American continent south of the 49th parallel were built almost entirely, except in one or two cases in which some land assistance was given in the early history of the country, at the expense of the owners—the stockholders and the bondholders. That is what has happened down there. In addition to that they have a population that enables them to support these seven transcontinental railway lines. But, Mr. Chairman, the three transcontinental railway lines that cross this North American continent in Canada were built by the people of Canada. The people of the Dominion have paid dollar for dollar for every foot of railway that has been constructed within the bounds of the country and yet we do not own these railways. We do not need three transcontinental railway lines. I could go on by the hour telling you about the grass and shrubs growing along the line of the Transcontinental and of various portions of that road which are not even being operated. We have tossed $200,000,000 of the people's money into this Transcontinental railway and of what use is it to us at the present time? It has been built a long way ahead of the time when, if ever, it will be required. I believe that if the policy enunciated by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister years ago of contenting ourselves with only one transcontinental railway around the north shore of Lake Superior, to be taken over by the people and left open to all lines to run their trains over, had been adopted we would not have had an expenditure of $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 to face and grapple with at the present critical juncture of the country's history. We would then have had but one Transcontinental road, and what an enormous saving would have been effected in the operation of only one great system. We do not want a lot of railroad corporations. Let me tell hon. members this—and I have it from some of the best railway authorities that ever entered this country—that notwithstanding all that is said to the politicians, all that is said to members of Parliament, and all that is said to the people of this country about competition, you get no competition, absolutely none. The railroad companies of this country, and of this continent—in fact, the railroads of all countries—are a solid combination. Their officials meet from time to time and fix the rates absolutely between themselves. If one company's line is forty miles longer than another company's line between two given points, those two companies adopt the same tariff, so that there never is competition, and there never will be competition. So that the thing to-day is to get as many railroads as you can under one management, and if you have them under one management you save so much in staff, so much in salaries, and so much in administration, that it makes an enormous contribution to the success of a railway.

Just a word while it is in my mind with regard to the Canadian Pacific railway. I notice that my hon. friend the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) advocated that the Canadian Pacific should be taken over, and there are some people who say, "Let us take all the railroads over." In my judgment that would be the greatest mistake that the Canadian people could make in connection with the present solution of the issue. The Canadian Pacific railway is an entity in itself. It is a well-managed corporation—no keener or more efficient management can be found on this continent. But the Government system, embracing, as it will embrace, the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial, the Prince Edward Island railways, the Transcontinental, and the Grand Trunk Pacific railways, and the old Grand Trunk railway also, will touch practically all important points in the Dominion. What special object would there be in acquiring the Canadian Pacific also? We do not want two lines of railroad touching at the same points; let the Canadian Pacific go on just as it is. But if we take and co-ordinate this great Government system of railroads, and if we adopt the advice that I have offered with regard to capitalization, I want to assure the House and the country that we shall be able to adopt rates on the Government system that will compel the Canadian Pacific to reduce its present rates, and we shall be doing an inconceiveable service to the people of Canada. Let me illustrate what I mean: We have had in the city of Winnipeg for the last twenty years or more, a system of electric light and electric power, owned, by the way, by the same interests that control the Canadian Northern. The water power was developed on the Winnipeg river,

and transmitted some sixty or seventy miles into Winnipeg. Six or seven years ago—and it is worth while that every member should know these facts,—the people of Winnipeg, feeling, as they had a right to feel, that the rates they were paying for power and light were much too high, decided to develop a water power and an electric light system of their own. They procured from the Dominion Government what is known as the Point du Bois Falls on the Winnipeg river, and they developed that system at a cost of six or seven million dollars. Now, mark you, they cut the rates to one-third of what the people were paying at that time to the Winnipeg Electric Railway interests. Not only that, but they have had a yearly surplus of from $80,000 to $85,000, after providing for sinking fund and all proper expenses of operation for the last two or three years. They have saved, and are saving, the consumers of light and power in the city of Winnipeg $3,000,000 a year, so that in the last six or seven years the total saving to the people of that city has been over $18,000,000, because the other company was obliged to cut its rates and bring them down to the level of the rates charged by the public owned system. In other words, three times the cost of the entire enterprise has been saved to the citizens of Winnipeg. Now, if we adopt the plan proposed by the right hon. Prime Minister, and co-ordinate all these railroads, if we eliminate the useless mileage and wipe out the unnecessary and criminal waste which the public should not have to pay for, I believe we can duplicate the experience of the people of Winnipeg and largely reduce the rates that are in force at the present time. And the beauty of the proposition is that the great Canadian Pacific Railway, splendid road that it is, will be obliged to meet our rates, and then see what a saving there will be to the people.

Mr. McCREA: Will the hon. gentleman tell us what the rates in Winnipeg are for light?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have those rates in my desk in my room. I will send them to my hon. friend in the morning, if he desires them. They are so low as to surprise hon. members.

Now I want to imitate—if the House is interested, and I take it from the attention I have received up to the present time that it is interested—in a small way the example of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and give a brief history of the railways of this country, and in doing so to review briefly in the first case the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir John Willison, the able Toronto editor, declared in a publication, not so very long ago, that "the Canadian Pacific Railway bargain was the most insane bargain ever entered into by a free people." I just give that by way of preface. I have heard, in going about this country in the performance of my newspaper duties and as a public man, many citizens of Canada, who ought to have better sense, say, "What a debt of gratitude the people of Canada owe to the railroad corporations." I want before I conclude to-night to present such a case that no one in this country will ever repeat a statement that is so full of folly as that statement is. I do not suppose that the average member recalls the early history of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor do I suppose that the memory of the average member retains the circumstances of the great Canadian Pacific Railway scandal which startled the country in the early seventies of last century as a result of which $300,000 was transferred from the original syndicate, or those representing it, to the pockets of politicians and used corruptly. But we need not go into that to-night.

When the Government of Sir John Macdonald fell, I think in 1872 or 1873, the Government of Alexander Mackenzie succeeded, and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, with his Cabinet, undertook to construct as a public work a line across the continent to link up the province of British Columbia, which was a condition of the union of that province with the Dominion. Sometimes I think it would have been a great thing for Canada if the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie—that prime old Liberal, who loved his country, and who, as he told us in a letter, written by himself, had to sleep on his arms almost day and night in order to keep the exploiters at bay—had lived and continued in office. I believe then we would never have had this colossal and criminal folly to deal with of which I am talking to-night. The Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, during its regime of four or five years, continued with the construction of the Canadian Pacific as a publicly-owned railway, and they spent $35,000,000 in building certain sections of that road. When the Government fell, and Sir John Macdonald returned to power, he and his party reverted to the idea of a privately owned railway, and they handed over—and these facts may not be known to all members of this

House—to the Canadian Pacific syndicate this $35,000,000 of completed railroad as a present. They gave further to that syndicate $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land. I want to preface these remarks by saying that I am not here to criticise the Canadian Pacific railway, nor do I feel like criticising the bargain that was then made. The country was new; the Northwest was not opened up, and there was a big excuse for making a prodigal bargain. In fact, the public men of that day scarcely understood the nature of the bargain they were making. With that preface, I think we shall be able, perhaps, to consider this matter in a calmer and more judicial frame of mind. I want to say here, lest I forget it later on, that, with all that experience before us, with the statement of perhaps the leading publicist of this country that it was the most insane bargain ever entered into by a free people, I never could comprehend succeeding Governments continuing to reproduce this great folly in a more accentuated manner, making the conditions under which new roads were being constructed very much worse than those pertaining to the construction of the Canadian Pacific. They gave to the Canadian Pacific completed road to the value of $35,000,000 cash $25,000,0000 and 25,000,000 acres of land, on which the company had realized over $100,000,000, and still have remaining 11,000,000 acres which they estimate at a value considerably over another $100,000,000.

This land, as you know, was in a new unsettled country. But the Canadian Pacific syndicate was a live corporation. What do you suppose they did? They induced the Government in 1881-2 to set aside large tracts in the best areas of the fertile West from which they might select their land, and they subsequently did select their lands from those areas. So that, $35,000,000 of completed road, $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land from which they have realized $100,000,000 and on which they expect to realize $100,000,000 more, amount to $260,000,000, which is more than the original estimate of the cost of construction of this line.

Mr. CURRIE: What was the land worth at the time the contract was made?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Never mind what it was worth; I am telling you what they got out of it. I have not condemned the bargain made; there was a great excuse for it at the time. But I want to explode this absurd notion held by many that the Canadian people owe a debt of gratitude to the railroad companies.

Then we gave exemption of duties on the materials required in the construction of that road, which was a concession of enormous value at the time. In addition we gave from the public treasury large loans whenever the company asked for them. The time was when it was not the Canadian Northern which was rapping at the doors of Parliament; it was the Canadian Pacific, and this Parliament always came to the rescue of the Canadian Pacific when it required assistance. Here is something the people of this country perhaps never think of, or have no realization of. We gave the Canadian Pacific exemption from taxation upon all its possessions until Gabriel blows his trumpet. Based on the rate of taxation which exists in the United States, this concession amounts to the appalling approximate sum of $500,000,000 every thirty years. Just think of it. Perhaps you do not recollect all these things, Mr. Chairman, but the exemption from taxation on every dollar's worth that this company owns is worth to them $500,000,000 approximately every thirty years if you take the average rate of taxation prevailing in the United States.

I want to deal with a matter which I am sure will interest the House. When a company receives a grant in the old country it is a statutory grant, and a grant by statute is just as good as if the patents were issued for the land. When the contract was made in 1881, a clause was placed in it that:

> Notwithstanding any Act of any legislature or any municipality all the possessions of the company—

Now mark this.

> —all the possessions of the company, its roadbed, rolling stock, capital stock, station houses and station grounds, shall be exempt from taxation forever

Forever! That is a long time, Mr. Chairman. Now mark what follows:

> And the land grant shall be exempt from taxation for twenty years from the grant thereof from the Crown.

It was the understanding of Parliament at the time that while the appurtenances and possessions of the company would be exempt forever, the land grant would only be exempt from taxation for twenty years from the grant thereof from the Crown. I have explained to the House that when the bargain was ratified, the Government set aside the best agricultural areas through-

out the Northwest, from which the company might select their land grant. But the company did not take out their patents for this land grant at once. I was in Parliament the year before the expiration of this twenty years, and I had learned that the company had not taken out their patents, and had further learned that they proposed to contend that their exemption period should begin with the issue of their patents and not with the statutory grant from the Crown. Learning that, I introduced a Bill in the House of Commons some twenty years ago to interpret that clause. I read from speeches of hon. gentlemen who were in the House of Commons at the time the contract was ratified to show that it was the understanding of Parliament that the exemption of taxation on the land grant should only last for twenty years from the time of the ratification of the contract. I read from the remarks of Sir Hector Langevin, Minister of Public Works in Sir John A. Macdonald's Government. He said:

> Therefore in a very short time, the parish or municipality will be settled, and the exemption of taxation on these lands will not be felt, because the land remaining to be sold will remain there only until the settlement can be extended in that direction. So that after the twenty years what will remain exempted from taxation will be just the 100 feet in width on the length of the municipality.

It is clear that Sir Hector Langevin understood that the land grant would be taxable in twenty years and that the exemption from taxation would be only the 100 feet of roadbed.

Hon. Edward Blake, the greatest tribune of the people who ever sat in this House, spoke as follows:

> They have perpetual exemption—

He was referring to the Canadian Pacific.

> —from taxation on their enormous property, a monstrous provision, in my opinion; and this monstrosity is not to last merely twenty years, which is the period of bondage in other respects but it is to last forever.

Sir John A. Macdonald, in connection with the ratification of this contract, expressed the view that the Canadian Pacific, owing to the vast subsidies given to it by the people, would be able to carry freight at a very much lower rate—I think he said one-third—than that charged by privately-owned railroads. At that time I introduced an Act to interpret that land-tax exemption clause. I pointed out that the ink was scarcely dry on that contract giving the company a statutory grant of 25,000,000 acres of land when the company borrowed $25,000,000 in land grant bonds, and that the grant was as available for all the purposes of financing of the company as it ever was. But the twenty years expired, and when I introduced an Act to interpret that clause I was met, forsooth, with the most strenuous opposition on the part of leading politicians of this House. I regret to say that the present leader of the Opposition—I think at that time, certainly on one occasion—characterized me as a Socialist for daring to introduce an Act interpreting a clause in a charter and interfering with vested rights. I was prompted during my speech in the House by the late Hon. J. G. Haggart, member for Lanark, former Minister of Railways in Sir John A. Macdonald's Government, and I was able to state to the House that he had introduced an Act for the purpose of interpreting a clause in the Canadian Pacific charter, when it suited the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway company that that interpretation should be made. It happened that they wanted certain remission of duties on material that they had imported, and the Government of the day introduced an Act interpreting a clause in their charter and enabling them to make off with a large sum of money. But when I, in my humble capacity as representative of the people, asked that a clause in this charter should be interpreted in order that the interests of the public should be protected, I was denounced as a Socialist. The late Sir Charles Tupper, who was leading the Opposition, also denounced me in the grandiloquent language so characteristic of him, so that I met with opposition on all sides and was voted down. It was then that I was discovered to be a pestilent fellow, a danger to vested interests, and a menace to the country. As a matter of fact, I suppose that I was a menace to the big interests. But—I hope the House will forgive me this personal word—after the next election I was the only member of the entire 213 against whom a petition to unseat was pressed. All the other protests were sawed off and a conspiracy to drive me from public life was formed by the corrupt manipulators of the two parties who put their heads together to commit the crime. I had run as an independent candidate in the 1900 election. The Conservatives did not put up a candidate against me and supported me pretty largely. I served one session in that parliament, the protest could not be brought to trial before the House met. At that session I opposed a Bill—a Mackenzie and Mann Bill which was backed by the Conservatives—because I thought it was my duty to do so. That

act of mine was used for my political undoing at that time. The so-called Liberals —that is not Liberalism at all—put up the money, and the Conservative manipulators got the evidence to prove that teams had been hired in my election. Although my entire election expenses were sworn to as being less than $600 in a riding 125 miles long by 100 miles wide, I was unseated. forsooth, on the ground of bribery and corruption. While the judges who sat on that petition were considering their verdict, a bribe was flaunted before them by the "kept" press of that day in the shape of an offer of a seat on the Supreme Court bench of this country for one, and the position of Chief Justice of Manitoba for the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Hon. gentlemen need not worry about my reference to the judiciary. Both the judges are dead, and if they are looking up to-night from where they are they will know the truth of what I say. The sequel is that I was unseated, and they both received the jobs suggested in the "kept" press. This is the first time I have ever made any public statement with regard to this matter. It should be a warning to any young member of this House who may ever be tempted to stand up for the right against the power of party so often exercised in the past for evil purposes. But I think the time is past when a conspiracy of that kind can be repeated and carried out successfully. I believe that a better day has dawned in this country. More independence prevails. On this side of the House we have men who belong to different schools of thought, but they speak their minds on public questions with freedom and frankness. What is a free Parliament if it is not a body which gives to those who sit within it the right to represent the interests of their constituents? But under this system of ours we have witnessed the spectacle for the last forty or fifty years of a solid phalanx sitting to the right of the Speaker—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nesbitt): My hon. friend is very interesting on the railway question; and I would suggest to him that he adhere to it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The point which I was making was in connection with the railway question. We have on this side of the House a splendid galaxy of men who are united in seeing that the Government does the best it can with this railway question. I was leading up to that point, but, perhaps, having been a partisan in the old days yourself, Mr. Chairman, you may be inclined to a little extent to overlook these things. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the member for North Simcoe has stolen my glass of water. The Minister of Public Works says that my wind is all right; notwithstanding that reminds me of a story. On one occasion the late Hon. George Brown was making a speech in Peterborough. It was very warm; and he was drinking a large quantity of water and was waving his arms about and gesticulating wildly, when an Irishman in the audience said: "Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I ever saw a wind-mill run by water."

To conclude that point of my argument about the taxation Bill that I was unable to get through the House—I mean my Bill to interpret the tax exemption clause—I think I got six or seven votes to ninety-nine, so that you see the representatives or the "mis-representatives" of the people at that time were pretty solidly lined up with the corporations. We, however, got from the Government of the day a pledge that they would issue the patents to the railroad companies for their lands, and that they would refer the question to the courts for interpretation as to whether the exemption should date from the ratification of the contracts or from the issue of the patents. I pointed out at that time upon the floor of the House that that was a dangerous thing to do; that if the reference were made to the courts of this clause the courts would take cognizance only of the actual wording of the clause, and the last act I performed in Parliament before my undoing by virtue of the conspiracy referred to, was to move a resolution that, when the reference was made to the courts, the courts should be requested to take cognizance of the understanding of Parliament when the contract was ratified. I think that was a reasonable proposition. My resolution was, however, voted down on that occasion, and the reference was made to the courts—with what result? That the courts did exactly as I predicted they would do; they rendered a decision that the exemption from taxation should bear date from the issue of the patents. Therefore, the Canadian Pacific railway had another twenty years' exemption from taxation on this enormous land grant. Do hon. members realize what this exemption from taxation has meant and means to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? The other night

I made an estimate that that taxation would be worth, on an average, $2,000,000 a year, and as it runs, or will run, for forty years, if you compound the interest the exemption in that connection alone would probably amount to $100,000,000. About $50,000,000 at least could have been saved to the people of this country if my advice had been taken on that occasion. There is in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter a clause that is known as the ten per cent clause. Let me read it :

> The Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, respecting tolls, is hereby extended so that such reduction may be to such an extent that such tolls when reduced shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway.

When I was in Parliament in 1896, 1897 and 1898 I was urged by some gentleman in Winnipeg to bring up this question of the ten per cent clause. The company at that time was charging excessive rates in the Northwest. I introduced a resolution that the Government should appoint a commission to find out how much money the country put into the Canadian Pacific and how much money the Canadian Pacific capitalists put in of their own. I made at that time on the floor of the House this argument, which, I believe, is a legitimate one, that in allowing them a profit of ten per cent, we should not allow them ten per cent profit on the tens of millions of dollars that the people put in, but that we should allow them profits only on the money they put in themselves. I need hardly tell the House—it goes without saying—that my resolution was voted down on that occasion by a parliament that seemed to be more considerate of corporations than of public interests. Let me, before I pass from the consideration of the Canadian Pacific, refer very briefly to the position which Lord Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, took in the manifesto which he issued the other day to the people of Canada, and which was first presented at the annual meeting of that railway company. He said in that statement that those who held the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway had paid on an average of $112 for every $100 of stock. When I read that statement, my memory carried me back to the first issue of stock of $20,000,000 which was distributed during the construction of the road amongst members of the syndicate and their associates at twenty-five per cent of its par value. This twenty million dollars worth of stock realized five million dollars, and this latter amount was set aside and was paid back to the purchasers of the stock in dividends at the rate of six per cent per annum par value, so that in four years they got back their own money and they owned the stock besides. That is pretty good financing. In 1883, also before the road was completed, there was another issue of thirty million dollars' worth of stock distributed amongst the members of the syndicate, shareholders and friends, at fifty cents on the dollar. Therefore, out of the first fifty million dollars of stock the company realized only twenty million dollars in capital, cash. This stock was also a paying investment for the shareholders, because even before the road was built, they received their six per cent per annum par value, and they soon received back more than they had paid for the stock, and they owned the stock besides. If hon. members have any desire to make fuller investigation and to check the figures I have given, they might look up the sessional papers of the day.

In addition to the aid granted to the Canadian Pacific railway, which I have already stated, over thirty million dollars were contributed to subsidiary companies. Provincial Governments granted to subsidiary companies of the Canadian Pacific railway twelve million dollars; British Columbia contributed 6,389,000 acres of land, which has netted the company an enormous amount of money, and they still own over 11,000,000 acres. They have realized from the sale of lands and townsites nearly $124,000,000, exclusive of the lands which the company still holds, and which cannot be worth less than $115,000,000 or $120,000,000. That makes a total public assistance to the company of $228,500,000. Then if you add $400,000,000 of the value of the taxation exemption, exclusive of land tax exemption for the thirty-five years the company has been in existence, it will bring the public aid up to the appalling sum of $628,000,000. If you add to that $125,000,000 for land, townsites, etc., already unsold, you have the surprising approximate figure of $753,000,000, which almost approaches the valuation that Lord Shaughnessy, in his recent manifesto, places upon the assets of the company to-day; which manifesto was, I think, issued for the purpose of serving notice on the Canadian people that if they nationalize the Canadian Pacific railway they must pay an enormous figure for it. I think the House will agree with me that the Canadian people are not under any very profound debt of gratitude, as some

would have us think, to the great Canadian Pacific Railway corporation.

I do not want to go into the figures of the aid given by the country to the Canadian Northern railway. We have had those figures almost ad nauseam. The Prime Minister, this afternoon, in his able resumé, gave to the House most comprehensive figures. I have already, earlier in the evening, dealt with that aspect of affairs.

Let us now take up the question of the Grand Trunk railway. It was in the early days when the old Grand Trunk railway was established in this country, and the union between politics and the railway corporations does not seem to have been as close or as direct as it developed later on. The total subsidies to the old Grand Trunk railway were thirteen million dollars. Many years ago the Government loaned this company fifteen million dollars which were never repaid, and this makes a total of twenty-eight million dollars. If you add these two sums and figure out compound interest upon them for the long period, the result will be a huge sum.

I promised earlier in the evening to make some reference to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, or Transcontinental line. The construction of this enterprise is perhaps the most insane upon which the Canadian people ever embarked. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, coupled with others in and out of the House who surrounded him in 1903, are responsible for this monstrosity. If time permitted, I should like to deal fully with the history of this enterprise, but it is not of such distant date that the country is not perhaps pretty well seized of the facts. In launching the project in Parliament, the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who was then Prime Minister, spoke as follows:

> It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; Heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels.

Let me recall to the House, the reply which the late Hon. Mr. Blair, who at that time was Minister of Railways in the Laurier Cabinet, made to the right hon. gentleman. Here are Mr. Blair's words:

> What does the right honourable gentleman mean when he says: "The flood of tide is upon us that leads us on to fortune; if we let it pass, it may never recur again"? What does the right hon. gentleman mean when he says: "If we let it pass, the voyage of our National life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows?" What does the right hon. gentleman mean when he says: "We cannot wait, because time does not wait?" I think, Mr. Speaker, and I say it with all respect to my right hon. friend, that it would have been as correct if not so poetic, for him to have said:— "We cannot wait, because Senator Cox cannot wait."

I shall not go further into the history of the inception of this enterprise. I would recommend hon. members to read up Hansard of that interesting period and learn what was said on the floor of the House about this preposterous proposition.

I want to repeat the point I made earlier in my remarks, that I do not believe anything is to be gained by indulging in recriminations with regard to the responsibility of this or that party for the condition of affairs we find at the present time. As I have already said, all parties are almost equally responsible, and the best thing we can do is to get behind the right hon. leader of the Government in endeavouring to evolve a satisfactory national state-owned system out of the roads that must in a very short time come to us, and some have already come. I believe that that object can be accomplished very much more easily by a Union Government than I believe that the country is seized of the seriousness of the situation, and I believe seriousness of the situation, and I believe the Government also notwithstanding the stress of work due to its multitudinous and exacting duties also realizes how serious the situation is. I believe the speech which the right hon. Prime Minister delivered this afternoon must have convinced the country, as it certainly convinced members of this House, that he at least is fully seized of the importance of the whole question, and that he and his Government propose to solve that problem in the near future in a manner that I trust will redound to the interest and credit of the country. I should like to see the Canadian state-owned system of railways placed at as early a date as possible in the hands of such a management as was foreshadowed by the Prime Minister this afternoon and as recommended in the Drayton-Acworth report. I believe the importance of the question necessitates the earliest possible solution. Speaking for myself, I am very much gratified to find that the Government as represented here this afternoon in the very able deliverance by the Prime Minister is fully alive to the importance of the whole question and has resolved to apply the solution at the earliest possible date.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: At this late hour and at a time when we are all anxious to conclude the work of the session and get away as soon as possible, I would hesitate

to rise and say anything on this question but for the fact that I feel, like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that this is one of the burning questions before the people of this country, and one to which we should all at least endeavour to direct some attention in order that the best possible solution may be found of the railway problem in this country. If I were to follow the remarks of my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) I would be compelled to disagree with many of the arguments he advanced and with many of the conclusions he reached. But it is not my purpose to deal with his remarks. I wish to direct my attention to what the actual condition is with regard to the whole railway situation in this country and see if I can offer any suggestions that will assist in finding a possible solution. In passing, I might say that I entirely disagree with the gloomy picture my hon. friend from Springfield drew of the future of this country when he left it to be understood that in his opinion the development of this country would never be such as to make necessary the railways we now have projected from one end of the country to the other. I heartily agree with what was said in that connection by the right hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon, because I believe the time will come, and come very shortly, when three transcontinental lines, properly equipped and operated, will be required to handle the traffic of this country. These roads may have been projected a little too soon, but let me point out this: In the United States they have a population of four hundred people to every mile of railway, whereas in Canada, according to the last census, we have only one hundred and eighty-five people to each mile of railway. Now, in order to bring our population, sparse as it is, up to the same standard in relation to railway mileage as prevails in the United States, we need to increase our poulation just up to sixteen million people, and I do not think it is a very far cry to the day when we shall have sixteen million people in this country. I am assuming for the moment that our railway mileage should be proportionate to our population, but when we remember that our population is spread over an area as large as the United States, I think the argument will not hold water that population proportionate to railway mileage is a fair way of determining what our mileage should be. I would point out to the hon. member for Springfield that whereas in 1896 the gross earnings of all the railways in Canada serving the territory now being served by the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental was $38,000,000. in 1916, or just twenty years later, they had increased to $160,130,786. I would also like to remind my hon. friend that I had the privilege of running a locomotive on one of these transcontinental railways during the year when the first 1,000,000 bushels of wheat was hauled over the Canadian Pacific, then the only transcontinental railway in existence from the head of the lakes to the seaboard. In the first year when they hauled that 1,000,000 bushels of wheat it was an event in the history of this country. During this last winter 1,000,000 bushels of wheat was moved out of Fort William in one single day. If we had had the facilities to carry the traffic there would have been two or three million bushels of wheat being moved daily at some periods during the winter just passed. I have read a statement by a gentleman, who takes a position very similar to that of the hon. member for Springfield in regard to this question, that there have been wheat and flour stored in the West for years because there have not been railway facilities to get it out. I do not believe that is so, but it is just an evidence of the extreme statements that men will make when they undertake to bolster up a position that requires an extreme statement to support it.

I would like to refer to the position of the railways in this country with regard to what they have cost and what they must earn. The value of a railway property can only be estimated, providing it has been projected with a reasonable degree of common sense and properly built, on the basis of its mileage cost. We have in Canada approximately 40,000 miles of railway and in connection with these railways the Canadian people have paid $956,085,581, exclusive of the Intercolonial railway. The Prime Minister gave us some figures with regard to the Intercolonial this afternoon and placed the total investment in that road at $137,184,199.62. My own opinion is that it would be difficult to find a group of chartered accountants in the country who could determine what the Intercolonial has cost this country, if you figured it out on the same basis as that on which any private institution would figure it out. The question is: What have we got for the expenditure of this money? Let us take the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian

Pacific, the Transcontinental, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, dealing with each separately.

The Canadian Pacific is the most complete, most efficient and the most economically operated railway system in the world. I wonder whether my hon. friend from Springfield knows that it is part of the system of railways that gives the cheapest transportation that is given anywhere in the civilized world? The Australian railways were referred to as an example of the success that may be made in
11 p.m. the operation of publicly owned railways, and the question was asked if they could do that in Australia why could not we do it in Canada? It costs the people of Australia two cents per ton mile for every ton of freight that is moved while it costs the people of Canada three-quarters of a cent per ton mile for every ton of freight that is moved. That shows how successful they are in the operation of state railways in Australia. If you refer to the Drayton-Acworth report you will see that that is the system of railways that is held up by all those who advocate public ownership of railways as the best and most economically operated system of railroads in the world.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the rate which is just quoted apply only to the Canadian Pacific or is it a general rate in Canada?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: A general rate in Canada. It averages three-quarters of a cent per ton mile as against the Australian rate of two cents per ton mile and that is the lowest rate on any Government-owned railway that we have any record of. I am not going to refer to Germany in this connection. You cannot compare anything that is done in central or in eastern Europe with what is being done in Canada. We are not going to pay our railway employees, or any other class of men, the wages they pay their men in Germany and that, in the last analaysis, is how we will have to determine what the cost of these respective services are.

The question that confronts us now is how best to get out of a situation in which we find ourselves as a result of our own mistakes or the mistakes of the people of Canada. In what I am going to say I want to emphasize what the hon. member for Springfield has said. I am not going to attribute to any particular group of people responsibility for the position we are in. The only thing for us to do is to try and find some way of getting out of that position. In order to determine what that position actually is, it is necessary that we should know what the capitalization of our railways is and how much money it is going to cost to bring them up to a state of one hundred per cent efficiency. I will take the Grand Trunk railway first, because, after all, the Grand Trunk with its subsidiaries presents the most difficult railway problem with which we have to deal. The Grand Trunk railway proper, with a mileage of 3,331 miles, has a total outstanding liability of $424,169,310. According to the figures given by their own experts and engineers, they require $51,000,000 at the present time for betterments and equipment, making a total of $475,169,310 or equal to $140,000 per mile of the total mileage of the railway. The Grand Trunk Pacific, with a mileage of 1,964 miles cost, according to the figures given by the Drayton-Acworth report, $197,129,387. The total cash and bond guarantees, which constitute a direct liability which the Canadian people must carry whether they like it or not, amount to $127,939,888. The Grand Trunk Railway Company proper is responsible for bond guarantees and cash that has been put into this road amounting to $69,189,499. The Grand Trunk Railway Company are also a party to the bond guarantees for which the Canadian people are responsible. In addition to that amount of $197,129,387 there were advances made to the amount of $7,500,000 making the total cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific $204,629,387. The estimated amount required to complete the road is $25,000,000, so that for the road itself with its present equipment we have a cost of $112,000 per mile.

In this connection I am going to give an estimate of what is required to bring the Transcontinental railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railways up to standard.

I take the Canadian Pacific as the standard of what is required by way of rolling stock and all the facilities necessary to operate a railway. What is required to purchase equipment that will bring the Grand Trunk Pacific railway up to standard is $21,358,500, a total of $250,987,887, or approximately $128,000 per mile. It may also be noted that in addition to the above the Grand Trunk railway of Canada is contingently liable to the Government of Canada on bond guarantees totalling $54,900,481. The National Transcontinental, another subsidiary of the Grand Trunk railway, has cost, when all the outstanding liabilities are covered, approximately $200,000,000, equal to $110,000 per mile on a total mileage of 1,811 miles. To furnish the locomotives

and equipment necessary to bring the road up to standard will require $26,259,500, making a total of $226,259,500, or $125,500 per mile. To recapitulate: With regard to the Grand Trunk and its subsidiaries we find that the Grand Trunk's present liability for the 3,331 miles of railway is $475,169,310; for the Grand Trunk Pacific it is $250,967,887; for the National Transcontinental, $226,259,500, or a grand total of $952,416,697 for a total of 7,104 miles, equal to $134,000 per mile on the total mileage, presenting, in my opinion, a situation that it will be utterly impossible for the Grand Trunk or any privately owned railway to meet, because the railway can never earn, in competition with railways that have been built as they should have been built, a sufficient amount of money to pay the cost of operating, and keep up the equipment, and pay the interest on that enormous overhead charge.

Now the question may be asked, what remedy can be suggested for the Grand Trunk railway problem? The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) suggested writing down the liability, and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) interjected a remark that would lead me at least to conclude that he, for one, did not think that was possible. But if we are going to deal with the railways of this country as a business proposition—whether we operate them as publicly owned, or privately owned, institutions—there is no other way out of it. If they were in the hands of a receiver, that is the first thing that it would be necessary to do—to write down the overhead liability and bring the railways down to a business basis. Now I have made a valuation of the Grand Trunk railway, and its subsidiaries, on the basis of $60,000 per mile for the Grand Trunk railway, and $55,000 per mile for the National Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and you will notice that in doing that I have put the figures very high—higher than some hon. members who have spoken here in connection with this subject would lead us to conclude these railways could possibly be worth. But in putting those figures I have included what, in my judgment—after consultation with the most practical men I could get in touch with—will be a sufficient amount of money to bring these railways up to standard, both with respect to roadbed and also equipment. I have placed a capitalization of $60,000 per mile on the Grand Trunk proper, and $55,000 per mile on the other lines, and it simply works out like this: On the basis of $60,000 per mile the Grand Trunk would stand a capitalization of $199,660,000. The National Transcontinental at $55,000 per mile would stand a capitalization of $99,550,000. The Grand Trunk Pacific at $55,000 per mile would stand a capitalization of $100,370,000, a total for the group of $405,785,000. Meaning that we have to write off from the Grand Trunk proper, all their present outstanding liabilities. And in that connection let me say that I am in hearty accord with the statement of the leader of the Opposition this afternoon, that if we ever take over the Grand Trunk railway it will be necessary to scrutinize those outstanding liabilities, or we will find ourselves loaded up with something that we cannot possibly take care of, or something on which the railway itself can never earn an income. The situation narrows itself down to this: to put that group of railways on a business basis we must write off from the old Grand Trunk $266,480,000, from the National Transcontinental $70,000 per mile, or $127,656,000, and from the Grand Trunk Pacific $144,572,000, or $538,708,500 all told. Now leaving out the old Grand Trunk entirely, I would just like to ask one question: Why should we not write off from the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, the sums that I have indicated, being approximately $70,000 a mile. There is not a man in this House, I do not believe that there is a man in the country, who has given the question any thought, but will agree with me when I say that we deliberately threw that money away and we knew that we were doing so, and the Grand Trunk railway of Canada, the parent system, was contingently liable with the Canadian people. I would put it this way: The Canadian people are primarily responsible for the waste on what is called the Transcontinental from Winnipeg east, with the Grand Trunk shareholders contingently liable. For the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert the Grand Trunk railway is primarily, liable with the Canadian people contingently liable, because they were each supposed to be a check on the other, and when the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, who was, I understand, an official of the Grand Trunk railway, entered into an orgy—and it was nothing more or less when grafting contractors were permitted, or enabled, to steal $70,000 per mile on the whole mileage, for in reality that is what it amounted to—the Grand Trunk should be compelled to suffer with the Canadian people. And

while the Canadian people were primarily responsible for the National Transcontinental railway, and they must bear the burden, the Grand Trunk was responsible for the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let me repeat also that if that group of railways are ever to be operated as a business proposition the capitalization has got to be written down in order to put them on the same basis as other railways that are operated in competition with them.

Now, let me refer for a moment to the Canadian Northern about which so much has been said. I have no brief for any man who is connected with the Canadian Northern, I am not quite sure that I have ever seen a number of the people to whom reference is frequently being made in connection with the construction of this railway, but I am going to say this about it, and in doing so I challenge contradiction: You cannot find anywhere on the continent of America, another railway with the same mileage, and the same equipment, that was built for the same amount of money as the Canadian Northern. Whether there was grafting in connection with this railway system or not, I do not know. Whether Mackenzie and Mann made a profit of it, I am equally ignorant, but I do know that you can trace the record of all the railways on the North American continent and you cannot find one—including the Canadian Pacific—that has been built and equipped as cheaply as the Canadian Northern. And if the Canadian people take over, as they have already taken over, the Canadian Northern, and put its management in the hands of a group of practical men, they have a railroad property as valuable as any on the American continent based on its mileage cost. I do not know all about the Canadian Northern, but I do know what many people have said with regard to it. I can quote from speeches made in this House by the Minister of Railways and Canals in former days, in which it was stated that the Canadian Northern had the most ideal group of freight and traffic gathering railways in the Canadian West. They have not such a complete group in the East, but they could project their mileage if it became necessary on the same basis. Let me repeat again: after the road has been taken over and put into a state of 100 per cent efficiency, the Canadian people will have one of the most valuable railroad properties on the American continent based on its mileage cost. I am going to give the figures. I am taking the outstanding liabilities at $400,000,000. It has been stated here this evening that they are $438,000,000, but I am putting them at $400,000,000. The Drayton-Acworth report states that $40,000,000 is required for equipment, cars, locomotives, etc. That report also states that betterments, including terminals, will require $30,000,000. I have gone into this very carefully, as I said a few moments ago, with men who, I believe, know something about the railway situation, and I have determined that the Drayton-Acworth report did not provide nearly a sufficient amount of money to complete and equip the Canadian Northern and to bring it up to efficiency. This is what I have figured would be required additional to bring the system up to standard and to provide the necessary terminals and connections, namely, $65,000,000, instead of $30,000,000 estimated in the report. The estimated additional amount for rolling stock is $85,000,000, instead of $40,000,000, making a total of $550,000,000. If you wish you can add to that a total of $50,000,000 for contingencies which have not been taken care of, and you have the railway then at $60,000 per mile. I will give the distribution of the figures as they have been worked out as to what is necessary to bring the present mileage up to standard:

Railway fastenings and railway ties on the basis of difference in weight of rails now in use and those required to bring the whole mileage up to standard	$ 14,605,000 00
Ballasting, ditching, etc	15,000,000 00
Roundhouses, coaling plants intermediate terminal facilities, way stations, trackmens' houses and general maintenance of way equipment	13,395,000 00
Main terminal facilities, and interchange connections	22,000,000 00
Locomotives of all classes	30,000,000 00
Cars of all classes	55,000,000 00
Total	$150,000,000 00

As I say, you can add to that $50,000,000 for contingencies which have not been taken into account. These figures have been very carefully gone over by railway experts, men who have worked them out in comparison with the equipment standard and roadbed of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. CURRIE: Are those figures based on present-day cost?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: These are present-day prices. Another point in connection with this is that, in addition to the railway, the people of Canada, have in

the Canadian Northern, a considerable amount of valuable assets. They have grain elevators at the head of the lakes, capable of taking care of 10,000,000 bushels; they have six lake steamers plying on the Great Lakes; there are the Canadian Northern Telegraph and the Great Northwestern Telegraph companies with 1,500 offices; and a variety of subsidiary assets which go with a railway of that character. Let me repeat again: you can investigate conditions as you will, and if you can find another railway on the American continent brought up to that standard at a cost of $60,000 a mile, you will have found something that I have been unable to get any information of. My honourable friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) this evening referred to the Canadian Pacific as having cost $46,000 per mile, and he used one set of figures given out by the President of the Canadian Pacific in the last annual statement; but he entirely overlooked in the same statement what was given as the total cost of the road. The cost of the Canadian Pacific, including $131,000,000 of earnings put back into betterments and equipment, was $818,000,000, or $61,000 per mile for the whole system just as it is. The capital stands at $61,000 per mile for the system.

Mr. CURRIE: Do these figures provide for double-tracking the Canadian Northern?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: No, the figures I have given will not double-track the Canadian Northern, but will put that road and its equipment on a basis equal to what the Canadian Pacific is on. And it will cost the Canadian Pacific $10,000,000 to get its grades between Port Arthur and Sudbury equal to those of the Canadian Northern between the same points. I know what I am talking about, because I have been over both lines; and I know what the Canadian Pacific is figuring on in connection with that line.

A great deal has been said with regard to what the Canadian people have put into the Canadian Pacific and what the Canadian Pacific shareholders have put into it. If we were to judge by the remarks of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) we would come to the conclusion that the Canadian people had built the Canadian Pacific railway and presented the shareholders with many hundreds of millions of dollars in addition. You can investigate the figures from top to bottom if you will, and you will find that what the Canadian Pacific has received by way of cash subsidies and cash from their land grant, and the completed road that was given to them when they started, at a value of about $30,000,000, is $200,000,000 or $14,000 per mile on the total mileage of the road. The old Grand Trunk, which is supposed not to have received anything from the Canadian people, received more than $8,000 per mile as a cash bonus on the total mileage of their railway. As a matter of fact, the assistance granted to all of the Canadian railways is as follows:

	Per mile.
Grand Trunk	$ 8,400
Canadian Pacific	14,814
Canadian Northern	31,729
Grand Trunk Pacific	65,000
National Transcontinental	110,000

I would like to give the House some comparison between the earning capacity of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific; because it is worth considering when you have to stop and determine what the Grand Trunk is really doing for itself. The Grand Trunk has been earning for the last accounting period for which we can get any report, $10,983 on every mile of its road.

Mr. CURRIE: What date?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: 1916. The Canadian Pacific is earning $9,593 per mile on every mile. The balance in favour of the Grand Trunk is $1,390 per mile. The Grand Trunk earnings on the Canadian Pacific railway mileage basis would have been reduced by $4,630,090. The Canadian Pacific earnings on the Grand Trunk mileage basis would have been increased by $18,070,000. However, that is beside the point; the question we have to consider is how are we going to deal with this combination of railways and get an efficient transportation system economically operated with reasonable freight rates. Three proposals have been submitted, one of which is the nationalizing of all Canadian railways. I am opposed in principle to the nationalization of railways, because I do not believe that you can do with the biggest things in the country what you cannot do with the little things. While there is no other way out of it; while we have to make the best of the situation, the solution of the whole problem if it were possible, would be our getting back to the position we were in fifteen years ago and putting the railways into the hands of privately-owned companies under proper regulations.

It has also been suggested—in fact the Drayton-Acworth report contains this recommendation—that all the roads be turned

over to one large private company. I have prepared a group of figures to show what would be necessary both in the case of the present owners continuing as they are and in the case of a new corporation being formed to take over the entire group of railways. If the Grand Trunk undertook to continue and the sum of $100,000,000 were written off the National Transcontinental to cover the moneys squandered in the enterprise, they would still have to assume a present liability of $852,416,697 and in addition would have to find at least $100,000,000 in cash to put the system in a position to make even partial operation a possibility. They would continue to be handicapped by lack of traffic-gathering branches throughout the entire Canadian West. If the Canadian Northern railway undertook to carry their obligations, they would assume a liability of $400,000,000 and have to find in addition at least $150,000,000 in cash to make the operation of their system possible. If the two were combined in one group or company, as is suggested in the Drayton-Acworth report, the amount of $1,252,416,697 would have to be found, and, eliminating all necessary obligations, at least $150,000,000 to $175,000,000 would have to be furnished for equipment and betterments to put the roads in a position to make their successful operation a possibility. In other words, the total liabilities of the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the National Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern, assuming that the Canadian people wrote off $100,000,000 for what has been wasted in the Transcontinental, would be $1,252,416,697.

An hon. MEMBER: How would you write it off?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: You cannot do anything else but write it off. You have given it away and you cannot get it back.

Mr. McMASTER: You will have to pay interest on it.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: We will have to pay interest on it, but we cannot make the railroads earn that interest. If any one can devise a means by which the National Transcontinental as it stands to-day can earn the interest on $225,000,000, with 1,811 miles of railway in competition and with an overhead of charge of $61,000 per mile, he will find the solution for the whole problem.

Mr. McMASTER: If the Canadian people were the creditors of this amount, they could write it off; but the Canadian people are the debtors; therefore they cannot write it off.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The Canadian people borrowed a certain amount of money and put it into the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. For all practical purposes, they might as well have thrown it into lake Superior. When you come down to operate these railways as a business proposition, the liabilities which I have mentioned will be simply charged to the national debt and the people will pay interest on it, not because they put it into a railway, but because they permitted a group of grafters to get away with it. We are trying to get our railways down to a point where they can be operated as a business proposition, and we have to bring the capitalization down to a mileage basis in proportion to that of competing lines and to what the actual cost of the railway should be. It is not fair to ask the people who are paying freight and passenger rates on Canadian railways to pay interest on money that we deliberately threw away. Take, for instance, the case of the Grand Trunk proper, with liabilities amounting to $475,000,000. The Drayton-Acworth report, page 12, gives as the amount of securities outstanding against the 3,331 miles of the Grand Trunk as $424,169,310, and their experts say that they must have $51,000,000 in order to bring the equipment of the road up to standard. It is my opinion that $51,000,000 will not furnish the necessary equipment.

Mr. CURRIE: Page LXIV of the Drayton-Acworth report gives a statement of stock and share capital which the hon. gentleman has apparently overlooked. The grand total is about $240,000,000. The securities which may be regarded as a fixed charge against the company are the 4 per cent guaranteed stocks, £12,000,000, or, roughly speaking, $50,000,000. The only charge against the old Grand Trunk that carries with it the right of foreclosure is the 4 per cent guaranteed debenture stock. The rest represents guaranteed or preference stock and common stock.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If my hon. friend can purchase the Grand Trunk Railway system for $50,000,000, the Government would do well to employ him has their agent and start him out to do it right at once. I am simply giving the figures of the Drayton-Acworth report as to the outstanding liabilities of this road and the amount the Grand Trunk expert says is required to bring the equipment up to standard. As I have said, one of the

suggestions made in the Drayton-Acworth report is that some private corporation might be formed to take over this group of railways. If they do, they will have to assume a total liability of $1,252,416,697, and, in addition to that, find at least $175,000,000 in cash to equip and complete that group of railways just as they stand.

The next point is—what responsibility will the Canadian people, if they take over this group of railways, have to assume? On the Canadian Northern I have put the present liabilities at $400,000,000. That figure, as I have already stated, may not be exact. On the National Transcontinental, the Canadian people will have to assume a liability of $200,000,000. On the Grand Trunk Pacific, they will have to assume a liability of $135,439,888. In giving the House the figures for the Grand Trunk Pacific, I am giving simply the amounts on which the Canadian people have guaranteed the interest and which they will have to pay; I have not taken the amount that the Grand Trunk have put into the Grand Trunk Pacific, because, if the Canadian people take over the Grand Trunk Pacific, they have no more right to be called upon to make good the $69,000,000 that the Grand Trunk have squandered in it, than the Grand Trunk has to make good the $110,000,000 or $120,000,000 that the Canadian people have squandered in the Transcontinental east of Winnipeg. I would say to the Grand Trunk railway of Canada: If you are prepared to assume your own obligation and carry out the contract you made with the Canadian people by taking over and operating the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, we shall assume our liability and write off the hundred million dollars or so that we threw away, but you will bear the rest. If you are not ready to do that, we shall take over the whole thing at its value; we shall bear the loss that we ourselves are responsible for, but we are not going to bear a loss of money which you yourself squandered. I would say to them, in cold-blooded terms: Look to the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway who was responsible for the squandering of that money between Winnipeg and Prince Rupert. That is the position I would take, and the owners or directors of the Grand Trunk railway were responsible for leaving him in that position. On those three railways, that makes a total liability of $735,439,888, from which the Canadian people cannot get away. But for railway purposes the proper thing to do, as I have already said, is to write off the money squandered on the National Transcontinental.

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

The next point is: What additional liabilities will have to be paid for the Grand Trunk railway in order to take it over? The maximum liability that the Canadian people should assume in connection with that road is $199,860,000. That makes a total obligation of $933,299,888. The question at once arises—where are we going to get this enormous sum of money? In that connection it might be worth while to point out that we do not require to find a single cent so far as actual money is concerned. All the new money that is required is the money that will be necessary to complete the roads, equip them and put them in a position in which they can earn something. And we have to do that in any case.

There is a point raised by the hon. member for Springfield with regard to what might be done in the way of eliminating unnecessary mileage. If the Canadian people take over this group of railways, and I would say here to-night that, if we are going to do it at all, we cannot do it too quickly. The Minister of Railways and Canals is, I believe, searching the whole country in order to find steel rails with which to keep the necessary mileage in proper condition, but if the Canadian people take over that group of railways, I can tell him where he can get rails sufficient to lay 550 miles of railway. Without going west of Port Arthur, he can take up every mile of steel on the Canadian Northern from Sudbury to the city of Ottawa, and still, if the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern are grouped in one system, have a direct line between those two points. The Canadian Northern runs to Parry Sound and the Grand Trunk runs from Parry Sound to Ottawa, and the Canadian Northern parallels it all the way. I have not the mileage at my finger ends, but about 315 or 316 miles of rails from Ottawa to Sudbury can be pulled up to-morrow if the people are going to operate the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk together, and in my opinion those rails should be pulled up, whether we are going to take over those railways or not, because any traffic that comes over the Canadian Northern can be diverted at Parry Sound and brought down to Ottawa. Another 175 miles that can be pulled up without any dislocation of traffic is from Toronto to Napanee on the Canadian Northern. If the Canadian people are ever going to operate the Canadian Northern and the Grand

Trunk together, they will certainly never use two railways running in sight of each other for 175 miles, while one of the two railways is able to carry all the traffic. From these two sections alone can be secured ten million dollars worth of steel rails that can be put into use on railways that actually require rails.

I do not know anything personally about the West, but from information I have received, this can be more than duplicated between Winnipeg and the foot of the Rocky Mountains without impairing the railways from an efficiency standpoint in the least.

I just want to say a word for the benefit of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) in connection with the purchases that the Government of Canada is making of rolling stock and motive power for the Canadian railways. If you look up the last returns that we have from the Railway Commission, you will find that the Grand Trunk railway have more locomotives per mile and more cars per mile than any other railway in Canada; that they have fifty per cent more locomotives per mile than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and since the war broke out the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has practically not bought any locomotives.

Mr. MURPHY: The Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The Grand Trunk.

Mr. NICKLE: Is it not a fact that, although the Grand Trunk had a greater number of locomotives than the other railways, those locomotives were so old that the draw-bar efficiency made them practically inefficient for operating purposes?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: That may possibly be so, at least to some degree, but to my mind it is worth while finding out just where all those locomotives are.

Mr. NICKLE: In the shops.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Some of them may be in the shops, but information brought to me indirectly is that they are not all in the shops. The Grand Trunk is operating railroads both in Canada and the United States, and my information is that the Grand Trunk in Canada has been robbed for the benefit of the Grand Trunk in the United States. That may or may not be, but it is a matter at least worth investigating. There is another point in connection with that. My hon. friend has said that the reason for the Grand Trunk difficulty is that their locomotives are obsolete. I shall give the Minister of Railways and Canals a thought in this connection.

Who is it who is designing the locomotives the Canadian Government is purchasing for the Grand Trunk railway? My reason for asking is this: The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has referred to the fact that the Grand Trunk locomotives are obsolete. I may tell him that the Grand Trunk put new locomotives built by the Canadian Locomotive Company at Kingston into service less than three years ago, that were obsolete before they were turned out of the shops; positively obsolete, because they were of a type and class that was discarded twenty years ago by every railway using the modern locomotives. So, if we are purchasing locomotives for the Grand Trunk railway I would say to the Minister of Railways, be sure and find out who is designing them.

Mr. NICKLE: The hon. member agrees with me that the locomotives being built for the Grand Trunk have not sufficient draw-bar efficiency to make them up to date, that the designing is bad, that the engineering service is not as it should be.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: A locomotive may be obsolete and still have draw-bar efficiency. When I referred to a type of locomotive that was obsolete twenty years ago I was not referring to the draw-bar capacity of the locomotive, but to what it is going to cost to keep that locomotive in a state of efficiency on the road. I repeat that the last locomotive built for the Grand Trunk that I have had the privilege of seeing—and I make a business of watching for all these things—was of a type that was obsolete twenty years ago.

Now a word as to the Canadian Northern and its equipment. The road is not fully equipped, but from one end of the road to the other what they have got is all modern equipment, and it is due to the fact that they have modern officials, and if the Minister of Railways is purchasing engines there is one man I know of who can give him sound advice, namely, the General Manager of the Canadian Northern lines east of Port Arthur.

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Vaughan?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: No, but a gentleman who learned his business with Mr. Vaughan. I am giving that information because I think the Government should know it. It is only by getting down to details that we shall ever get out of what

the hon. member for Springfield terms "this mess," and that is what I have endeavoured to do in a rambling sort of way to-night. There is one other matter I want to refer to, and that is how we are going to manage these railways, and the tolls we are going to exact when we do manage them. I have studied the question from every angle, and if the declaration of the Prime Minister means anything, and I am one of those who believe it means just exactly what he said, I can see no better way than to follow the plan outlined in the Drayton-Acworth report. It will be absolutely necessary for the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian Government to appoint the first board of directors, but if the board is to be kept out of politics it should be self-perpetuating, in just the same way that the board of directors of any private-owned railway in Canada is self-perpetuating. I believe hon. gentlemen will agree with me that should the president of the Canadian Pacific retire, or before he retires for that matter, he will practically nominate his own successor, and the man he choses will be accepted by the directors, and the shareholders will back him up, and unless we are to have a new group of political directors for the State-owned system of railways in Canada, every time a change occurs we must find some means of having the members of the board chosen without coming back to Governments and Parliaments, because Governments and Parliaments will always be political so long as they exist.

Mr. McMASTER: If my hon. friend's suggestion is carried out, how will the railways owned by the people of Canada be controlled in any way by the people of Canada?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Place them under the Railway Commission, as far as control is concerned. As I understand it, the Drayton-Acworth report recommends that the power of nomination should rest with what they term the Dominion Railway Company, but I would term it a board of trustees for the Canadian people. The power of confirmation should rest with the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian Government. That is my idea. If some one else can suggest a better, all right, get busy. If we will look at what the Drayton-Acworth report refers to as the most efficient system of government-owned railways in the world, the Australasian experiment, we shall find that they have been changing from commission to board and then back again to commission, back and forth all the time, just because of political appointments. I say that if we are going to have political appointments in the operation of a state-owned system of railways, our last condition will be very much worse than the first.

The rates charged on the Government railways should be under the same control as the rates of privately-owned railways. I should like to refer for a moment to something that has been said with regard to the increase of rates granted Canadian railways by the Railway Commission a short time ago. The Government has been severely criticised for not reversing the order of the Railway Commission, but in my judgment if the Government is deserving of censure at all, it is because they took that order of the Railway Commission under consideration even in the slightest degree, and for this reason: If we are going to have independent control of railways, we cannot possibly set up the principle that every ruling of the Railway Commission is going to be revised by the Government of the day. Reverse the position for a moment, and assume that the Railway Commission orders a reduction of freight rates. Would that be a matter for the Government to revise? Should the Government say the reduction must not take place? The one is just as logical as the other, and it just comes down to this. I take it that we regard the Railway Commission as we would a court of justice in this country, and I do not think there is a man who would suggest that after a court had given its decision the case should go for review before a political body. Now as to the merits of the case. The railway companies have to earn increased salaries and an increased cost of all their materials, and I do not think that an increase of fifteen per cent was a large increase in proportion to the increased price they have to pay for everything. The difficulty is that people get a wrong view of what is essential and what is not essential. There are many in this House, for instance, who would say that the railways are not an agency for the production of anything, that they simply stand as a bar between producer and consumer. Now if some of the gentlemen representing a constituency in the West, we will say, will come with me one day next winter and get off the passenger train at White River I will undertake to get him a pass to ride on one of the 210 per cent engines running from White River to Chapleau. I will not ask him to handle a scoopful of coal the whole way, but just keep warm if he can and watch the men who are marketing the farmers' wheat, and I think at the end of the ride he will have a different con-

ception of what production and consumption really mean. The hon. member for Springfield, speaking on this question a few nights ago, said with all the dramatic eloquence of which he is capable that the tragedy of the increase in the freight rates was not that the freight rates were increased by fifteen per cent, but that on the very day the order went into effect the price of sugar in the West went up one-tenth of one cent per pound. Would he believe that the locomotive fireman who helps to market the western farmers' wheat found that on the day that the wheat commission set the price of wheat 180 per cent higher than it was in pre-war days his wife had to pay 125 per cent more for the bread to make the sandwiches that she put up in his lunch basket? I have not heard anybody say that there was any tragedy about that. I have heard people undertake to say that the price of wheat went up too high but I could not agree with them. I believe it was the right thing for the commission to do in order that they might induce greater production of the things necessary to feed the people during the war. I have also heard it said in business circles that, because the price of newsprint paper went up fifty per cent it was no reason why the daily newspapers should have increased the prices in their job printing departments 200 and 300 per cent. I do not agree with that. I am just repeating these statements but they do not represent my own views. I do not agree with the callous-hearted people who make these statements, and the only reason I refer to them is that I believe that when the hon. member undertakes to stage a tragedy based on the fact that one-tenth of a cent a pound has been added to the price of sugar he should at least exercise some little regard in the selection of the costume that the villain is going to appear in. To come back to the main question. Whatever is done with the Canadian railways, one thing that is necessary, if we are going to have efficiency and economy, is to find some means of keeping the overhead charges down to a proper basis and putting the railways in the hands of men who will operate them independently of any political considerations whatever and just the same as a private company would operate its own railway.

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman speaks about the Australian railways; what about the German, Belgian, French and Swiss State-owned railways?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I stated that I would make no comparison between the railways of Central Europe and the railways on the North American continent for the reason that it is utterly impossible. A railway must earn a sufficient amount of money to pay for the things it uses. We cannot make any comparison between conditions in Canada and those on the European continent. You can produce anything you like to mention in Central Europe a great deal cheaper than you can produce it in Canada. We are not going to ask our people to work for what the people of Europe get. I simply used the Australian railways for the purposes of comparison because the Drayton-Acworth report pointed them out as examples of Government ownership.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: At this late hour I have only a few observations to make and I shall try to confine myself to about fifteen minutes. I have taken a good deal of interest in the railway question and as I listened to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) presenting the case in regard to the Canadian Northern I felt that it was one of the most masterly expositions of the financial side of the railway question that I had ever heard in this House since I have had the honour of a seat in it. The railway situation certainly does not present a rosy appearance. But, in the meantime we must view these things as they are and not as we would like to see them. Both political parties have gone very far astray on this railway business. A third transcontinental railway should never have been built in this country for at least fifty years. But we went into it with our eyes open, or at least a large part of the people did. The first election that I went into as a candidate for this House I won in opposition to the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental railway. I got a very narrow majority, it is true, but I fought the election on that issue and I am thankful to-day to be able to say that I was opposed to this project from its inception. I looked upon it as a waste of money. But it went on and the cost has assumed proportions that were never dreamed of in those days. But, we cannot now go back upon it. We are involved in the expenditure, the money has been spent and we have to make the best of the situation. It has, to say the least of it, imposed a staggering, colossal indebtedness upon the people of Canada. The war is looked upon as a tremendous enterprise, and so it is, but my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has shown that in order to nationalize the railways

of Canada we would have to pay practically twice as much as we have spent in the war, or twice $1,000,000,000. I think my hon. friend placed the total railway capitalization of the country at
12 p.m. $2,500,000,000. At all events, that is within the mark. It will cost $2,500,000,000 to take possession of all the railways in Canada and to provide for the indebtedness in connection therewith. One thing I give my hon. friend great credit for is the statement with regard to the financial position of the railways of Canada which he has placed on Hansard to-night. I think he must be a practical railway man. I have received a great deal of information from the splendid address which he has given. It stands out it striking contrast to the speech delivered from this side of the House by the hon. gentleman who preceded him. I think the statements placed upon Hansard by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) are the most lamentable I have heard made in this House on any great question. My main reason for rising to-night was to try and say a few words to combat what has been placed in Hansard by the hon. member for Springfield. If that hon. gentleman knew one-tenth as much about railways as he thinks he does I should not have spoken to-night, but I feel convinced that the bulk of what he has placed on Hansard will not bear inspection on the part of any business man as being a fair statement of the railway situation.

The Prime Minister has informed us that the Canadian Northern railway has a total liability of $438,000,000. It is said to be worth, according to the figures the Prime Minister gave us, $518,000,000; so that it should have a balance on the right side of about $80,000,000. Of the two propositions, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, the chances of the former paying are one hundred-fold better than the latter, in my judgment. My hon. friend from East Algoma has shown that it has the lowest capitalization per mile of any railway upon this continent. That is something in its favour. Of course, it is not up to standard. We admit that. My hon. friend has submitted figures showing that $60,000 per mile will bring it up to standard whereas up to the present it has cost about $45,000 per mile.

It is admitted by all who know the railways of Canada that the best-placed railway, as far as the West is concerned, is the Canadian Northern with its branches. In saying that I am not saying anything

disrespectful of the Canadian Pacific. The first speech I ever made in my public life was in favour of the building of the Canadian Pacific and carrying out the bargain that we had entered into at Confederation—because it must not be lost sight of that the Canadian Pacific was built to redeem the promise made at Confederation that we should link up with British Columbia. That was a bargain just as much as the Intercolonial was a bargain with the people of the East and that must always be borne in mind. The hon. member for Springfield asserted that we paid far more out of the coffers of the Dominion than we should have paid for the Canadian Pacific. I am not going into that; it is ancient history. But, I do not agree with him in that. We have the finest transportation system in the world, bar none, in the Canadian Pacific. All honour to the men who put it through, all honour to the men who conceived the idea and successfully built that road, and all honour to the present management who are administering it with an efficiency that few railways in the world have attained.

But we have to face the position as we find it to-day, and the Canadian Northern railway is being taken over by the Government. I know that many hon. members, are very impatient because the road is not already administered by the Government, or by some commission appointed by the Government. But we must wait a little, the value of the stock has still to be adjudicated upon in the courts. You cannot take possession until the price is settled—not very well, or if you do you will be operating at a disadvantage and be liable to further trouble, taking possession of the road before the value is settled. We do know that the $60,000,000 of stock will not cost more than $10,000,000—that is the limit set. Now there are a great many people who say, "That is all absurd. We need not have paid a dollar. There has been too much money put into that road already by the people, and therefore we should take possession of it without giving those who own the stock the slightest advantage in the way of an arbitration—let us just expropriate that stock and take possession". That would be a high-handed piece of business, which, in my judgment, would not be at all right. I want to tell the members of the House that a railroad, the same as any other property, is always worth the amount it would fetch under the hammer, at any rate. We have in this country a tremendous railway in the Canadian Pacific. All honour to it, and all

credit, as I have said, for the way it is managed. But I am here to speak as a member of this House, and believing that I speak the feelings of the people of a large part of Canada from east to west and from north to south, after having put as much money into railways as we have done, we do not wish to see the whole of our Dominion placed in the hands of one railway company. That is what would have happened in Canada if the Canadian Northern railway had gone under the hammer: There was only one possible buyer of that road in the Dominion and that was the Canadian Pacific railway, who were anxious to obtain it and would have obtained it, I believe, if that course had been taken. Then the people of Canada would have shouted, and they would have had a good right to shout, because, after having built three transcontinental lines we are not prepared to put them into the hands of one railway company and have no competition, after all the money that we have spent. Let that never be lost sight of—we could not afford to do that. Even if we lost money in taking the Canadian Northern railway over, I believe when the position is explained thoroughly to the people of Canada, they will say that the Government is right, and that we could not afford to let that system pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific, as in my judgment, it would undoubtedly have done if it had gone under the hammer. Now that is a point that I think ought to be thoroughly emphasized. We want railway competition in Canada, the West particularly is absolutely set upon competition, and that is the reason, in my judgment—one of the main reasons, at all events— why the Government has taken the course it has and is keeping the Canadian Northern railway as a separate entity and to be run as a separate entity, either by the Government or by a commission. I myself believe that it is possible, even with the black outlook of the tremendous expenditure that has to be incurred in connection with the railway situation, to make the railways of Canada still pay a fair dividend upon all the money that has gone into them. It is a big proposition, but I believe it ultimately can be done. Let us look at the situation for a moment. My honorable friend (Mr. Nicholson) who has just spoken has shown you that we are carrying freight, if I remember his figures rightly, at three-quarters of a cent per ton per mile—I think that was his statement. Despite our rigorous climate, despite the tremendous force that we must exert in winter to run our railways at all, there is no country in the world—barring only the United States, and that country only in certain sections—that has as cheap freight rates as we have in the Dominion at the present time. That is something we ought to recognize, it is something to be proud of, and I think that the administration of our railways has shown that we are prepared to carry freight in a rigorous climate, where the temperature in the winter season goes down to twenty, thirty, forty and even fifty degrees below zero, and there are snowfalls anywhere from five to ten feet deep in our northern country that have to be pushed out of the way—and still in spite of all that we are carrying freights at an infinitesimal rate per mile as compared with the old countries of Europe that have as much population to the square mile as we have in a hundred square miles. We hear a great deal about the splendid administration of European railways. I have crossed the Atlantic nearly fifty times, and I have travelled on most of the railways in Europe many and many a time, and there is not a country in the world, in my judgment, that carries passengers in as much comfort, and in as reasonable a way, as do the railways in the Dominion of Canada and in the United States. My honourable friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) told us that people travel at a quarter of a cent, I think it was, per mile in Germany. He has more knowledge of Germany than I have if he can make that statement truthfully. I have travelled a great deal in Germany myself, I have visited that country five or ten times, and my experience was that not only did I not travel for a quarter of a cent per mile, but that it cost me a great deal more per mile to travel than it does on any of the railways of Canada. That was my experience, and if there are any other gentlemen here who have travelled much I think they can state also that they have never travelled in any country in Europe at any such charge as the honourable gentleman has spoken of, it is absurd on the face of it. Nobody who has travelled in Europe can tell me that. People have never been able to buy railway tickets from Cook, Son & Co., who are supposed to have the lowest rates that any firm in Europe have for travelling for any such price as the honourable member has spoken of.

Mr. MANION: I think in justice to the honourable member for Springfield it should be stated that in the European

countries—particularly in Germany and Belgium—they have special rates for working men going to and from their work that are very low. I think the honourable gentleman is absolutely right in regard to the ordinary rates of travel, for first-class passage, and so forth, but for the average workingman there are exceedingly low rates in Germany and Belgium.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am very much obliged to my honourable friend for making that statement. I do not wish to mis-state the position of the honourable member for Springfield, who is not in the House at present. I believe there are tickets sold at low rates that enable you to travel as much as you like between certain points. I know such tickets are issued—that you can get a passbook for thirty days, and that you can travel as much on the road as you like between certain points—but a man is not going to travel any more than he feels necessary, and under those circumstances the rate does not work out at as low a rate as might be looked for. I am speaking of the general rates that would be charged to passengers when travelling, not for a little distance that a workman would have to go between his home and his place of work, and which I do not think is a fair comparison. Certainly I was misled and others were misled listening to the figures given by the hon. member for Springfield to-night.

Some considerable attention has been given to Australia as an example. I have had the privilege of also visiting Australia, but I am not sure that the hon. member for Springfield has visited that country. I can speak candidly of the railway service rendered throughout Australia and the accommodation given, because I was there a few years ago. What did I find? At every boundary line between states you had to get out of bed at night if you were sleeping in a Pullman, and change to another Pullman, and every state has a different gauge on its roads. The remark was interjected that I was a narrow-gauge man when I asked a question during the hon. member for Springfield's speech, but I would draw that hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in Australia every state has a different gauge practically on its railways. Moreover, they have to transfer all the freight at these state boundaries, from one car to another. The reason for that is that the labour men say that more labour is rendered necessary than there would be if they only had the one gauge, and they want the system continued. Therefore, freight is transferred from one car to another at the present time on the state boundary line.

Mr. MURPHY: Are those railways operated by the Government?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: They are state-operated. These railways were mostly built by the States before the Commonwealth came into effect. The Commonwealth has been in existence now upwards of ten years, and up to the time I visited Australia they had not made any attempt to standardize their gauges. When I asked: "How can you possibly continue to have all the passengers change at your state boundaries, and to tranship all your freight from one car to another," they said: "Well, we have a large element here upon the railways who say we would be destroying their means of obtaining a livelihood if we allowed these cars to run through; that is why we have not made our gauges uniform." All the rates in Australia are infinitely higher than ours both as to freight and as to passengers, unless they have lately come down, and their cost per mile is infinitely more than ours. So I think the comparison between Australia and Canada does not work out to our disadvantage. I mention this to show that we are not so badly off as we have been made out to be. We are in a better position than many countries considered to be as bad as we are at the present time. I admit that some of the roads are unnecessary duplications. But I am sorry I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), when he said that the road between Toronto and Napanee should be ripped up. As one who travels frequently between Toronto and Ottawa, I find the Canadian Northern a tremendous advantage, and to rip that line up would be to say that you will have no alternative route from Toronto to Ottawa. It must be remembered that the Grand Trunk does not run into Ottawa from Toronto, unless you go down to Coteau Junction, which is only about thirty miles from Montreal, and which is a most round about way to reach Ottawa. The capital of the Dominion had only one road from Toronto until the Canadian Northern came in. This road, in my opinion, is serving a very valuable purpose in Ontario.

I want to dwell for a moment or two upon the position of the Canadian Northern, relative to the traffic that can be obtained by it. I had the pleasure not two years ago of travelling from one end of that road

to the other. I would not say that it has the best roadbed in the Dominion, but we travelled comfortably from Toronto to Vancouver at the rate of twenty-five miles per hour without mishap, and the engine was able to haul twelve to fourteen heavily-laden cars over the whole of the road. If I remember correctly it hauled fourteen cars, certainly not less than twelve heavily-laden Pullman cars over the Rocky Mountains. That is something which could not be done, I believe, on any other railway either to the north or to the south of the international boundary. I believe the Canadian Northern has the best grade of any of the roads, and the Grand Trunk Pacific runs over a part of the same tracks. One hon. member has said that we should never have embarked upon aiding the Canadian Northern railway at all. The Canadian Northern is an old line and was begun before the Grand Trunk Pacific was ever thought of. Its chances of paying are infinitely better. It is a well placed road both in the West, and in a good many parts of the East. And it must be remembered that in building this road, we are building for the future, and it was thought that Canada could support at least two transcontinentals. I believe it can. I believe that two transcontinentals can be made to pay and pay well, whether operated by private companies or as Government enterprises under a commission. For my own part, I want to say that it is war time, and the amount of money required to take possession of all the railways of Canada, or even of the railways leaving out the Canadian Pacific, is so great that we cannot afford to undertake it, and that is my only reason, speaking as a business man, for not advocating the immediate nationalization of all the railways of Canada. I may be wrong, but I venture the opinion, as a business man, that with proper management, and with a thoroughly well trained commission of railway men—not politicians, not statesmen even, but railway men of a practical order, such as we have in Canada—the operation of these roads will be successful. In my judgment, if a board was got together, of five or seven of the best railway men in Canada, as a commission and all the roads of Canada were placed at their disposal, they could make a financial and a business success of that great enterprise. I may be wrong but that is my sizing up of the situation. Knowing the possibilities of traffic in Canada I say that I believe that that can be done, and the Drayton-Acworth report practically recommends that that be done. I can hardly do better than read that part of their report dealing with how these railways should be operated:

> Our formal recommendations are:—
>
> 1. That a Board of Trustees be constituted by Act of Parliament and incorporated as "The Dominion Railway Company."
>
> 2. That the ownership of the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, and Grand Trunk Pacific railways be vested in this Company.

I presume they mean the Transcontinental, as well as the Grand Trunk Pacific.

> 3. That the Government assume responsibility to the Company for the interest on the existing securities of these undertakings.
>
> 4. That the Intercolonial (including the Prince Edward Island) and National Transcontinental railways be also handed over by the Government to the Company.
>
> 5. That the whole of these railways, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Intercolonial, and the National Transcontinental, be operated by the Company as one united system.

I must say that that recommendation appeals to me as sound common sense. I do not know these gentlemen personally, but after looking over their report, and having seen the basis upon which they make up all their figures, I believe that that finding is the solution of the railway question facing the Dominion at the present time. As far as I am concerned, just as soon as the war is over, I would be prepared to back up this, or any other, government which is prepared to take hold of this railway situation, face it as it is and make a success of it as a great national enterprise. I may be over optimistic, but I believe we have as good railway men in Canada as there are anywhere in the world, and nobody need tell me that we cannot get five or seven directors or trustees, whatever they may be called, who can operate the railways of Canada and make them a paying enterprise. My only reason for not advocating the immediate carrying out of these recommendations is that the war is on us, and the question is too large. I was favourable last year to the action taken by the Government in taking over the Canadian Northern. I am still of the same opinion, and it is my judgment that even if some blunders have been made in it, and though some of the money probably has been unwisely expended, we have in the Canadian Northern an asset worth all it is going to cost the people of Canada, whether we have to pay this supposed ten millions of dollars or not. I do not want to shirk any part of my responsibility in advocating that the $10,000,000 should be paid if the Commission of Arbitration find that it should be paid. I do not believe in confiscating property, even

though you have technically the right to do so, if there is really an equity in it, and the Arbitration Commission is sitting for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is any equity in that $60,000,000 of stock, with the understanding that it shall not cost us more than $10,000,000. Is it not best to be generous and fair? I do not know who will get this money, I have no more knowledge than any member sitting in this House as to whom that $10,000,000 will be paid if awarded, and I do not believe all of it will be awarded. But I do not think we are justified in stating that that stock is not worth a dollar, when the question of its value is being investigated in the courts by some of the best brains in Canada.

We ought to possess our souls in patience, realizing that they will make a just finding and that we shall not have to pay any more for it than the equity in it is worth. I believe that had the Canadian Pacific been given the opportunity of getting the road for $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 and assuming all its liabilities, they would not have taken twenty-four hours to decide that they would accept it. Gentlemen in this House wanted to see the road go under the hammer, to see it knocked down to the highest bidder. They knew that the Canadian Pacific was the only bidder, and that the Canadian Pacific would not have hesitated a moment to take the road. Had we permitted anything like that to happen, we could not have looked the people of western Canada in the face. We have spent a thousand millions in giving the West railway competition, and it is suggested that now, at the final stage, for the sake of $10,000,000 or $20,000,000, we should let this road merge with the other great railway corporations and destroy competition and all possibility of competition in that country for the next twenty-five or fifty years. In my judgment, the Transcontinental will not be run as a paying enterprise within the life of any hon. gentleman in this House. I do not believe it is possible. More than a thousand miles built in the wilderness, without the slightest traffic—without any passenger traffic at all to speak of along the whole of that route; a bridge at Quebec which cost $27,000,000; a railway which, according to the statement of the Prime Minister this afternoon, cost $90,000 per mile without interest or $110,000 per mile with interest, more than double the cost per mile of the Canadian Northern railway and almost double the cost per mile of the Canadian Pacific railway.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

We have every opportunity, I believe, of making the Canadian Northern a paying enterprise. I congratulate the Government on the splendid stand they have taken in this matter. I was elected as a kind of independent, so to speak, and I have criticised the Government; but when they do a good thing I want to give them credit for it. I stand by them to-night in the bargain that they have made with the Canadian Northern railway. They are facing this question like men. The position that the Prime Minister took in this House to-day and the statement that he made with regard to the Canadian Northern railway has put him up one hundred per cent in my estimation of him as a business man. I never thought that he was a very good business man, but the way he has tackled the railway question and the manner in which he has placed it before the House and the country gives us reassurance. At last the railway question is to be grappled with. We are to have a policy that we need not be ashamed of, the final financial results of which will be satisfactory not only to be members of the House but to all the people of Canada.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): At this late hour of the night—

Mr. BUREAU: Let us adjourn. It is half past twelve.

Mr. NICKLE:—At this hour of the night it may seem presumptuous for one to rise and address the committee, but as I since 1914 have taken more or less interest in this railway question I do not think I should allow this debate to close without putting on Hansard my views of the situation as I see it.

I cannot brush aside as lightly as the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) does the situation that confronts the Canadian people. Aside from the war, no one knocks more insistently on the door than those who say that a solution of this railway problem must be found. If my judgment is worth anything, before this problem is solved and before Canada meets the other financial obligations that she must of necessity meet, our resources, our foresight and our energy will be taxed to the utmost. I do not know that very much is gained by placing before the House a magnificent array of figures as to what this or that railroad cost or as to what the book value of this one is or the book value of the other one is. We should approach the question from this angle: how is Canada to attain the end that will be most beneficial for her? The

way that we have come shows us that up to the present time Canada has, by gifts, guarantees, subventions and other aid, given to the various railroads in Canada approximately $1,000,000,000. The National Transcontinental has had $160,000,000—and we may say that we own that road, because by taking it over and operating it I suppose it has been assumed—it is useless to argue otherwise—that the Grand Trunk Pacific have been relieved from any obligation that they had. I am prepared, therefore, to debit Canada with $160,000,000 as the cost of the National Transcontinental. We have also spent $115,000,000 on the Intercolonial, which belongs to us; and on the Prince Edward Island railway $10,000,000 has been spent. In other words, the three railroads that Canada really owns have received from Canada $285,000,000, leaving $715,000,000 that Canada has given to privately owned railroads.

I said that perhaps we could learn something by an examination of the way that we had come to aid us in reaching a conclusion as to how we should go. It has been said that history moves in cycles, that history repeats itself. I doubt very much whether that is a truism. I doubt whether history does repeat itself exactly. But if history does not repeat itself, it moves more or less along similar lines, and in the light of what was done in years gone by we can sometimes judge what should be done to-day. Hon. gentlemen who were interested in the early history of the railway companies of Canada, and who have read the pamphlets published on that railroad in the 60's and 70's, must have observed that practically the same condition prevailed in those days that prevails to-day. Practically the same arguments were being advanced in favour of and against nationalization as are being advanced to-day. Railroads were claiming aid for the same reason that it is now claimed; public men were discussing as we are discussing to-night why aid should or should not be given. When you come to determine the book value of a railroad, you really get but little assistance. I refer particularly to that at this moment, because I am speaking of the history of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If you go back to the history of that railroad in the 60's and 70's you will see that there were complaints of the pitiful plight in which that railway had found itself and worked itself in these years. You will find that there were charges of extravagance, corruption, mismanagement, and that the railway was in the position it was then in owing to more railway being constructed than the country could support, and to the improper and irregular way the railroad was constructed. It was just one series of financial rearrangements after another. The Grand Trunk charter was granted on the distinct understanding, if I remember the figures aright, that Canada would guarantee to Peto, Brassey, Betts and Jackson £3,000 sterling per mile and that the railway company or the railway constructors would find the other necessary capital to complete the road. The guarantee was soon used up. The company found themselves unable to sell stock. A certain amount of stock had been put on the market with a rosy prospectus that showed that 11½ per cent or thereabouts was going to be earned.

But it was soon demonstrated that the figures given were far in excess of what the company could earn, and it became apparent in a few years that the railway could not pay an ordinary dividend on its stock. No further subscriptions for stock could be had. The country was asked to put up more money and Statute after Statute was passed. Financial arrangements were brought about, but still no satisfactory result could be obtained, and the Grand Trunk, from the fifties until to-day has struggled to make dividends on an overcapitalization and has found itself utterly unable to meet the obligations cast upon it. As the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) have said, if the railroads of Canada are to be nationalized we might as well face the issue fairly and squarely and realize, if they are to be profitably run, capital accounts must be reduced materially, because if you do not take that method of managing your railroad, there will be, under operation and control by a commission, if that form of operation is decided upon, the same deficits that confront us to-day, because the mileage in Canada and the population per mile is not sufficient to enable us to earn enough to pay overhead charges and to meet the interest charges on the various overcapitalized undertakings.

Just let me give the House an instance of how the book value of a railway may be increased. If you turn to page 32 of the Drayton-Acworth report, you will see how in 1915 £126,809 were added to the capital charges or the book value of the Grand Trunk railway by charging up to capital

account this sum to meet the discount and commission on debentures they had to sell below par, because their credit had been injured. In other words the book value of the railroad was increased almost three-quarters of a million dollars because the company had to sell its debentures at less than par and by an improper system of bookkeeping that amount was charged up to capital account.

As I have said, the problem we have to face is—where are we going and why are we going in that direction? Surely the experience of the last ten years has taught us that private ownership and the exploitation of the credit of the country has led to one of the most unfortunate railroad muddles the world has ever had to solve, and it comes on Canada at a particularly unfortunate time. We are not saying to the promoters of the railroad: We want to take away your property. We are not confiscating the property at all, but time and again they have represented to this Government and to the country at large that, if we made them an alleged sufficient grant or guarantee or a new loan, they would be able to meet their obligations, and Canada would no longer be called upon to supply further aid. There is not one of us who does not know how repeatedly we have been disappointed. I sat in this House in 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914, and each year there was a fresh claim and an equally emphatic protest that, if Parliament yielded to the exploiters or promoters, if the hon. members like that term better, it would be the last time they would ask for money, and the undertaking would be carried to a successful conclusion. In 1914, my spirit rebelled, and I laid down what I thought was a sound principle of public guidance, namely, that if the people of Canada had to pay for a railroad, then the people of Canada were entitled to own it. In 1914, I was opposed to giving further aid, and the reason of my entering into this discussion to-night is because the hon. member for Springfield was rather severe on some of us for voting last year for the arbitration in reference to $60,000,000 worth of Canadian Northern stock. In 1914, I was opposed to Canada going into partnership with Mackenzie and Mann interests in the ownership and management of the Canadian Northern, and I felt that we were going into partnership in 1914 when we took $40,000,000 worth of their stock and left $60,000,000 of the stock to the promoters or to the Mackenzie and Mann interests, because my reading of history has told me this—and if the gentlemen present in this House care to read history--they will realize this--that when any kind of financial difficulty arises in regard to a large national undertaking, the private persons responsible for that undertaking always assert that Canada has a partnership in the undertaking, and that there is a national obligation to protect the credit of those who venture their capital in a speculative undertaking. For that reason I was opposed in 1914 to the partnership, but at that time public ownership was not as popular as it is to-day, and there was not as much cheering in the House of Commons when those of us who were in favour of public ownership and public operation of the road advocated those principles as now greets those who rise to speak on the subject. Parliament, however, decided that the partnership was to be, and the arrangement was that $45,000,000 of the Canadian Northern bonds were to be guaranteed, for which Canada was to receive $40,000,000 of the stock, the balance of $60,000,000 remaining with the owners. The probabilities are that if the war had not broken out, the cash on hand in the Canadian Northern treasuries at that time and the guarantee of the $45,000,000 of bonds would have permitted the Canadian Northern railway to work its way to a successful conclusion. Parliament laid down the principle that Canada was prepared to go into the partnership. Some of us voted against it, but then it seemed to me unfair in 1917 that those who had lent money on the stock of the company and those who had made advances on the bonds of the company should have their securities ruined because a war had unexpectedly broken out, and it was impossible for those behind the undertaking to realize what in ordinary times they would have been able to realize from their debentures and to proceed with the work as they would ordinarily have been able to proceed with it. If the Canadian Pacific were willing to say to the Canadian Northern, as I understand they were: "We are prepared to give something substantial for your stock if you are prepared to hand it over to us," and if the Parliament of Canada was not prepared to give the privilege of selling, it would have been confiscation of the rankest and most indefensible kind for Canada to say to the Canadian Northern people: You cannot sell to the Canadian Pacific, and as we are in a position to refuse you the right of selling, and are also in a position to take your property, we are going to take it for nothing, although another company is prepared to

give you a substantial price for it. That would be a confiscation and doing a grave injustice and practising a national irregularity in reference to those who, in good faith, had made advances on the stock and other securities of the Canadian Northern. For that reason I feel the vote I gave in 1917 was justifiable; but even if it were not justifiable, upon that ground, I was quite willing to pay a substantial sum to remove from the lobbies of this Parliament men who exercise a pernicious influence, and to begin what I thought was the nationalization of the railways of Canada, because I cannot as a Canadian see—and I have faith in this country and am proud of Canadian ability, character and energy—why we cannot develop in this country just as capable, honest and energetic men as other countries can develop, and if all the rest of the world, with the exception of the United States and Great Britain, can successfully carry on commission operated railways, I am utterly at a loss to see why railways cannot be similarly operated in Canada. In speaking of that matter to-night, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) reflected somewhat on the Australian railway system. He drew the attention of the House, as an evidence of the mismanagement of that system, to the fact that Australia had different gauges of railways, and he, therefore, from that seemed to argue that the Australian system was a failure.

When the railroads first began in Canada and different charters were granted to different companies, many of them started out on the same principle as actuated Australia. They started out with a different gauge of railway, each thinking that in that way it would retain freight originating on its own lines and prevent its transference to another line. Experience very quickly taught us that in a country as widespread as Canada it was absolutely necessary that for facility of transportation the gauges should be standardized and various methods were adopted to bring about that result. Without presenting the matter detail by detail the final result was this: We agreed on a standard gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches or 4 feet 8⅝ inches as the proper gauge, and to-day that is practically the gauge adopted throughout Canada. I understand that exactly the same thing is taking place in Australia that took place in Canada. The railways were originally constructed by different states with different gauges but now that they are under the Commonwealth I was told by a gentleman from Australia whom I had the pleasure of meeting two years ago that they realized that to work out their system they must standardize their gauge and they are doing exactly what Canada did. In the doing of it, of course, there is inconvenience, but from what I learned from this gentleman with whom I spoke, they are making a success of their roads even under the disadvantages under which they are working at the present time, and they are satisfied that when the work is completed they will work with greater economy and with greater advantage to the Commonwealth at large.

I therefore come to this: we have to face the situation of doing either one of two things. We have got to meet the annual deficits the railroads in Canada are going to have for many years and leave them in the hands of promoters, or we have to take over the roads and run them ourselves. I say that in 1917 we laid down the principle that all Canadian Northern stock was to be acquired by the Canadian people. Having acquired that stock, practically speaking, the people of Canada will own the Canadian Northern. We already own the National Transcontinental, the Prince Edward Island railway, and the Intercolonial railway. The Canadian Northern has a magnificent network of lines in the western provinces, though weak in the eastern part of Canada, particularly in Ontario and Quebec, where the Grand Trunk is strong. Many Canadian Northern lines parallel Grand Trunk lines. I am using " Grand Trunk " in the generic term including various departments of that railway. If we can co-ordinate these roads it is going to cheapen operation by reducing overhead and maintenance charges. Now why not do it? I quite admit that if the situation was this, that the Grand Trunk were able to carry out their undertaking it would be considered confiscation and a breach of the national obligation to interfere arbitrarily with them, but that is not the position in Canada to-day. Canada is not saying to the Grand Trunk Railway, "We are going to have your road and are not going to pay you for it." But the Grand Trunk management are saying to Canada, "We cannot carry the obligations we undertook by solemn contract. You have taken the National Transcontinental from us and we say we are relieved of all obligation for its operation. We appreciate the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific is on our back and we cannot get rid of it. We appreciate the fact that if you insist that we carry out our obligations under the contract of 1903 there

is bound to be an insolvency." You ask me on what I base that statement. I base it on the evidence given by Mr. Chamberlin, set out in the appendix to the Drayton-Acworth report, where in his examination—and the risk a man always runs when he puts himself on oath is that people will believe him even if it turns out to his disadvantage afterwards to be believed—Mr. Chamberlin said, and surely if we in the Parliament of Canada take Mr. Chamberlin as meaning what he said, he should not complain and say we are doing anything we should not do:

Sir Henry Drayton: You speak of confiscation, in your letter, Mr. Chamberlin. No person is thinking of confiscating the investment that I know of. If you can afford to carry it, you will be allowed to carry it. That was not really meant, was it? Suppose you are left to yourselves, the thing crashes, no one confiscates it. Isn't that right?

Mr. Chamberlin: To a certain extent, yes.

Sir Henry Drayton: To every extent, isn't it?

Mr. Chamberlin: To every extent.

There we have Mr. Chamberlin's own evidence that the position of the Grand Trunk to the Grand Trunk Pacific is this: That if the Government does not come to the aid of the Grand Trunk the whole scheme is going to come down in insolvency, not only the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the old Grand Trunk itself. The reason I allude to this particular point is this: I read an extract cabled a few days ago from one of the English papers to the effect that at the annual meeting of the Grand Trunk shareholders bitter denouncement had been made of the Canadian Government in that the shareholders had been led to believe that the Canadian people were confiscating the Grand Trunk railway, whereas if the facts had been fairly and squarely put before them, they would have known the Canadian people were not confiscating the Grand Trunk, but that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had admitted to the Government and the people of Canada that they were not able to carry out their obligation, and that there was bound to be an insolvency if Canada did not go to the rescue. Canada has a right to be put in a proper light before the investers of the Old World, and I sincerely hope that some echo of what is being said here to-night will be heard across the water. The position the Grand Trunk find themselves in to-day is not the fault of the Canadian people, but the fault of the promoters and exploiters of the national credit. The reason I say that is this. They began in 1903 the movement for the establishment and development of the National Transcontinental railway. The Government of Canada, headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, did not go to the Grand Trunk Railway, but Mr. Hays came to Sir Wilfrid Laurier with a proposition. He suggested that the Grand Trunk railway in the eastern part of Canada wanted a western connection. I am ready to admit that the original proposition took the road only as far as North Bay, and that in Parliament it was extended from North Bay down as far as Quebec, and subsequently the Grand Trunk were compelled to accept an extension of the line from Quebec to Moncton. But the Grand Trunk were not compelled to accept it in the sense that they had to enter into an obligation they did not approve of. They could have said, "If the Parliament and Government desire us to go so far we will throw up the whole thing." But they did nothing of the sort. They had the choice of doing one of two things, abandoning the enterprise or carrying it out as Parliament desired. The Grand Trunk accepted the terms of the Parliament of Canada and as Mr. Chamberlin said in his evidence—I shall not give his exact words because it is getting late—the contract was utterly impossible for the company to carry out to a successful fruition, the Grand Trunk could not carry out the scheme, Mr. Chamberlin did not wish to reflect on those who had gone before but he was unable to see how Mr. Hays had ever entered into the contract believing it would be a success. He said "it was always impossible." I therefore say the people of Canada are not responsible for the difficulty in which the Grand Trunk find themselves to-night. The Grand Trunk itself, by its improper contract, by lack of foresight on the part of its officials and lack of business vision put the Grand Trunk in the position it is in to-day, and as a Canadian subject, and as a taxpayer I object, to the offspring of the Grand Trunk Railway Company being put in a basket and left on my doorstep, and the railway ringing the bell and saying: "Take charge of the basket and assume the responsibility." I have every desire to protect the credit of Canada, and I say that the Prime Minister if he carries on negotiations this summer with the Grand Trunk shareholders should make it perfectly clear to them and to the people of England that the obligation of the Canadian people was discharged to the last dollar, that Canada did more than she promised to do, that we agreed to guarantee a certain number of bonds and we did it,

that we agreed to build a road and we did it and more.

One hon. gentleman has said that the people of Canada were primarily responsible for whatever sums were spent on building the National Transcontinental. I dissent from that view. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, all of whose stock is owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, had by their agreement with the Government the right to have their engineers superintend the construction of the Transcontinental, and if for political or other reasons their engineers and directors or their management were supine, it is not the fault of Canada if the road cost more than it should, and the blame should not be laid at the door of Canada.

I want to direct the attention of the House to another point. Somebody has stated that the Government was to blame because Canada gave aid to the Canadian Northern railway after the arrangement had been made with the Grand Trunk for the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Government was not a partner in the undertaking as the Grand Trunk directors assert. The Government agreed that the people of Canada would do a certain thing in assisting this undertaking. The Government have done everything they promised to do and the Government of Canada are, and have always been, a Governement and not a partner. If the Grand Trunk management were not astute enough to protect themselves against the competition of another national transcontinental railway I do not think that they can lay it to the Government and the people that there has been any lack of faith or any bad faith, in the fact that aid was granted to another railway. I am not defending the giving of aid to the Canadian Northern subsequent to the inauguration of the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific project. I think it was a mistaken policy. It would have been infinitely wiser if the Grand Trunk had purchased the Canadian Northern line. But if the members of this House want some evidence of the money that exploiters and promoters attempt to make out of railway construction let me direct their attention to another portion of the evidence of Mr. Chamberlin. Sir Henry Drayton asked Mr. Chamberlin this question as reported at page 80 of the Drayton-Acworth report:

Sir Henry Drayton: If I am not very much mistaken, negotiations were entered into between your executive and the executive of the Canadian Northern, looking to the fusion of the systems, so that there would not be this duplication.

Mr. Chamberlin: They tried to buy the Manitoba lines, but they could not get together, Mr. Hays told me at one time, and Mr. Wainwright told me also. I asked them why they did not buy out the Canadian Northern, they said they had had meeting after meeting with them, and that the best terms they could get were that they should assume all obligations, all bonds and everything else, and give $25,000,000 for the common stock for that little bunch of lines up around Winnipeg.

That meant that the Canadian Northern people asked the Grand Trunk to pay them $25,000,000 for the common stock which they held. That will give you some idea of the exploitation that has been attempted in this country. I think it well that the people should realize what private ownership has done in connection with railway promotion. People had hardly come to realize the terrific problem that confronted us in this country before a private Bill was again introduced into this House in the session of 1915 asking Parliament to grant a charter to another transcontinental railway and it was only because of the active efforts of those opposed to Canada being loaded up with any further lines that the charter was withdrawn and the promotion stopped. For these reasons I think the time has come for the taking over of those lines. The experience of the world has demonstrated that it is possible to get able, honest men to operate public utilities such as railways. We have demonstrated that in regard to lighting and power plants and in various other ways. And if these things can be done by other public bodies why cannot the same thing be done in reference to a railway?

1 a.m.

Then, let us regard it from another angle. The main object to be sought is to procure adequate transportation for the people and commodities of the country. It must be abundantly clear to any person who has read this report, and who knows anything of the railway situation in Canada—and certainly the hon. member from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) put a mass of illuminating figures on the record to-night—that the railways have reached the point where they are utterly unable to raise the necessary capital to carry on their undertakings. It is admitted that the Canadian Northern Railway system cannot raise the $100,000,000 that they need in the next five years to bring their road up to the standard necessary in connection with a road seeking to undertake transportation in Canada. What will be required by the

Grand Trunk railway is set forth on page 33 of the Drayton-Acworth report as follows:

Rebuilding and reinforcing freight car equipment	$ 8,943,971 14
Rebuilding freight and passenger cars with safety appliances	458,501 61
Equipping engines with safety appliances	17,274 32
Deferred renewals in maintenance of way department	11,761,598 00
Total	$21,181,345 07

That is the amount required to put that road in anything like a decent running state. The strange thing is that during the time that that railway was running down until it came to the disastrous condition that it is in to-day, the management of the Grand Trunk paid in dividends to its stockholders $36,000,000 which should have gone into the road to provide for the development of the transportation of the country. If you turn to the next page you will see that the capital expenditures necessary to be made are as follows:

Requirements for rolling stock, shops and machinery	$26,150,000
Requirements for automatic block signals, (main line in Canada only)	3,533,000
Requirements for installing rock ballast crushing plant	467,500
Total	$30,150,500

In other words, the Grand Trunk will have to raise $51,000,000 and the Canadian Northern $100,000,000 to put these two roads in a state of efficiency. After you have developed them on independent lines where are you? They have to meet in competition, not in co-operation, and surely it must be clear to you that the Grand Trunk cannot make improvements costing $50,000,000 meet its interest charge of $5,000,000 in addition on its Grand Trunk Pacific guarantees. In this connection I will read the answers which Mr. Chamberlin gave to questions put to him by Mr. Acworth:

Commissioner Acworth: I can follow the point this far; that the Grand Trunk Pacific, being regarded as a Government obligation, the Government should see that anybody who had put money into the Grand Trunk Pacific should be protected to the last penny. But wouldn't it be absolute justice on the part of the Government to say that the Grand Trunk went into this undertaking, and that the Government must ask the Grand Trunk to pay all it can towards the obligation the Government has to carry; in other words, that the Government must ask the Grand Trunk to accept the sinking of the $26,000,000 they have already advanced, and that the Government must ask the company to contribute, in order to minimize the loss, all the net revenue the company has, that while it is not enough yet the Government must have that.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. Chamberlin: The fact is that the Grand Trunk is not able to contribute anything towards paying its own security holders and making the improvements the people of Canada demand and the business of Canada require.

Sir Henry Drayton: But last year the Grand Trunk gave its shareholders half a million sterling?

Mr. Chamberlin: Yes.

Commissioner Acworth: Do you mean to say that that was a necessary expenditure—I am not a shareholder?

Mr. Chamberlin: If you strike off the interest on your securities . . . .

Commissioner Acworth: It was not a security; they gave half a million to their guaranteed shareholders?

Mr. Ardley: Four per cent on the guaranteed stock was paid.

Commissioner Acworth: Which came to half a million sterling. Wouldn't it be absolute justice for the Government to say . . . .

Mr. Chamberlin: To wipe out these poor shareholders?

Commissioner Acworth: To say to the Grand Trunk that they must pay these liabilities to whatever extent they can, because as far as the public was concerned the Government would have to face the rest, but that the Grand Trunk must do all it can?

Mr. Chamberlin: The Grand Trunk can just about meet it, but cannot pay the shareholders anything.

What that means in ordinary language is that Mr. Chamberlin, the president of the road, says that if the Grand Trunk met the existing obligations of the Grand Trunk Pacific nothing would be available for the betterments and for the improvement of the road to say nothing of the shareholders. That is with respect to the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific which was guaranteed by Grand Trunk Railway Company. In the face of that, it seems to me that the Canadian people have the right to say to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, "If you want to be relieved from this obligation we are prepared to treat you reasonably and fairly, but we are not prepared to say that because you made a bad bargain we will relieve you from all the obligations that you have incurred and take over your original Grand Trunk railway at a reconstruction value, or whatever sum you show on your books." That would be most unfair to the people of Canada. That would put the people of Canada in this position—that those who come here to exploit our credit would practically look to Canada as a sort of fairy godmother, and if the venture turned out unprofitable Canada must lose, but if the venture turned out profitable then the company should take all the profit and all the advantage. I am not going to take any more of the time of the House.

Mr. McMASTER: Go on, it is good stuff.

Mr. NICKLE: Well, there are one or two points I want to clear up, and as honourable gentlemen have expressed the wish for me to go on, perhaps it is just as well that I should touch on those points.

Now in regard to the Intercolonial, that railway is always held up by opposing Canadians as the outstanding example of a failure of Government ownership. But is that fair? The Intercolonial was a political railroad. It was constructed round by the St. Lawrence so that it would be well removed from the American border. It was a political road and it was a military road. Every car mile that is operated on that road costs more money to run in relation to the earnings got than if it were a direct line. What I mean by that is this: The railroad is operated on the arc of a circle, but the freight charge must be in competition with the rate charged on the diameter of the circle. That is, for a very much larger mileage the Intercolonial gets only the smaller freight charged on the straight line, and while I have not the figures before me to-night—not intending to speak on this subject—I was much impressed some years ago by an examination of the figures which showed to me conclusively that the car mile freight on the Intercolonial was smaller by far than that charged on the other railroads. And that simply means this: That every extra mile you operate a railroad to carry freight means that much extra cost that the railroad has to pay for operation—wages, coal, upkeep, and everything that is included in the operation of a railroad—and if a railroad is unnecessarily long, and only earning freight proportionate to a shorter railroad, certainly it is never going to be comparatively a success. If in conjunction with that fact you take the fact that the people of the eastern provinces have always regarded the Intercolonial as a quid pro quo for the canals in the central part of the country, and incidentally used for the transportation of the western commodities to the seaboard, I do not think it is surprising that the railroad has not been a great success. Then, too, being a political railway, political considerations have entered into its operation, with the result that the road has not made money. Therefore, I say it is not an outstanding example of the failure of public operation, but is an example of how a badly situated road cannot be a profitable work, and must of necessity be a financial failure, when burdened further as I have explained.

I agree with what the hon. member for East Algoma said, that if after these railroads are taken over—I am talking of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk system—you are going to operate them successfully, you have got to co-ordinate them, you have got to remove all unnecessary overhead charges, you have got to get rid of parallel lines, and you have got to insist that between the Canadian Pacific and these co-ordinated Government lines there shall be co-operation and control of rates through the railway commission. I do not believe the time is ripe for the taking over of the Canadian Pacific Railway system: If I understand the position of the Canadian Pacific railway, they would have a right, if the Parliament of Canada insisted there should be nationalization, that the assets of the Canadian Pacific Railway system be taken over at their value, and men who are in a position to speak—I do not profess to speak of my own knowledge—tell me that if the assets of the Canadian Pacific were taken over at reconstruction value Canada would have to practically pay $800,000,000 for the undertaking, and it would necessitate an increase in freight rates of twenty to thirty per cent probably on the rates now charged. It would be impossible for Canada to do anything of that sort.

The Canadian Pacific railway is financially strong, and it is well run, and, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, the object of Canada at this critical time must be the protection of her credit, while securing adequate transportation facilities, and if in competition with Government-owned roads and publicly-managed roads—the Canadian Pacific railway is in a sufficiently strong position to stand the competition and to operate the road as a financial success, then why should Canada load herself up at a critical time like this with $800,000,000 which she can avoid? It seems to me it would be an unwise thing to do, and unwise for another reason: If the Canadian Pacific were taken over by the Government of Canada it would remove that tremendous asset as a borrowing security when fresh capital is going to be required for the development of this country. The Canadian Pacific railway to-day has a great place in the financial markets of the world, her credit is on the soundest basis. But if the road were taken over by the Government of Canada it would not add

one dollar to the credit power of the Canadian people as a people, but would remove that credit power from one of the greatest combinations that the world has ever known, as well as scattering abroad the capital represented by the stock and securities. For these reasons I think it would be unwise at the present time to take over the Canadian Pacific railway. Let us take no more steps at the present than we must take, but let us take such steps as are nationally necessary to secure for the Canadian people the properties that they are going to be called upon to carry in any event. Let us take such steps as will lessen the cost of transportation, that will cut out unnecessary duplication, and that will co-ordinate under one system in Canada these two roads that are at present a financial failure. Let us try to see to it that some scheme of operation is developed by which political interference will be avoided, that the maximum efficiency will be secured, and that we at length will take one great forward step in solving the problem that has been forced upon us, not by the choice of the Canadian people, but perhaps through the lack of vision of her statesmen and Parliamentarians. Let us take this step now in the interest of the national life of Canada, but let us make clear to the world that while we are taking this step we are not confiscating the property of other people, but that we are dealing fairly with them, that we are relieving them from obligations they have voluntarily entered into, and that if there is difficulty in the administration of their railroads and undertakings, those difficulties have not been brought about by the niggardliness, not by the parsimony, and not by the necessities of the Canadian people, but by the directors and others responsible for the administration of these great undertakings and from their lack of foresight and appreciation of the conditions that prevail in this country.

Mr. MURPHY: I suggest that the committee rise now and that the House adjourn.

Mr. SIFTON: If there is any other hon. member who wishes to speak—

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: I understood from the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that we were to adjourn at midnight. Later I was informed by the Chief Whip on this side that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) desired us to go on for an hour or so longer.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. SIFTON: I said one o'clock. I am quite willing to adjourn if there is no one else desirous of continuing the debate to-night.

Mr. CURRIE: Many of us have been here since ten o'clock this morning, and I think we should adjourn.

Mr. SIFTON: I stated, if anybody desired to continue the debate to-morrow, not to-night, he could do so.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 83 to amend the Special War Revenue Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Sifton the House adjourned at 1.18 a.m., Thursday.

Thursday, May 16, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

Return to order of the House with reference to the Imperial Royal Flying Corps in Canada and Return to order of the House showing the status of Canadian recruits in the Royal Flying Corps.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

SENATE BILLS.

HALIFAX RELIEF COMMISSION.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved that Bill No. 97, respecting the Halifax Relief Commission, be read the first time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This Bill is merely to confirm certain legislation passed at the recent session of the Legislature of Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY moved the first reading of Bill No. 98, to amend the Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: Explain.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill is simply to make clear that under the provisions of the Act incorporating the Canadian Patriotic Fund, the corporation body was to be entitled to distribute the funds among the relatives resident in Canada of soldiers forming part of our own forces or the Allied forces. Under the present reading of the statute, as the section is worded, it is open to the suggestion that this money is to be distributed among the relatives of soldiers resident, or who were resident, in Canada, when they enlisted, wherever those may be, and on the other hand that the relatives in Canada of soldiers who did not reside in Canada would not be entitled to be considered. The corporation always has acted on the interpretation that all relatives resident in Canada of soldiers actually fighting, are entitled to benefit; and they desire to have it made clear that that is the correct interpretation and the Act is for that purpose.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty, Bill No. 99, to amend the Act of the present session, intituled: "An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act," was read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 100, for the relief of David M. Sloss.—Mr. Copp.

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Lillie Mabel Billing.—Mr. Mowat.

HEREDITARY TITLES IN CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Has the Prime Minister sufficiently matured his plans to let us know on what day we may renew the debate on titles?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I have not come to a decision about that.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of William Leo Walpole.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Mary Claire Dawson Hislop.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Martin Hafner.—Mr. H. A. Mackie.

Bill No. 79, for the relief of Ida Sophia Wardell.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Bill No. 80, for the relief of Edward David Hill.—Mr. Richardson.

Bill No. 73, for the relief of Frederick Ernest Zang.—Mr. Redmond.

Bill No. 74, for the relief of Thomas Bailey Wainwright.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 91, for the relief of Francis Newman.—Mr. Lalor.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Henry Ernest Saxby.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 90, respecting The Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Nickle.

JURISDICTION OF PROVINCIAL COURTS IN DIVORCE CASES.

In Committee on Private Bills:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I notice that an unusually large number of divorce Bills are before the House this year. A few days ago a judgment was rendered by the Supreme Court of Manitoba, in which, if I mistake not, it was declared that henceforth the courts of Manitoba could grant divorces; that under the British North America Act, as amended when Manitoba came into Confederation, the English law was, in certain circumstances, to obtain in that province, and with it the application of the English law on the annulment of marriages. I believe that that pronouncement of the Supreme Court of Manitoba has not been challenged. The same assertion was made, I believe, by the courts in one of the other western provinces.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was decided in the same way in Saskatchewan, judging from a press report.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like to have an expression of opinion from my right hon. friend with regard to this very important matter, because these decisions may alter completely our divorce proceedings in this Parliament. The opinion has been expressed in the other Chamber that larger powers should be conferred on the Senate with regard to the granting of divorces.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know nothing of the decisions referred to except what has appeared in the public press. The Minister of Justice will doubtless be able to give some information on the subject after he has had opportunity of examining it. In four of the provinces, I believe—the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia—jurisdiction has hitherto been exercised by the courts in respect to the granting of divorces. So far as I know, jurisdiction in these provinces has never been

questioned. Similar jurisdiction is now asserted in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. It would be a very desirable consummation if these matters could be referred to the courts.

It is obvious to every one, who is familiar with divorce proceedings as conducted in the Senate, and in the courts, that the public interest is much better conserved by having such matters dealt with in a judicial way. In a divorce court it is the duty of the presiding judge, in an undefended case, to appoint a King's proctor, who is charged with taking up the defence and of making such inquiry, by cross-examination of witnesses, and so forth, as to assure himself that there is no collusion between the parties. Whether or not any proceeding of that kind is taken before the Senate Committee, I do not know, but if so it is of recent years, because formerly no such practice prevailed. Apart from that, divorce is a proper subject for judicial inquiry if it is to be dealt with at all. I venture to express the hope that, if jurisdiction has been asserted by the courts in the three western provinces, it may transpire that their decision is well founded. It may also be proper for this House to consider whether by some means the jurisdiction could be transferred to the courts of the other provinces of Canada. At all events, whenever the Senate is to consider a divorce Bill, the evidence upon which that Bill is founded, should be taken before a judicial tribunal and not by a committee of the Senate. Let us assume that there is some insuperable obstacle to vesting this jurisdiction in the courts of Ontario and Quebec. Would it not be better to have the inquiry conducted by a judge, the evidence heard by him, and the determination upon that evidence reported by him, leaving to the Senate the final adjudication by Act of Parliament? We can all, I think, agree that the present system is highly unsatisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As I understand the question, it is not exactly as the Prime Minister puts it. Under the Act of Confederation, the Parliament of Canada alone has the power to legislate upon divorce. There is no doubt at all that, upon the broad terms of the constitution of this country, this Parliament has the right to establish a divorce court or to give jurisdiction. But this Parliament has always refrained from exercising that jurisdiction, and consequently, the practice has grown up of parties seeking divorce, and who can not obtain it in their own province, coming to this Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Just as used to be the case in Great Britain.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly, and that will be the case here until there is a divorce court established. The other question to which my right hon. friend referred is, as I understand it, that the province of Manitoba and also the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta claim they have the right to establish divorce courts.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand the province of Manitoba claims its own courts have jurisdiction to decide divorce cases. If that is the situation, there is only one question at the present time. If any province which established its constitution at the time of Confederation has not the power to give its courts jurisdiction to grant divorces, have the new provinces now the power to give their courts jurisdiction to grant divorces? That is the question to-day, and it can, of course, be decided only by the supreme judicial authority, and the sooner there is a concrete case decided in regard to this point, the better it will be. If it be determined by the supreme judicial authority that the new provinces created since Confederation have the power to have divorces granted by their own courts, that will simplify the question very much so far as the divorce business of this Parliament is concerned.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would not my right hon. friend think it better to have those matters determined by a judicial inquiry rather than by the Senate?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Here is a province which asserts that it has, under the constitution, the authority to have its own courts decide these matters. If that be so, the question of the interpretation of the constitution ought to be determined before any other proceeding is taken.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think anybody contends that the province of Manitoba can create a divorce court. I think the contention is that the divorce court is already there, and there as a consequence of what this Parliament has done, whether it so intended or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: As a layman, may I venture to give an expression of opinion? Not only has Manitoba declared its power in the matter; it has done more,

it has exercised that power, because it has recently granted a divorce, and I believe it is claimed that, under similar legislation, Saskatchewan and Alberta may do the same thing. I am one of those who have long felt it would be better if we could have one general divorce court for the whole Dominion. I think we can all agree that the manner in which divorce cases are dealt with by this Parliament is not at all in accordance with, shall I say, moral conditions, nor in accordance with sound legislation. If we cannot have a general divorce court, might it not be a wise course for the Government to say that, wherever there is a divorce court clearly established in a province, the parties in that province shall go to that court? That would reduce the duties of this Parliament to the exercise of the functions of a divorce court only for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, until the good day shall come when even those provinces will be allowed to dispose of those matters in a better way.

REPORT.

Second report of the War Purchasing Commission, for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Sir Robert Borden.

THE YUKON ELECTION:

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE.

On the Order being called for the consideration of the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, covering the Yukon election.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (West Calgary): Although I was a member of the committee which dealt with the question of the Yukon election, and although that committee by a majority of one supported the motion of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) I cannot concur in the report which the committee has presented to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the hon. member to submit a motion?

Mr. TWEEDIE: Yes. The question which was really before the committee was in connection with the counting of the overseas vote for the Yukon constituency, in which Mr. F. T. Congdon and Dr. Alfred Thompson were the candidates. The general nomination day in the ridings throughout the Dominion of Canada in the last election was the nineteenth day of November, and polling day was on the seventeenth day of December. There was a deferred election in the Yukon, and under the Act, December 31, 1917, was fixed as nomination day, and January 28, 1918, as polling day. After the election had been held in the Yukon, Mr. Congdon through his agents served notice of protest on the General Returning Officer at Ottawa, forbidding him to count the overseas vote, Mr. Congdon then having a majority of 110 on the home vote. The Returning Officer referred the matter to the Governor in Council, and an Order in Council was passed on the 26th February, and pursuant to that Order in Council, the record was submitted to the House for consideration. After the record had been submitted to the House the following motion was passed:

> That the special return of the General Returning Officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with power and authority to consider the same and the several documents therein alluded and to report their conclusion and their determination thereon to this House.

That limited the reference to the committee to the record as submitted to the House, and there was no question of going beyond the limits of that reference and considering extraneous matter. So the question really before the committee was whether or not the overseas vote, which amounted to 256 for Thompson and 28 for Congdon, should be counted, thereby determining who should be entitled to sit for the Yukon. When the matter came before the Committee on Privileges and Elections it was thought desirable by all the members that both parties should have the privilege of appearing and consequently adjournments of the committee were had from time to time to give Mr. Congdon the opportunity of appearing and presenting fully his side of the case in connection with the election. It was generally understood, I believe, when these adjournments were made from time to time, that after Mr. Congdon had presented his case to the members of the committee, that committee itself would settle the question at issue. But, instead of arriving at a conclusion, as they were instructed to do by the order of this House, by a resolution which was adopted and reported to this House, and which reads as follows:

> Resolved, that a stated case be prepared and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision.

—the committee shifts to an outside jurisdiction the responsibility which was placed upon it by this House.

Once having assumed the obligation of disposing of the Yukon case, it is my opinion that it should be disposed of by that committee, and that the matter should not be kept dragging along from time to time. If it is to be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, it simply means that the parties have to appear before some tribunal and state their case. They asked for an opportunity of stating their case before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and by frequent adjournments they were enabled to do that. After they have done that, it is my opinion that the committee should dispose of the matter one way or the other and report their findings on the question of fact to this House so that it may be finally disposed of.

But, assuming, for the purposes of argument, that there may be ground upon which the contention of the mover of the resolution in the committee may be based, I submit that the resolution as it has been submitted to this House is impracticable because, if you will notice carefully the wording of the resolution, it says:

> That a stated case be prepared and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision.

We will take the first words of the mover of that resolution, " a stated case." He is a good lawyer; he has had experience upon the bench of Nova Scotia, and he knows, as well as I know, what is meant by a stated case. It is the submission of a set of facts, or a set of questions, which must be agreed to by the parties themselves who are interested in these facts, for decision by a tribunal in the province in which the case arises. When the hon. gentleman says "a stated case" he makes no suggestion as to who shall prepare such case and he makes no suggestion as to who shall be allowed to become parties to it. He takes out of their hands the rights to which they are entitled as a matter of ordinary statute law in any province of the Dominion. Does he suggest that the committee should state that case? Does he suggest that the members of the House of Commons should state that case? Does he suggest that the Governor in Council should state that case He makes absolutely no suggestion whatever in regard to the preparation of the stated case, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is beyond the power of this House to prepare any stated case for any court or for any judges in the Dominion.

[Mr. Tweedie.]

Mr. McKENZIE: I did suggest—

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think it is necessary to tell me to sit down. I wish to remind my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie) that I suggested in the committee that a subcommittee of the committee should prepare a stated case. Perhaps it escaped the ear of my hon. friend, but that is what I suggested.

Mr. TWEEDIE: There was a resolution directing that the evidence be printed and submitted to this House, and I submit that we are bound by the record as it appears here and by the resolution as it appears in the Votes and Proceedings. Then, we come to the second question. He says that a "stated case shall be prepared and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision." My language on that point, if I cared to make it so, might perhaps be stronger than the occasion warrants. But think of a member of the House of Commons, in his place, moving that this question shall be submitted first to the Supreme Court of the Dominion of Canada, a body in which we are supposed to have the most eminent jurists in this country, or, in the alternative, to two judges of the province of Ontario. He practically says: "I would just as soon have the judgment of two judges of the province of Ontario on this question as the judgment of the whole Supreme Court of Canada." We must feel that this is more or less of an insult to the Supreme Court of this country to put it in contrast with two judges of the province of Ontario. Passing from the judges of the Supreme Court and the two judges of the province of Ontario, what justification is there for presenting to this House any resolution which would remove the consideration of this important question from the jurisdiction in which the question arises, namely, the jurisdiction of the Yukon Territory? Are these men to be brought from the Yukon Territory down to Ottawa, or Toronto, when it is purely a Yukon matter, and when, under the Controverted Elections Act, the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory has jurisdiction? If the hon. gentleman wishes to be absolutely fair, and to be bound by the principles of law in regard to this question, I submit to the members of this House that there is absolutely no justification whatever for removing either one of the parties from the

jurisdiction of the court in which the question before the House arises.

I think that this is a matter which should be disposed of by a committee of this House. I further think that if it is not so disposed of there is no authority whereby the members of this House can submit this case to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges in Ontario. If they do, it seems to me that they must stretch the Supreme Court Act to an extent which was never contemplated by the framers of that Act. If they could possibly get it in under section 60 it would have to come in under subsection (b) of the Supreme Court Act, which reads:

> Important questions of law or fact touching—(b) the constitutionality or interpretation of any Dominion or provincial legislation

It seems to me that we are not concerned in this case with any important question of law or fact touching the constitutionality or interpretation of the statutes under which elections are held. I submit that under the Act the principle upon which soldiers shall cast their vote is clearly laid down. I submit that the time in which that vote must be cast is clearly stated in the Military Voters' Act and that there is no question of constitutionality and no question of interpretation. We must take that Act and read it as we find it and if we do not, then we must be men enough to say whether or not the votes of these men overseas are going to be counted either for Dr. Thompson or for Mr. F. T. Congdon.

For these reasons I am going to ask this House to refer the matter back to the committee, and I ask that in accordance with the principle which is laid down in the 3rd edition of Bourinot's Parliamentary Practice, at page 556, and which reads:

> A report may be referred back to a committee for further consideration, or with instructions giving them power to amend the same in any respect. In this way a committee may regularly reconsider and even reverse a decision it has previously arrived at.

If my hon. friends have concluded that they have arrived at a decision, which conclusion I do not concur in, the matter still should be referred back to the committee, who have absolute power to deal with it in any manner they see fit. Therefore, for the purpose of bringing this matter to an issue I would move:

> That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be not concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said Committee for further consideration and to report thereon.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I want to present the case to the House, not in any legal way at all, but simply for the purpose of appealing to the sense of justice of hon. members, and also to their sense of fairness. Let me begin by stating that if there was delay in the consideration of this case by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, it was not due to any fault on the part of either of the parties concerned, nor was it due to any fault on the part of the members of the committee. My hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie), should not complain of this, because at the meeting of the committee which took place on Tuesday, April 21, according to the printed report of the proceedings of the committee, he first of all moved a motion and then withdrew it. Here is what the hon. gentleman said:

> I will withdraw the motion I made and substitute the following:
>
> That this Committee adjourn until eleven o'clock, on Thursday, May 2nd, and if at that time Mr. Congdon has not left the city of Vancouver for Ottawa, then this Committee should proceed to dispose of the case in his absence.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: In his absence?

Mr. DEVLIN: Yes.

> If he has left then we will have a reasonable adjournment to allow him to get to the city of Ottawa.

That motion was carried.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I would like to make an explanation. I made no complaint whatever. I think the committee only acted fairly in adjourning from time to time to allow the interested parties to appear before them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Against the wishes of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I moved the resolution.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am saying this in fairness to the hon. member. I am not complaining of his attitude at all, I simply want to show that the committee used all diligence in proceeding. Again on May 2, Mr. Tweedie moved:

> That the Committee adjourn until Tuesday morning next at ten-thirty o'clock, and then proceed to the consideration of the matter referred to.

That motion also was carried. That brought us up to the meeting of Tuesday, May 7, when Mr. Congdon was present, and the case was proceeded with. I mention this en passant, Mr. Speaker, in order to show that there was no fault to be found on account of the delays occasioned in the

consideration of this case. The proceedings went on equitably and with all due haste. The consideration of the Yukon election was taken in different phases, and I am not going to review those phases. I merely want to point out that both candidates seemed to agree upon one thing: That the nomination papers were not to be held for any further consideration by the committee, but that they were to be accepted, the whole case then being reduced to a point of law as to whether the votes cast by the soldiers overseas should be considered in the election or not. Those members of the committee who are now present will, I think, bear me out in that statement. Nominations for the Yukon took place on December 31, 1917, and the polling day was fixed for January 28, 1918. It was contended by Mr. Congdon that any votes that were given before the day of nomination should not be counted in the election, and he supported his contention by citing different sections of the Elections Act, and notably of the Military Voters' Election Act, laying stress particularly upon section 6, and subsection 1 of section 8, the section reading:

> That at the expiration of the time for nominating the candidates—

that is to say at the expiration of the 31st of December, 1917. And then section 8:

> Polls shall be held in such camps or other places in Canada or elsewhere, as shall be assigned to the charge of presiding officers for the purposes of this part. Those held without Canada shall be maintained open during such sufficient number of days and during such hours as military exigencies will permit, but so that no polling shall commence before the day following that of the nomination of candidates, nor continue after eight o'clock of the evening of the day for holding the poll within Canada.

Let me again read the last words of the section just quoted:

> but so that no polling shall commence before the day following that of the nomination of candidates.

The nomination of candidates, I repeat, was on December 31st, 1917, and according to the Military Voters' Act, no polling of the soldiers could take place before the day following that of the nomination of candidates. There are certain exceptions to this, and notably in the case of emergencies. Subsection 5 of the said clause 8 reads:

> In any case where, for any reason, unless the vote of a military elector is immediately taken it is likely that he may not subsequently be able to vote, the Deputy Presiding Officer may take such vote otherwise than at a formally held poll, but such vote shall be so taken in the presence of the Deputy Scrutineers, or failing either or both, of a military elector, or two military electors, who shall, together with the Deputy Presiding Officer, sign upon the envelope in which the ballot is inserted a certificate that the vote was taken under this subsection, and the reasons which made it necessary.

In the opinion of the majority of the members of the Committee, the whole question then resolved itself into this simple legal question: Are the votes cast prior to nomination day for the Yukon, to be considered as votes cast in that election? In order to do justice to both candidates, the majority of the committee decided that, as it was purely a legal question, the matter should be referred in a stated case to the Supreme Court of Canada for decision. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) moved that a subcommittee should draft the stated case to be presented to the Supreme Court. I do not wish to enter more fully into this question; I simply desire to submit the matter to the House in fairness and justice to the people of Canada who are concerned in the election of a candidate to represent one of the constituencies of this Dominion, and in justice also to the two candidates themselves. Neither the one nor the other has any advantage to gain by referring the matter to the Supreme Court; neither the one nor the other is under any disadvantage through the fact that the Supreme Court, being a judicial body, accustomed to decide questions of law, will decide the one question that was up before the committee as to whether the votes cast before nomination day in the Yukon Territory should be considered or not. And for that purpose, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move in amendment to the motion of the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie), seconded by the hon. member for North Cape Breton:

> That all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:
>
> That this House concurs in the said resolution of the Committee on Privileges and Elections presented to the House on the 13th day of May, concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory; that a stated case be prepared and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not had opportunity to consider whether the amendment is of the nature of a negative motion. I reserve the right to determine subsequently whether it is in order or not.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I shall be very brief in second-

ing the amendment of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). Perhaps I might, in the first instance, answer briefly the mover of the motion (Mr. Tweedie). He suggested that I had no business to move that this pure question of law should be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, and particularly that I had no right to say that, if it did not go to the Supreme Court of Canada it should go to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. I do not know what the hon. member means by saying that I was trying to draw an insulting comparison between the Supreme Court of Canada and two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. Nothing could be further from my mind than to suggest such thing. The Supreme Court of Canada is par excellence the court to which any question of law which this Parliament wants decided should go. There is no question about that. I am asked why I suggested two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. The reason is that ordinarily any person who complains about an election has a right to petition, and by this petition he gets the benefit of the decision of two judges of the Supreme Court of a province. If he belongs to Ontario, or if the case is to be tried in the province of Ontario, he gets the benefit of the judicial knowledge of two judges of the Supreme Court of that province. That is why it seemed to me that if it was thought best to proceed along the line of a petition, it should go to the Supreme Court of the nearest and most convenient province. I did say in Committee that I was perfectly satisfied that it should go to the Yukon if they had judges there competent to deal with it, but that I thought it would be more convenient to submit the facts and argue the case before judges in Ottawa or Toronto, or some place close at hand, than to send men out to the Yukon to argue the case. That is the reason I suggested that the case should go forward to such a court as would be capable of dealing with it if it were proceeded with as a petition.

The submission by Parliament of questions of law to judges is not a new practice. It is an old practice in England, where the House of Commons and the House of Lords for many years have been in the habit of drafting questions of law difficult for them to decide and sending them down to judges of High Courts in England. The same practice is in vogue here. And where there is a question that is purely one of law, I submit to every sensible man in this House that the place to decide that question of law is a court properly constituted for that purpose. I have every respect, Sir, for the judgment and decision and conscientious beliefs and scruples of every man in this House. But we are in a House divided into two camps politically; we are a partisan body; we cannot escape from it. There may be a few here who are not partisans, but taking the House as a whole, it is a partisan body, and I am sure, Sir, that you and any reasonable man in this House will agree that a partisan body is not the proper court or institution to which to submit the deciding of a cold-blooded proposition of what the law is upon any given point. I felt that the same ideas and the same condition of things existed in the committee to which this matter was submitted, and I moved, therefore, on that occasion that it be taken out of the realm of party politics and sent where there would be no politics, and where the question of law would be dealt with purely and simply as the highest court in the land can deal with it.

The hon. member for Calgary seemed to express a doubt as to whether we have jurisdiction to send this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada. Of course, the House, as such, may not do so, although I think it is easily within the inference. But Section 60 of the Supreme Court Act, Chapter 139 of the Revised Statutes of Canada deals with questions of this kind. There are several things that we can submit to the Supreme Court of Canada. One is:

> The interpretation of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886.

Another is:

> The constitutionality or interpretation of any Dominion or provincial legislation.

Even if the section went no further than this, we could very well send this matter to the Supreme Court for decision. But it proceeds:

> (c) the appellate jurisdiction as to educational matters, by The British North America Act, 1867, or by any other Act or law vested in the Governor in Council; or,
>
> (d) the powers of the Parliament of Canada, or of the legislatures of the provinces, or of the respective Governments thereof, whether or not the particular power in question has been or is proposed to be executed.

If under these provisions of the law any doubt exists as to our power to refer this matter to the Supreme Court, surely the following subsection is sufficiently sweeping:

> (e) any other matter, whether or not in the opinion of the court ejusdem generis with the foregoing enumerations, with reference to which the Governor in Council sees fit to submit any such question.

Under this provision the Governor in Council has wide power to submit to the Supreme court any question which should properly be decided by that body. I think that I have made it clear, therefore, that the Governor in Council has power and authority to submit this particular question to the Supreme Court. In any case, it should be submitted to some court satisfactory to the House and to the Governor in Council. I simply want to have a judicial finding upon a matter which is purely a question of law. The Prime Minister said this morning that in divorce cases it was unsatisfactory that questions of fact should be determined by the Senate or by any political body. If it is undesirable to try questions of fact or of law before a political body such as the Senate or this House, it is equally undesirable to try a question of this kind. While we have no power to send divorce cases to the Supreme Court of Canada, we we have power to refer to them a political question of this kind. When we did have jurisdiction to deal with these political questions—perhaps we have it yet—that jurisdiction was not vested in such a committee as we had the other day. As early as 1873 the then great leader of the Conservative party, Sir John A. Macdonald, as may be seen by reference to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, introduced an Act into the House taking the jurisdiction in this matter entirely out of the realm of politics and placing it in the hands of the judges. Since I became a member of this House I have heard no hint of any such thing as an election trial before this House. If any such trials have taken place since 1873, I am not familiar with them. The feeling has been that the House should not try questions of law such as arise in election cases, but refer them to a competent court for decision.

Some hon. gentlemen may say that the case is plain; why should it not be decided on the spot? My answer is this: if this were a simple proposition, the Governor in Council, a body composed of very excellent lawyers, would at once direct the general returning officer to decide the case without delay. But they deemed the question of sufficient importance to cause them to issue an injunction to the general returning officer, instructing him not to decide the question. Mr. O'Connor, the general returning officer, is a good lawyer who has had a good deal of experience at the bar of Nova Scotia and has dealt with many intricate cases. He is well known to some of the members of Council, particularly to the Prime Minister. But it was deemed advisable to estop that gentleman from deciding this point, and to send it here to be dealt with. It is a pity that at the very outset this case was not sent to the court instead of this House. But if an error was made in sending it here, we have not yet gone too far; we should take the earliest opportunity of sending it to a proper court for decision. The member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) made a remark the other night—page 1815 of Hansard—which emphasizes what I mean when I say that this is not a proper court to try such cases. He said:

> I would form my opinion to some extent on the past history of the applicant, his or her experience, and the work that he or she had done, and the efficiency displayed in the particular branch in which the party had been engaged. If I were to undertake to give an opinion on a lawsuit, for instance, as to the grounds for submitting a case to the Court of Appeal, I would probably make a fool of myself.

That is what one of the brightest men in this House said about departing from his own sphere and passing judgment on something which his experience and training did not qualify him to decide. We should all be pleased that there is a court to which we can with confidence appeal concerning this point of law. Both sides will have full opportunity of arguing the matter. If the Supreme Court of Canada or two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario decide that although one or other of these gentlemen was not nominated when the votes were cast, nevertheless the ballots should be counted one way or the other, then the person in whose favour that decision is given may be declared elected by the returning officer, and that will be an end to the whole business. No matter how we decide the point in this House, the decision will be looked upon with ridicule as a partisan one. The proper, the logical, the fair thing for this House to do is to refer to the Supreme Court the record, without change, as it has been handed down by the general returning officer, Mr. O'Connor. Then the decision will be regarded by all as satisfactory; the procedure will be fair and constitutional, and a precedent will be established which may safely be followed in future. I have much pleasure in seconding the amendment.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the subject be-

fore the House is one with which I have some familiarity by reason of my attending on the Privileges and Elections Committee which has had the matter under review, but which has not finally dealt with it. My opinion is that the motion of the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) should carry, and indeed, if this House is to dispose of the subject at all, his motion must carry. It is agreed by hon. gentlemen opposite who support the amendment that there was submitted to the Privileges and Elections Committee—to use the adjective of the preceding speaker (Mr. McKenzie) —a pure, cold-blooded question of law for decision, and that the committee declined to accept the task and recommended that it be committed elsewhere. I do not so regard the situation. There came before the Governor in Council a special report from the general returning officer, referring certain matters connected with the discharge of his duty in relation to the Yukon election to the consideration of Council, and referring Council to certain representations that had been made by Mr. Congdon, one of the candidates in the Yukon, to the effect that certain of the votes that had been cast in that election should not be counted in determining the results. The general returning officer's report was, on motion of the Prime Minister, submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for consideration and determination, and for a report thereon to Parliament. I draw the attention of the House specially to the submission to the committee as passed by this House:

> Ordered, That the Special Return of the General Returning Officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with power and authority to consider the same and the several documents therein alluded to and to report their conclusion and determination thereon to this House.

That was the duty of the Privileges and Elections Committee.

Mr. DEVLIN: If the minister was referring to me a moment ago, in saying that I made a statement that the only question which was submitted to the committee was a cold-blooded question of law, I think he misunderstood me. What I said was that the consideration of the whole question resolved itself into this—whether the soldiers' votes overseas should be counted or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not refer to the hon. member. I gave the distinction of the use of that adjective to the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. DEVLIN: He is able to take care of himself.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps I did not express myself clearly, but what I meant to say was that that was what the question resolved itself into; that was the result of it; that the question to be decided by the Committee was a question of law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those are precisely the words I attributed to the hon. member, and that is precisely why I take exception.

Mr. MURPHY: At what page is to be found the order which the minister has just read?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At page 1 of the Proceedings of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. In pursuance of that committment of a clear and specific duty, there was carried in the Privileges and Elections Committee and reported to this House, a resolution recommending that the duty imposed upon them by this Parliament should be shifted from their shoulders to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to two judges of a court of Ontario, for determination upon a stated case. On the ground taken by the hon. member for West Calgary that the report of the committee is in no sense a discharge of the duty imposed upon it by this House, the only course left open to this House is to refer the matter back to that committee that it may discharge the duty imposed upon it by this House. Any other course is to depart from the stand taken by this House when that motion was passed. Either the House made a mistake when it took that stand and must now retract its position, modify its position, acknowledge its error, and settle the matter over again, or it must recommit to the Privileges and Elections Committee the duty which this House committed to it.

Was it right that Parliament should commit the adjudication of this matter to the committee? I think it was right, for the reason that the task of the committee is not by any means solely the determination of a question of law. The task of the committee is much larger than that. If it were solely a question of law, even then committees of this House have time and again questions of law and also questions of fact to determine. Questions involving both law and fact are time and again before committees of this House for determination and they are determined as best the committees can. But this is a threadbare, cold-

blooded question of law and nothing else. There is a question of law involved, it is true; part of the question is a question of law. I shall see if I can define to the House this fine, hair-splitting question of law.

Mr. McCREA: The minister is well qualified to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question is as to whether or not the term "nomination" day in the Military Voters' Act means the nomination day in each of the several constituencies, or means the general nomination day of Canada; whether or not the intention of Parliament was that the voters overseas should be all voted together in their respective constituencies at the same time over the same month, or whether they should be parted into camps and some voted in one period in one election and some in another, depending altogether when the vote should take place in the constituency in which they exercise their franchise. I was present when the Military Voters' Act was before this House; many other hon. members also were here, and I would like hon. gentlemen to search the records of Hansard and ascertain wherever a doubt arose in the fertile brains of any member of this House as to whether or not the vote of the soldiers overseas was all to be taken at the same time. Nobody ever questioned the thing; but it is contended—I shall not say rightly or wrongly, although I have an opinion—that according to the strict interpretation of the rules of law, the law is, that unless the overseas votes of a special constituency, namely the Yukon constituency, were taken after the day of nomination in that constituency, which day was the 29th of December, long after the whole general votes were taken overseas, then those votes could not be counted at all. It is argued, in support of that, that, inasmuch as they were taken previously, commencing on the day of the general nomination, the 19th of November, those overseas voters had voted without a full knowledge, at all events without official knowledge, of the candidates for whom they were voting. When I say that, I think I have said, in favour of the merits of contention, everything which has a right to consideration. That is a question of law; that may be called a cold-blooded question of law, and if there ever was something cold-blooded, in the nature of the legal interpretation, I think it is that.

But there is more than that involved; there is involved the question of right and justice; there is the question of the intent of Parliament, whatever be the specific interpretation of the law. There is the question of what, if that is the law, it is the duty of this Parliament to do in relation to the votes so cast. Was that duty not committed to the committee? If it should be found, on a cold-blooded question of law, that the correct interpretation was that these votes must be all disregarded, was it not the duty of the committee to determine whether or not Parliament should allow that evidence to go forward and deny the franchise to one-fifth of the electorate of that constituency, or whether it was the duty of this House to give to these men the franchise that it was within their power to exercise?

It has been argued on the part of some, as I stated before, that these men did not know officially who the candidates were, and that may be quite correct. It is argued on the part of others that these men knew who the Government was, and who the Opposition was, and knew what the issue of the election was, and to the utmost of the power reposed in them under the law of Canada, exercised the franchise which was given to them; and if it should be found, in the determination of the law alone, that because they voted before the twenty-ninth day of December their votes should not be counted, then we would have to decide whether that was sufficient reason for the Parliament of Canada to say to them: "Because you voted without knowing who the candidates were we will legalize the franchise you exercised so far as it was in your power to exercise it." They voted for the Government or for the Opposition; they voted for or against the issue of conscription; they exercised the franchise to the full extent it was in their power to exercise it when they cast their ballot, and if we decide that having done so there is a legal objection to counting the votes, then what is the duty of Parliament in the premises? Is it the duty of Parliament to legalize those votes, or shall we say that on account of the fault of Parliament these men shall remain disfranchised throughout the life of this Parliament? That was the question submitted for determination to the Privileges and Election Committee by a resolution of this House. The Privileges and Elections Committee have made no report on that question at all, but on the motion of an hon. member of the committee it was decided without discussion, and I blame no one for that, simply to refer the cold-blooded question of law to the Supreme

Court of Canada or to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Now in the first place the only way to submit a stated case, as was very clearly explained by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie), is for all the parties interested in that case to agree upon a wording, and then lay the case before the tribunal for determination. Who are all the parties interested in this case? Are they only the late hon. member for the Yukon, Mr. Thompson, and Mr. Congdon, the Opposition candidate. Is nobody else interested? Are the people of the territory itself not interested, irrespective entirely of the personal rights of these men? Are the voters overseas, some 325 men, not interested, entirely irrespective of the rights of Mr. Congdon and Mr. Thompson? Are they not to be represented in making a stated case to the Supreme Court or to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario? And if they are to be represented, how are they to be represented, and who is to decide that matter? None of these questions are dealt with in this report. Furthermore, I contend that even if this House had adopted the report and went further, and did what the committee refused to do laid out the machinery by which this stated case would be prepared, and had the matter submitted to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court would be compelled to decide they had no jurisdiction to try the case at all. From no other source can the Supreme Court have jurisdiction except from the common law of Canada and the statute law, and I argue that neither common law nor statute law gives the Supreme Court any jurisdiction to hear and determine a report from a committee of Parliament. I do not think any elaboration of my own opinion would be very convincing to the House on a matter of this nature, but I take the liberty of quoting the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice on this point, which is to the effect that neither the Supreme Court of Canada nor any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario would have power to hear and determine such a matter, merely upon its submission by this House, as the report of the Privileges and Elections Committee. The opinion is contained in a memorandum to the Prime Minister dated May 15 and is as follows:

> The Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Privileges and Elections, upon reference of the special return of the General Returning Officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery concerning the Yukon election, recommends that a stated case be prepared and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision.
>
> Obviously such a reference may be made only if it be within the jurisdiction of the court or the judges, either inherently or by statute, to determine upon such a reference the question submitted by the stated case. Now there can be no doubt that it is not at common law a part of the duty of the courts, or the judges, to determine questions referred by a committee of the House of Commons.
>
> It is provided by the Supreme Court Act, section 61 that the court, or any two judges thereof shall examine and report upon any private Bill or petition for a private Bill presented to the Senate or House of Commons, and referred to the court under any rules or orders made by the Senate or House of Commons.
>
> This section describes a jurisdiction somewhat analogous to that which the House of Lords exercises to put questions of law to the judges, the answer to which may be necessary to the House in its legislative capacity. The House of Lords also in its judicial capacity may consult the judges, but that power is exercised only for the purpose of obtaining advice with respect to the disposition of pending cases, and as to this the jurisdiction is different from any which is possessed by either House of Parliament in Canada. With respect to advice upon legislative questions the judges in England, as the cases show, have been very careful to confine their answers to the strict legal construction of existing statutes, and they have asked to be excused from answering questions which go beyond this. It will be perceived, however, that section 61 of the Supreme Court Act falls far short of enabling a committee of the House of Commons to submit a stated case with regard to an election return, and, except for section 61, there is no legislation authorizing the court or the judges to advise the House, or any committee. The business of the court is to determine questions raised between parties impleaded in judicial proceedings, and moreover no doubt to execute any judicial duty which may be imposed by statute but as the proceeding recommended by the committee is entirely novel and not within any jurisdiction which the court possesses, it is out of question that the court would decline to adjudicate upon any case submitted by the committee, or by the House upon the recommendation of the committee, and I apprehend that the only way in which the committee's recommendation could be made effective would be by statute imposing a new duty upon the court.

Words could not be clearer as to the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice on the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to hear such a commitment did this Parliament adopt the report. So upon the score of that the court suggested would have no jurisdiction whatever to determine the issue if it were committed to it, on the score, secondly, that there is no method of putting the case to the court if they had jurisdiction, and on the score, thirdly, and most strongly of all, that it is the duty of a committee of this House to discharge an obligation imposed upon them by this

House and not to seek to evade that charge, and because this House is bound in justice to itself not to evade its duty until it has exhausted all its powers under a committee, I think we ought to adopt the motion of the hon. member for Calgary and refer the matter back.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL: I am somewhat removed from the Yukon, and have to rely mainly on newspaper reports, but I understand from those reports that there was no real issue in the election in that constituency, as both candidates stood on practically the same platform as supporters of conscription and Union Government. Perhaps the minister will say whether I am misinformed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the matter raised by the hon. member should affect the case now before Parliament, but on that matter there are very conflicting opinions

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: Mr. Speaker, if we were dealing with the merits of this question we might bring it home to ourselves, in one of our nearby constituencies, without going to the far-away Yukon. Suppose that on the 19th November in any constituency in Canada the nominations were being made and somebody should come up and say: "Look here, Mr. Returning Officer, we thought this election was going on some time ago; we held a meeting in our district, we have been doing some voting and we propose that you shall count the votes given some weeks ago when there were no candidates in the field." What would the returning officer say? Surely he would say at once: "There is no candidate in the field until the candidate is nominated, and when there is no candidate in the field, votes can hardly be counted in an election which comes on later." That seems to me to be reason and common sense. But we are not called upon in any degree to go into the merits of this question here because it seems to be rather a legal question. I was somewhat surprised at the argument put up by the Hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) when he said the committee had no discretion in this matter. We passed a resolution in this House referring the matter to a committee. I think I am justified in saying that in so doing we expressed no opinion at all. We simply referred this matter to the committee for inquiry and investigation. "No," says the Minister of the Interior, "we did not; we referred it to you with a command to settle this question yourselves." Surely that cannot have been the spirit in which this House adopted the reference. Surely it was referred to the committee with the understanding that they should deal with it as they thought best. But even if there were that command given, even if they were instructed to inquire and come to a determination and if, in their judgment they should come to the conclusion that the matter was one which might properly be referred to the court, would they not be justified in reporting accordingly? Would my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior seriously claim that because of the words of the reference, because of the instructions that they were to inquire into the matter, and to reach a conclusion and report, they were thereby not permitted to make a report advising a reference to the court? The essence of this question, as between the two motions, seems to be this: The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) desires that the matter shall be settled by the House and by a committee of the House. He says that he desires to refer this matter back to the committee in order that the committee of the House may settle it at once. In other words, he does not want any legal reference at all. On the other hand, the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) has proposed that this matter be referred to the higher courts. The essence of the question is whether this House desires to settle this thing itself or whether it desires to obtain a judicial opinion on a judicial matter. That seems to me to be the essence of the whole question. If the machinery whereby that judicial tribunal is to be created is defective, by all means let us try to make it effective. The essence of the whole question is: "Shall we deal with this matter in the House or by a judicial reference?" On that question I do not believe there should be any hesitation in the mind of any reasonable man. Parliament has a long history in regard to the question of the trial of controverted elections. Away back in the early times of the House of Commons of Great Britain from which we draw our inspiration and practice it was found inconvenient for the House to deal with these matters because many difficulties arose from that practice, and more than that, they obtained a distinctly partisan decision. And so, in the progress of time the procedure was changed and it was agreed that a committee should be chosen to deal with these matters. For some years the committee procedure was followed. But there again they found that they were using

partisan machinery to deal with questions which were not properly the subject of partisan consideration. After further years of progress it was decided that the committee system was wrong. I have a recollection of such cases in our provincial legislature. One arose in Nova Scotia in my boyhood days long before Confederation, as a result of which party feeling and great personal bitterness existed for a long period afterwards. The case was tried by a committee of the House and a decision was reported favourable to one candidate and confirming in his seat the member who had been returned. I remember that a very distinguished statesman, who afterwards rose to great eminence in this House, when, in later years another distinguished man was proposed to be made chief justice of Nova Scotia, declared in the political journal which he controlled that the latter was unfit to be a judge in Nova Scotia because he had perjured himself in that election case. That is the kind of thing you get if you proceed to deal with these matters through a party tribunal in the form of a committee of the House. There have been some cases even in this Parliament in which it was felt that that procedure was very unsatisfactory and by the common consent of all parties this Parliament resolved that it was incompetent to discuss questions of that character and that in fairness and justice all such matters should be referred to a judicial tribunal under the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) tell me when it was decided that Parliament was incompetent to settle these cases?

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot give my hon. friend the date of the Controverted Elections Act, but it was in the early days.

Mr. McKENZIE: 1873.

Mr. FIELDING: I say that Parliament decided it would no longer have the committee system and that there should be created a judicial tribunal for the performance of such duties. But Parliament has not absolutely dispossessed itself of authority in such matters. There are cases in which Parliament will still take action, but they are not cases which are purely matters of dispute between the parties. Take the case in which an Irish constituency returned O'Donovan Rossa. It was reported to Parliament that he was a convict. He was known to be a convict, and not only a convict but actually in prison. There arose a question as to whether he should be debarred from taking his seat. It was argued that he was not qualified to take his seat, and Parliament decided that it would not allow him to take his seat. There was no dispute as to the validity of the return; it was a question of qualification or disqualification, and it was therefore a question with which Parliament itself should deal. John Mitchell was returned by acclamation for Tipperary. John Mitchell was an escaped political convict, and Parliament decided that he was disqualified. There was no dispute as to the return, but Parliament determined that he was not qualified and it ordered a new writ to issue. John Mitchell became a candidate again mation, and I would ask hon. members to observe the distinction which Parliament made. John Mitchell having been elected by acclamation, there was no question as to the procedure by the returning officer; it was purely a question of qualification, and the House of Commons decided that it should have the say as to that. But when John Mitchell became a candidatae again he was opposed, and the question became more than one of qualification; it became a question of dispute between two candidates. Then Parliament said: "It is not a matter within our power; that must go to a judicial tribunal."

Some years ago a very famous case occurred in this House, commonly known as the King-Baird case. It will be admitted by anybody who reads the evidence that all the facts in that case were in favour of Mr. King. But Mr. Baird had been declared returned by the returning officer. The issue was threshed out, and it became more or less a matter of party controversy. However, the conclusion reached was that Parliament ought not to take any action. Sir John Thompson, who was then Minister of Justice, made a very strong argument based simply on the ground that it was a judicial matter in which Parliament should not interfere. Now the equities were so strongly with Mr. King that public opinion forced Mr. Baird, although he was sustained in his seat, to resign and be again elected. But notwithstanding that the case, in point of equity, was so strongly in favour of Mr. King, Sir John Thompson took the ground: this is not a question for Parliament, but one for the judicial tribunals of the country. I do not think this should be a matter of party controversy. We are going to make precedents in this matter to-day, and hon. gentlemen on both sides should be

chary of creating precedents that may be embarrassing in the future. If there is one thing more than another which has been clearly understood it is that the House of Commons of Canada ought not of itself to undertake to deal with questions of this kind, because of the danger of partisanship entering into the matter, and, therefore, Parliament would be acting wisely in determining upon a reference to the judiciary of the country. If the machinery by which that can be done is not effective, let us improve it, but let us not try to settle the matter here in violation of the long traditions of Parliament, which declare that the courts, and not the House of Commons, are the proper authorities to decide matters of this kind.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, the House is certainly indebted to the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) for having put this matter before it in its proper light. As he rightly said, the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections was certainly not a refusal on the part of the members of that committee to deal with the question referred to them by the order of reference of this House. The order of reference reads:

> That the Special Return of the General Returning Officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with power and authority to consider the same and the several documents therein alluded to and to report their conclusion and determination thereon to this House.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) to the contrary notwithstanding, the Committee on Privileges and Elections have considered the matter referred to them, and they have reported their conclusion and determination to the House. After having heard the arguments of both parties, they have determined that the question resolves itself into a mere question of law, and that it should not be left to the members of the committee, which may be a partisan committee, to decide, but that it should be decided by judicial authority. That is the gist of the case. I am not concerned as to whether the drafting is defective; that may easily be remedied by the House. Even if an Act of Parliament is necessary to give effect to the views of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, such an Act may very expeditiously be passed.

The question as to who is to represent a particular constituency in the Canadian House of Commons is of very great importance. It is just as important a question as whether a county will be represented at all, and interests not only the people of the particular constituency affected, but the people of the country as a whole. All citizens of Canada are interested in the ability, integrity, qualifications and standing of all and any of the members of the House of Commons. So the question of considering the conflicting claims of two gentlemen who assert their right to a seat in this House must be dealt with without any party spirit and free from all political bias on the part of the members of this House. By the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, this Parliament, following the precedent of the British Parliament, has left to judicial authority the decision of all questions relating to controverted elections. The principle goes to the extent, as is asserted by British constitutional authority, that the only question which Parliament has reserved to itself to deal with is the question as to whether a proper or fit person has been returned in obedience to the writ. I will quote the words of the late Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice, uttered in the House of Commons in 1887, as found on page 157 of Hansard of that year.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him if he does not consider that the whole question is comprised in the disenfranchisement or otherwise of the soldiers?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I will deal with that later on. Here are the words of the late Sir John Thompson:

> Since the change which I have referred to, and by which Parliament has renounced its rights to deal with the matter of controverted elections, there has been fully recognized in the various discussions that have taken place in the Imperial House of Commons, this principle, that everything has been transferred to the judiciary in connection with controverted elections, excepting the one question of the disqualification of persons who have been returned to Parliament. As was said by Sir Henry James, in 1882, in the case of Michael Davitt, the only question which Parliament has reserved to itself to deal with is the question whether a proper person has been returned in obedience to the writ As was explained by Lord Coleridge and Lord Selborne in a previous debate in 1870, that reservation is not in conflict with the Statute which says that the election shall only be contested by an election petition, because the House has to consider whether the writ has been obeyed which com-

manded the electors of the shire, or the county, to return a suitable person to sit in that House. The House, therefore, is still seized of the right to decide whether the writ has been obeyed by the election of a person who is fit and proper to sit in that House. But as soon as the question has been decided as to the qualification of the person so returned, the conduct of the returning officer, or the number of votes which were received, the conduct of the candidates, and every other question connected with the election, or with the conduct of the returning officer, has been relegated to the judiciary, and the House has always declined to exercise its functions and its power to interfere.

I shall also quote the words of May in his "Parliamentary Practice:"

Before the year 1770, controverted elections were tried and determined by the whole House of Commons, as mere party questions, upon which the strength of contending factions might be tested.

In order to prevent so notorious a perversion of justice, the House consented to submit the exercise of its privilege to a tribunal constituted by law, which, though composed of its own members, should be appointed so as to secure impartiality, and the administration of justice according to the laws of the land, and under the sanction of oaths.

Further on he says:

This principle was maintained, with partial alterations of the means by which it was carried out, until 1868, when the jurisdiction of the House, in the trial of controverted elections was transferred by statute to the courts of law.

In this country this principle has been accepted in our Dominion Controverted Elections Act. Section 91 of that Act says:

All elections shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance herewith.

And this applies, Mr. Speaker, even when no return has been made. Section 11 of the Act says:

The petition presented under this Act may be in any prescribed form; but, if or in so far as no form is prescribed, it need not be in any particular form, but it must complain of the undue election or return of a member or that no return has been made, or that a double return has been made, or of matter contained in any special return made,

And so on. And Section 8 says:

Whenever a petition under this Act, complaining of no return, is presented, such order may be made thereon by the court as is deemed expedient for compelling a return to be made.

So that the matter of controverted elections is entirely left to judicial authority, whether a return has been made by the returning officer, or whether no return at all has been made.

Of all cases, Sir, it seems to me that the present instance should be decided according to that principle. There are no questions of fact discussed or even challenged. The Act of 1917 amending the election law must be interpreted according to the views of Dr. Thompson, or it must be interpreted according to those of Mr. Congdon. This Parliament cannot make a law for the purpose of changing a law which was passed last year in order that the change can be made applicable to an election which has actually taken place. Retroactivity in a case of that kind would be immoral on its very face. So the law as it is must be interpreted, and what the members of this House must ask themselves is: What is the proper authority to interpret that law?

I respectfully submit that the judicial authority, not this Parliament, is the only proper authority to interpret the statute passed last year. Let me ask members of the House this simple question: Do they consider that they are as well qualified as the members of the Supreme Court of Canada to interpret a law or to decide a case arising from the interpretation of a law, either from the point of view of legal knowledge, of judicial experience or even of impartiality? For my part, I admit that my qualification for that duty is not equal to that of the Supreme Court of Canada. I have my views on the matter; perhaps I may state them in a few words. It is the essential factor of an election that there should be candidates. Without candidates there can be no election. It necessarily follows that votes registered at a time or in a county when or where there is no candidate have no legal value, are worth no more than blank pieces of paper. That is my opinion, but I am willing to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

The first principle of responsible Government is the right to vote for a particular candidate and for the man. That rule has never been departed from in any country under the British flag. It was departed from to a certain extent for the first time at the last election, but even then it was provided that the electors could vote for the man. But in the Yukon case the voters did not have that right until after December 31, 1917; therefore all votes cast before that date are contrary to law and contrary to the rights of the parties. But I repeat that I am willing to leave the decision of this matter to judicial authority.

As to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada to deal with a case of this kind, I do not think that there is any difficulty. Even the Minister of the Interior

(Hon. Arthur Meighen) and the gentleman who wrote the letter that he quoted this morning, have said that Parliament could pass a law conferring such jurisdiction on the Supreme Court. He could not say otherwise, because section 43 of the Supreme Court Act says:

> Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained the court shall also have jurisdiction as provided in any other Act conferring jurisdiction.

It would be very easy to pass an Act to confer such jurisdiction on the court, but I submit that that is not necessary. Section 60 of the Act provides that the Governor in Council may refer the decision of a question of law to the Supreme Court. It says:

> Important questions of law or fact touching the constitutionality or interpretation of any Dominion or Provincial legislation may be referred by the Governor in Council to the Supreme court for hearing and consideration.

Surely the present case, which touches the interpretation of a Dominion statute, could, under this provision, be referred by the Governor in Council to the Supreme Court of Canada. I am surprised that instead of passing the Order in Council of February 26 referring this matter to Parliament the Government did not adopt the simpler method of dealing with it by referring it to the Supreme Court of Canada. Let no hon. gentleman tell me that the Governor in Council only can do that. Surely Parliament is superior to the Governor in Council. If an Order in Council is necessary to the making of such a reference, surely this House may instruct or even order the issuing of such an order. The executive power is the servant, not the master, of the legislative power. However objectionable the assertion may be to their pride, ministers of the Crown are the servants, not the masters of Parliament. Surely a decision of this House confirming the decision of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is equivalent to an instruction to the Governor in Council to refer the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada, which they have the power to do under the Supreme Court Act.

The decision of the Supreme Court in this matter would be easy of execution. They would either instruct the returning officer to count or not to count the challenged votes, or instruct the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to declare Dr. Thompson or Mr. Congdon duly elected. Shorn of all legal technicalities, the question is, can the votes which were given and registered previous to the nomination of candidates—in other words, when there were no candidates—be counted under the law of the country as it is to-day? I respectfully submit that the matter of deciding this question does not pertain to the members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or to the members of this House. I strongly urge members of the House not to take a step backwards, but to act according to constitutional usage and authority and to leave the decision of such an important question to the judiciary of the land.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): My hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe) attaches a meaning to the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), which it is rather difficult to follow. Both the report and the amendment, if adopted by this House, would be admittedly ineffective so far as the two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario are concerned, and, unless the Governor in Council should act according to my hon. friend's suggestion—I will deal with that a little later—they would be equally ineffective so far as the Supreme Court of Canada is concerned. Does my hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe) suggest that the Governor in Council, or this House, has without special legislation, power to refer this matter to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. The hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) who moved the resolution in the Committee admitted that, according to his view, the Committee on Privileges and Elections and not the Governor in Council should have prepared the stated case. Hon. gentlemen who have dealt with this matter do not seem quite to understand what it is they do suggest. Let us, in the first place recall the fact that this matter came into this House by reason of a special return which did not declare any candidate elected for the Yukon territory. Having come into this House on the report of the General Returning Officer, it was referred by unanimous consent, as the House deemed proper to refer it, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I repeat that, according to my conception, the Committee on Privileges and Elections have made to this House a report which is both impracticable and ineffective, and for that reason I think it ought to be referred back in order that they may make a report such as the House contemplated when the reference was made in the first instance. The question came into this House upon a special return.

The House had the right to deal with that return. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom the matter was referred, had the right to deal with it, and that Committee have left the matter just about where it was in the first instance, I have already said that no hon. gentleman in this House would for one moment contend that this report or the amendment could be carried out in its literal terms. Both the report and the amendment suggest that this matter may be left to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. Those who vote for this amendment vote their belief that this House can properly refer the matter to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, or that the Governor in Council could do so. The matter would degenerate into a farce if the Governor in Council attempted to do anything of the kind, because everyone in this House knows perfectly well that the Governor in Council has no such power. So far as the Supreme Court of Canada is concerned, neither the report nor the amendment suggests that the Governor in Council should take any action.

The purport of the motion in committee of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) was that a committee of this House should refer the question to the Supreme Court of Canada. Neither this House nor the Committee on Privileges and Elections has any such power without special legislation. So far as the Governor in Council is concerned, I do not concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) that this is in contemplation of section 60 of the Supreme Court Act. On the contrary, I am impressed with the view taken by the Deputy Minister of Justice. It seems to me it was not the intention of that Act to refer controverted election matters—because this practically amounts to that—to refer questions between parties, although these matters concern this House as well—to the Supreme Court of Canada for determination under section 60 of the Supreme Court Act. No such jurisdiction has ever been exercised by the Governor in Council in such matters in the past, and I venture to believe it was not the intention of the Act that they should be so referred.

Just one or two words more. My hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe) speaks of any action by this House or by a committee of this House, which would not be based upon an exact and literal interpretation of the Military Voters' Act or the War-time Elections Act, as quite immoral.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I never said that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my hon. friend understand that any member of this House during the past session, when those Acts were passed, had it in contemplation that, by reason of such conditions as he has alluded to, three or four hundred men—I forget how many—who have gone overseas to fight for this country and who, equally with the other 300,000 had the right to vote, should be deprived of their franchise? That, I think, is a pretty important question to take into consideration. This House has rights; the people of this country have rights, and the men who, under the terms of that Act, according to its true intention, were to have the right to vote, must also be taken into consideration when this matter comes to be determined, and the matter could not be put more clearly than it was put before the Committee on Privileges and Elections by Mr. Congdon, one of the candidates at the recent election in the Yukon. This is what Mr. Congdon said on the 7th of this month before that committee:

> There cannot be any doubt that even under the Controverted Elections Act of Canada the House of Commons still has jurisdiction over election matters of this kind; that was evidenced by the fact that even in the case of an election petition before a court established under the Controverted Elections Act, the court might report to Parliament, which enables Parliament to go further than any decision which could possibly be given by the court and to come to a conclusion such as the court could not possibly arrive at. The commonwealth is interested in the service of every member of the Commons' House of Parliament, and the court and the council of State and Justice of which this Committee is the representative is governed by rules of state and law peculiar and more high and more politic than those which govern the court in cases of any matter between party and party. For this reason it has always been the practice in regard to matters of this kind not to be scared away by technicalities, not to be hampered by rules which might be binding in courts of Justice, but to go straight to the heart of the matter, and determine what is just in regard to the matter in dispute.

I do not think the matter could be put in more cogent terms. I may be permitted to recall the attention of the hon. member for Kamouraska to the fact that the Act in question deliberately sanctioned the vote by men overseas, not for a particular candidate, but for one party or the other in this House. That was the purpose of this Act. Men were authorized to vote either for the Government or the Opposition; and for the very reason that it might, in some instances, be impossible for those men to know who was the particular candidate sup-

porting the Government or the particular candidate supporting the Opposition, that provision was inserted in the Bill presented to the House. For that reason, Parliament sanctioned that principle, and even if there be such a technicality as that hon. gentleman relies on, I think that statute, interpreted, according to the language of Mr. Congdon before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, might not necessarily result in the disfranchisement of three or four hundred gallant men from the Yukon who have fought the battles of this country overseas and who have the same right to be heard in the determination of their representative in this Parliament as any other man in this country or any other soldier overseas. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) has addressed certain observations to this House with the greater part of which I agree, but I venture to think that the very argument which he put forward constitutes one of the strongest reasons for referring this matter back to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. He says that if it is necessary, for the purpose of doing what is right and just and fair in this matter, let us have special legislation. Well if we are to have special legislation was it not the duty of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to suggest that to us; and to prepare a draft of that necessary legislation and report it to the House? Instead of doing that they have brought in a report which I repeat is in its terms both impracticable and ineffective. The committee in short has not discharged the functions conferred upon it by this Parliament when the special election return was referred to it, and under those circumstances I think it is eminently right and proper that the report should be referred back for further consideration by that committee. If the committee reaches the conclusion that there should be special legislation one way or the other—special legislation to assure to these soldiers the right to the franchises which Parliament undoubtedly intended to confer upon them, or special legislation for the purpose of making it abundantly clear that some court in this country shall have the power to determine this matter—then let the Committee on Privileges and Elections take that matter into consideration, prepare their draft of the proposed legislation, and report it to the House. For the reasons which were urged by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens, if for no other reason, I would think that the report should be referred back. I am content to leave the matter there, pointing out to my hon. friend who has last spoken (Mr. E. Lapointe) that it never was the intention of this Parliament from first to last to deprive a single man of those 300,000 who are overseas of the right to vote because he did not happen to know who the candidate was. That I repeat never was the intention of Parliament from first to last, and if there is any technicality in the statute by reason of which the postponement of the election in the Yukon will bring about a different result from that which would have been brought about if that particular contingency had been foreseen and provided for in clear terms in the statute, I still think it is the duty of this House to take very carefully into consideration whether or not they are to sanction the disfranchisement of the soldiers who have voted and whose right to vote is now called in question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the legislation of last session was of such a hasty character that we need not be surprised if it has resulted in a great deal of confusion, one or two instances of which have already come to our attention. The Act was passed without any contemplation of a case such as we have before us to-day; in fact, many of the points which have arisen in the working out of the Act were not foreseen. For instance, the Act provides that a petition to controvert an election must be presented within forty days of the election, together with the return or no return, and so on. The date for the nomination of candidates in the Yukon was the thirty-first day of December, 1917, and as some of the votes were polled overseas, it was not possible to have a full return of the election within forty days of nomination. The same condition applies in practically every riding, and therefore under the law there could be no petition against an election. I might allude to an election in one of the western provinces which my friends wanted to controvert; we thought there was good ground for protest, and we were satisfied that if the matter was brought before a court the election would be set aside, but we could not bring a protest at all because in framing the new legislation last year regard had not been had to existing legislation. Another contingency was not foreseen. The legislation of last session provided that the election in the Yukon should take place, not at the same time as the general election, but afterwards, and it should have been the duty of Parliament, primarily, the duty of the Government, who had charge of the legislation and introduced it, to provide for the Yukon soldiers' vote being protected. But

their votes were not protected, and the Act was passed with all the blemishes with which we are now familiar. Provision should have been made to secure the soldiers' votes in the Yukon election, but that was not done, and therefore the soldiers' votes did not apply.

The Prime Minister a moment ago made a strong point of the fact that the soldiers might be disfranchised. That may be, but it will not be the fault of Parliament, but the fault of the law which did not provide for this case. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior said that the soldiers knew whether they voted for the Government or for the Opposition. In the Military Voters Bill of 1915 provision was not made for the mention of any particular candidate on the ballot; the soldier was simply permitted to vote for the Government or for the Opposition. I called the attention of my right hon. friend to that point last year and the section was amended. Primarily, of course, the Government and the Opposition are at issue, but the candidate himself has always an influence on the elector, and we should not abridge the elector's liberty in that respect in the slightest degree. Everybody in this House knows that many and many a time an elector will be influenced to vote for this or that candidate for other than political reasons, and sometimes for political reasons which the elector will not accept generally, but will accept in a particular case. Again, a man may be in favour of the Government or Opposition candidate, but will not support the policy of the Government or of the Opposition. On the other hand, many and many an elector is in sympathy with the Government or Opposition, but not in sympathy with the Government or Opposition candidate. These considerations influence the voters many and many a time. But the Military Voters' Act of 1915 swept all these considerations aside, and limited the soldiers' choice to the Government or Opposition candidate, without mention of his name.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think I can very positively say that my right hon. friend is falling into error when he says that in the Act of 1915 there was no provision by which a man could vote for a particular candidate. I have not the statute before me, but my recollection is very clear on the point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My memory may be at fault, but I do not think so. Supposing I am wrong, I come now to a provision which I certainly believe was not in the Act of 1915. Here is the ballot which was submitted to the soldier:

> The deputy presiding officer shall sign such certificate and deliver the envelope on which it appears, with a ballot paper, to the voter, who may mark the ballot paper in accordance with the directions thereon as a vote for the Government, the Opposition, or any Independent candidate or candidates, or Labour candidate or candidates or for any candidate or candidates (if more than one candidate is to be elected) designated by name for whom he desires to vote;

Whether that is in the Act of 1915 or not, it is in the Act of 1917. The voter could vote for the Government; he could vote for the Opposition, for Mr. Congdon, or for Mr. Thompson, but at the time he voted he could vote for neither Mr. Thompson nor Mr. Congdon because neither Mr. Thompson nor Mr. Congdon was a candidate. Therefore, his liberty was abridged. He could not select as between any candidate because there were no candidates in the field. Will my hon. friend tell me that under such circumstances it is fair to Mr. Congdon, or fair to Mr. Thompson, when the voters could vote neither for one nor the other? That is the reason that all the arguments which have been put up by hon. gentlemen opposite fall to the ground. The liberty of the elector was abridged. If it was intended, as it should have been when it was made the general law of the land, that the law should be applied in the Yukon as well as anywhere else, it should have been provided that voters in the Yukon should vote not before there were candidates but after there were candidates. Why was that not done? Somebody blundered perhaps but it was not done and that is the condition we have to-day. Mr. Congdon, who had a majority of the votes of those who alone could vote in the election, made a protest to the returning officer that he should not count the soldiers' votes. He gave as a reason probably in his own mind, if not in writing, that the liberty of the voter had been abridged in that nobody was named as a candidate and the choice was limited simply between the Government and the Opposition. The returning officer did not decide the objection himself. He referred it to the Governor in Council. I do not know what authority the Government had to deal with the matter when they passed the Order in Council. I suppose they derived their authority from section 19 of the Act of last year which reads:

> For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Part, or supplying any deficiency therein, the Governor General in

Council may make such regulations, not inconsistent therewith, as may be deemed necessary.

I doubt very much if under this section of the Act the Governor in Council could pass an Order in Council which was passed because it was not a regulation. A regulation would have been passed before the election and not after the election. But they did it. In the preamble of that Order in Council I read this:

The Governor in Council is pleased under authority of section 19 of Part IV. of the Dominion Elections Act, and section 6 of the War Measures Act, 1914, to make the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly.

I do not know whether the War Measures Act would give any power to the Governor in Council but this is the Order:

The general returning officer shall, with respect to the elections in said electoral districts of the Yukon Territory, and Nelson, make to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a special return fully disclosing the conditions and showing the result of the polling and such return shall be put before the House of Commons for its consideration and for such action by it as may be deemed necessary or proper according to the circumstances.

When this return was laid before the House, the House very properly, referred it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The committee met, considered the matter and they made the report which is now before us. In it they stated that in their opinion the matter should be decided by judicial authority. My hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) who made the motion that is now before the House, took exception to this report. I will read it in order to make intelligible that which is to follow. It is recommended:

That a stated case be prepared and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision.

My hon. friend from West Calgary stated that the committee had not properly discharged its duty. I cannot agree with him and I believe that on reflection he must come to the conclusion that the point that he has now raised is not justified. The reference is in these terms:

Ordered, that the special return of the general returning officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with power and authority to consider the same and the several documents therein alluded to and to report their conclusion and determination thereon to this House.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

We have to-day that conclusion and determination. The conclusion and determination, as stated here, is that a stated case should be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, for decision. They did not take it upon themselves to determine the case involved for the very reasons which have been given in this discussion already. The committee is composed of the members of this House and the members of this House are actively engaged in politics. We may make the concession that we are partisans. However honestly we may hold to our opinions. I suppose our opinions and our convictions may be said to be biased one way or the other. The judges are supposed to be and ought to be above party consideration. I think we can say in fairness to the bench of Canada that whenever a man goes upon the bench, whatever may have been his political proclivities in the past, from that time on he leaves them behind him and goes into the matters that are placed before him and decides the cases with which he has to deal according to law and the principles of justice as he understands them. The committee, of which my hon. friend is a member, has decided, after taking the whole question into consideration, that the best way is to refer the case to the judicial authority. Is there a man in this House, on one side of the other, who believes that in a matter of this kind there is a better way of disposing of it than by having a judicial determination of it? If anybody is competent to go into these matters, if anybody has to decide whether the soldiers' vote ought to be taken into consideration, or whether the rights of parties or candidates ought to be considered is it not the judges of our courts? Is there any man in this House more competent or better qualified to do this than those who are appointed by law to be the arbiters between man and man? There may, perhaps, be some technicality, but I am sure that had I been a member of the committee I would have endeavoured to have made the report firmer than it is. I would have left no alternative in it. Even suppose the House adopts the principle laid down by the committee, it is not deprived of its power to supplement this report in any manner that it thinks fit in order to give it the proper judicial interpretation and sanction which it must have. The report does not ask that the decision should be final, but it asks that a stated case be prepared for submission to the Supreme Court of Canada, or to

two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario for decision.

They can give their decision so far as it can be given, and if their opinion is that they have not the authority to determine this matter, then the report will come back and Parliament will take, if need be, whatever action may be necessary to supplement the opinion which they have expressed. I call the attention of my hon. friends to the fact that again and again matters have been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada in order to have a judicial interpretation of a point at issue, not with the idea that the court should judicially determine those matters themselves and render a decision which would be binding upon all parties, but to permit the court to give their opinion to the Government and to Parliament so that such action as afterwards may be taken, and should be taken, by Parliament, in the interest of all parties concerned, may have the sanction of the law. Sir, I say this to my hon. friends on the other side of the House: Let us adopt this report, let the case go to the judges, and whatever decision they give, whatever the judicial opinion may be, it is only an opinion, it will not be a final decision binding upon all parties. Then it will be incumbent upon the Parliament of Canada to supplement that opinion in such a manner as to grant justice to whomsoever justice may be due.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): If I might venture to do so, I would express sympathy with the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, by reason of the fact that those who support him seem to me to have furnished the most conclusive argument why his amendment should not be adopted. First of all, I think that the right hon. leader of the Opposition in his main argument has furnished us with reasons which should confirm us in the belief that beyond a doubt the action recommended by this Committee should not be taken. What is the principal argument of the right hon. gentleman? It is that because these votes were taken, under the statute, before nominations, and because provision was not made in the statute for that, that therefore all of the soldier ballots must be rejected, and the soldiers must be deprived absolutely of their vote. And why does the right hon. gentleman say that those votes should be rejected? Because the statute as enacted, if held to be applicable and to permit these votes, would abridge the right of the soldier, because it would deprive him of the privilege of voting for a candidate by name. And what is his remedy for this grievance? It is to wipe out entirely the right of the soldiers to vote. Let us say that the statute in its operation did abridge the right of the soldier, but it still left him the right, in common with all others to vote for the Government, or vote for the Opposition, and the right hon. gentleman says: Let us remedy that by taking a course that will infallibly deprive the soldier even of that abridged right.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that somebody blundered. He does not dispute that Parliament in passing the Act in question intended the soldier voter in the Yukon to have the right to vote like every other soldier, but he says that somebody blundered. I presume that I might take that suggestion to myself, inasmuch as I had a good deal to do with the drawing of that Act. How does he propose to remedy that? I blundered, therefore let us punish the soldier by taking his vote away from him. I am far from admitting that under a correct or reasonable interpretation of the statute those votes should not be counted. But what is precisely the advantage that results from this return being referred to this House? It is that the House would not be tied down. Mr. Congdon himself congratulated us upon that. This House would not be tied down to a literal interpretation of the statute, and if the committee had come to the conclusion that that literal interpretation precluded the counting of the soldiers' vote, if they came to the conclusion that somebody had blundered, the committee had it in their power to recommend to the House that the blunder be corrected. But the right hon. gentleman does not want that to be made possible. He wants this matter sent to a tribunal that will be bound by the letter of the statute, and no matter what the people of Canada, acting through their representatives desired and intended, although it be absolutely clear that they intended that those men should vote, and though it be absolutely clear therefore that in substance those men had a right to vote—because there is an irregularity according to the letter of the statute those votes shall be wiped out. I must confess that if I had any doubts in my own mind as to what the proper course to be taken with regard to

4 p.m.

this motion and this amendment was after listening to the argument of the right hon. gentleman I would feel that it was absolutely impossible for me to reach any other conclusion than that this question should remain in the hands of the legislative authority clothed with power to provide an adequate remedy if a mistake has been made, and that it would be the most futile of remedies to send the matter to a tribunal that will be tied down to the letter of the law; and, if the right hon. gentleman is correct in his contention, with the only result that we will have a decision that somebody blundered, and because of that fact the soldier must lose his vote. If, in the judgment of the House, that is the important matter to have decided, I think we should vote for the amendment. But if, in the opinion of the House, the proper thing to have decided is whether or not men who had a right to vote—men who, by the admission of the right hon. gentleman, failed to obtain their votes because the statute was not made sufficiently clear—shall be, as regards this election, permanently disfranchised, then we should vote down the amendment. I might point out also that it will be no adequate remedy to say: You may go back and have another election, because those very men whose rights are in question will, under the statute in such a case, have no votes. So the amendment, if it be carried, assures this one thing: That if the statute is not perfectly clear the soldiers will be disfranchised, and the intention of Parliament will be defeated. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) says that it is the exclusive privilege of the courts to interpret the statutes. That is quite true if you are dealing with the application of a statute, but is it an unknown thing that when Parliament has discovered that the interpretation attached by the courts to a particular Act of Parliament was not in accord with its intention, that Parliament should legislate to give authoritative interpretation to its own statute? And if ever there was a case, it seems to me, where the exercise of that power on the part of Parliament—if there be need to exercise it—would be justified, it is in this particular case. If there be need for it, and Parliament does not exercise its power to effect a remedy, you irreparably deprive all of these men of the right that Parliament itself, with the people of Canada behind it, intended to give them. I do not think that I need add anything further except to ask, in regard to what the hon. member for Kamouraska said as to the clearness of the right of the Governor in Council to refer this matter to the Supreme Court—assuming he is quite right in that contention, what is it we will get from the Supreme Court? A decision as to who was elected? An order is issued to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make a certain return and to the returning officer to count those votes? There is nothing of the kind in that section. What will it be that will come back to us? It will be advice as to what the law is, that is all. Nobody will be authorized to do anything. Parliament will have to take it up, and we will then have to act. And, in my judgment, if there came back to us the advice that, because of the too narrow words of the statute, because, if you will, some one had blundered these men under the strict letter of the Act were deprived of their votes, there would, in my judgment, be no proper course for Parliament to take, having the power to remedy the evil result of a possibly ambiguous statute than to so legislate as to secure to those men the recognition of the effect of their vote.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): I did not have the pleasure this morning of being here when my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) moved his motion, and when my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) moved his amendment, as I was kept busy before the Private Bills Committee. We should get down to the cold facts of this whole matter. What are they? Last year we passed two Acts, the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters Act. A mistake has been made in one of the Acts. We forgot to provide for the Yukon Territory, which, under the War-time Elections Act is a deferred election. Whose fault is that? I say, Mr. Chairman, that every member who sat in this House last year must take his responsibility for not having thought the matter over and suggested it, and those who framed the Bill must take responsibility for not having properly studied its provisions, and for not having provided for this contingency. As a result we are confronted with the situation to-day that a deferred election has taken place in the Yukon, and that no return has been made declaring one of the candidates elected. But such grave doubt as to the proper course existed in the minds of the ministers that they ordered the returning officer to report the matter to the House of Commons. I will read section 3 of the Order in Council of the 26th of February:

The General Returning Officer shall, with respect to the elections in said electoral districts of the Yukon Territory, and Nelson, make to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a special return fully disclosing the conditions and showing the result of the polling and such return shall be put before the House of Commons for its consideration and for such action by it as may be deemed necessary or proper according to the circumstances.

The special return of the General Returning Officer came to the House and the House decided to refer the special return to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I should here interpret the genealogy of the events. I ask myself, Mr. Chairman, was this return referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections with a mandate to declare one or the other of the candidates elected and more especially, one of them? No. It was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for the purpose of inquiring into it and making a report to this House of its conclusion and determination. A majority of the committee has made a report. Apparently that report did not satisfy the members of the Cabinet and some of the supporters of the Government, and therefore they tell the committee: "You do not know your business, we will tell you what to do, and when you have learned what to do, come back and make us a proper report." I am not willing as a member of the committee to accept that kind of teaching, even from the Prime Minister. I have sat in the committee, and have faithfully and honestly considered the case, and I am going to submit what conclusion I have come to, and justify my vote in favour of this report.

I listened with interest this morning to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) who talked of hair-splitting. I have always awarded him the palm so far as hair-splitting is concerned, and nobody has come into this House to take it away from him. He says: "You cannot put that reference before the Supreme Court; the remedy is to legislate by statute." My hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) says: "Why should we not legislate by statute and also give the court authority?" But the Minister of the Interior immediately contended that we would burden the court with too much work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never said that.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend said in very words: "It will impose new duties upon the court." This is a special case which is the result of our own fault, because we did not legislate properly, and the Supreme Court has only to substitute itself for the general returning officer and to give an interpretation to the statute. The Minister of Justice has given an interpretation of the statute, not like the Prime Minister, who says that if that statute is submitted to the Supreme Court, by the very wording of the statute you will deprive a certain number of soldiers of their votes. I do not consider that we are here to be charged, if we do not admit that the statute should be interpreted as read, as willing to do anything against the soldiers. And under the circumstance of this election taking place after the others, it may well be likened to a by-election. My friends on the other side, the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister especially, tried to evade the question by saying: "Are you going to deprive those poor boys of their vote?" We do not want to deprive the poor boys of their vote. We worked steadily at these Election Acts last year, and the Minister of the Interior will give us credit for staying long enough to help him discuss them and pass them. I remember that the Prime Minister stated at that time that we could not be too careful; that despite all the precautions we were taking, some soldiers would have to lose their votes. And he was right. We could not presume that every soldier who was in Europe would be able to cast his vote. Therefore, there was at the time of the passing of the Act the anticipation that some of the soldiers would lose their votes, and the protection went so far as to provide, in subsection 5 of section 8 of the Military Voters Act, whereby it is enacted:

(5) In any case where, for any reason, unless the vote of a military elector is immediately taken, it is likely that he may not subsequently be able to vote, the Deputy Presiding Officer may take such vote otherwise than at a formally held poll.

There was a provision in the Act whereby the people voting in the Yukon would have been entitled to vote if the Act had been properly put into effect by following certain restrictions imposed under that subsection. If the soldiers' vote was the essence of all these votes, and if the representation in this House was to be based on the fact that all men at the front should give their vote to the man who was elected to entitle him to have the proper status in this House, I do not see why this Act applies only to a general election. My hon. friends will admit that if to-morrow these candidates were both to die we would be compelled to have a new election, and the soldier would not have a vote at that election. If one of us should disappear from this political scene, we should have to have a new election for the constituency affected. What,

then, becomes of all our protestations, of all the eloquence of the Minister of Justice in his remarks on this subject? In a case like that the Military Voters Act would not apply; we wilfully deprive the soldiers of their votes in by-elections. The Yukon election may be likened to a by-election; because that election was deferred, the requirements of the Act with regard to general elections do not apply.

Something has been said about the alleged difficulty of preparing a stated case. The Committee on Privileges and Elections have decided that the matter should be turned over to six judges of the Supreme Court whose duty it is to read laws and to interpret them. After all, the general returning officer undertook to interpret this law. On page 4 of the special report of the clerk of the Crown in chancery, the general returning officer says:

> The day for holding the poll within Canada under Part IV of said Act for the election of a member to represent the Yukon Territory is not specifically denominated by said Act, but I have assumed it to have been the intention of Parliament that in the case of a general election, in which case only does Part IV of said Act at all apply, (see Section 1) polling ought to be, as it could proceed for all electoral districts including the Yukon Territory, on one and the same day.

This is what the general returning officer thinks Parliament intended to convey. You say to the members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections: tell us whether the general returning officer's interpretation of the Act is correct; if you say that it is not correct, we will keep you at work until you say that it is, so that we may declare Dr. Thompson elected. I shall say nothing about the reasons which induced Parliament in 1873 to pass an Act taking these matters away from the jurisdiction of politicians. Dr. Thompson and Mr. Congdon are known to most members of Parliament who have been here for a number of years. Both have sat in Parliament, both are able men and are too well known to need any eulogy from me. I could not pay either of them too high a compliment. In deciding this matter, then, where is the line of division? Just your political feeling; just the political affiliations of these gentlemen in the past. Both are eminently qualified to represent a constituency; both would honour the House of Commons by sitting in it; we do not have to decide as to their abilities or qualifications. I confess that if I saw a hole that would sink the man who was not of my political affiliation, I would naturally and humanly be inclined to look upon that hole as bigger than it really was. The man who would not see it that way would have to have an aeroplane or some other means of flying higher than ordinary mortals. If the reverse were the case, I should be inclined to see the hole a little smaller, so that the other fellow would not get through. That is human nature; that is the reason why these political issues have been taken away from political tribunals and submitted to a judicial body.

This issue has been stated as a mixture of fact and of law. Somebody said that if we were to have a stated case, both parties would have to be represented at its preparation and the case agreed upon by both. I agree to that. But both parties have already been heard by members of the committee. The Prime Minister has read part of Mr. Congdon's statement before the committee. I wish to read part of Dr. Thompson's statement, made through his solicitor, Mr. Hogg, as follows:

> Mr. Hogg.—Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee, perhaps I may make it clearer to the committee, acting for Dr. Thompson, what in my view is before the committee for consideration. There is no matter of fact before the committee and upon which a vote would need to be taken. The facts are contained entirely in documents before the committee. The matter is a pure question of law and the first point of law to be determined is as to the interpretation of the Military Voters' Act which covers the voting of those persons qualified by the Act, that is the soldiers, within and without Canada. That is a matter for interpretation with respect to that Act as dealing with this question as follows: First, does this Act apply to the Yukon, and second, were the soldiers' votes taken with respect to that constituency at the proper and lawful time, and at the only time laid down by the Military Voters Act?

Further on, Mr. Hogg says:

> There is a stated case laid before Parliament as to the interpretation of this statute and as to the legality of Mr. Congdon's nomination paper.

This is Dr. Thompson's view of the whole matter. The special report of the general returning officer was submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as it could be to the Supreme Court, as a stated case. The committee, after considering the matter, have come to the conclusion that the point should be decided by proper judicial authority. If it is said that the report is defective, that is no reason why it should not be corrected when the defect is shown. If the law is defective, that is no reason why Parliament should not have the courage to amend it. Time and again the Minister of Justice has asked the House to adopt amendments to remove ambiguities in enactments. In the Committee on Privileges and Elections we have

no press gallery; there is a kind of muffler on the proceedings. Committees do not draw as much interest or publicity as the House does. If we have erred; if we have not treated the soldiers properly; if we have made a mistake in not making proper provision in the Military Voters' Act under which the soldiers could vote, let us assume the responsibility like men and enact such legislation as will correct the law. If, on the other hand, there is a doubt as to the interpretation, we should not undertake to make that interpretation.

It has been said that the general returning officer is a good lawyer and a man of ability. In that I concur. Nobody will dispute the fact that the Minister of Justice is a good lawyer, that his legal experience has extended over many years, and that he is a man of ability. Here are two conflicting issues. The general returning officer says that he took the Act to mean that the voting of the soldiers would take place on the same day all through Canada for all elections. If that holds good, there is no reason why the votes polled during the general election in the riding of any hon. member here should not be counted if a by-election should occur. Supposing some of us should die to-day, if the interpretation given by the general returning officer holds good that you can vote for a candidate when he is not a candidate, and that the fact that you vote for the Government means that you vote for the candidate endorsed by the Government, the same principle must apply in a by-election. The vote is there; the question is there; the issues are there, and there is no reason and I do not think any good reason can be given why the same principle should not apply. The Act is mandatory. There are three things to be done before you can vote for a candidate. In the first place, there must be a nomination. Nominations in the Yukon took place on the 31st of December. Voting overseas ceased on the 17th of December, and there was no candidate in the Yukon before the 31st of December. Does the House wish to establish the principle that people have the right to vote for a man who has not been nominated? If the votes given for the Government or against the Government are to be applied to one candidate or the other, there is a jurisdiction pre-requisite. You cannot endorse a man unless he has been nominated, and, therefore, the endorsation, if given before nomination, is worthless. Subsection 5 of section 12 of the Military Voters' Act says so in as many words:

> A vote for a party shall be counted as a vote for the candidate or candidates who has or have been recognized, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, as the candidate or candidates representing that party in the electoral district to which the vote has been applied. Some recognition shall be made in the case of the Government party by the Prime Minister, in the case of the Opposition party by the leader of the Opposition, and in the case of any Independent or Labour party by the recognized leader of such party. Within five days after the day of nomination the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition, and the recognized leader of any Independent or Labour party, shall severally notify the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

The Act is mandatory. If not, those votes cannot be applied. In this case nomination took place on the 31st of December, 1917. On the 5th of January, 1918, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada, by virtue of the subsection which I have just read, published in the Canada Gazette the official recognition of Alfred Thompson by the Government party and of Frederick Tennyson Congdon by the Opposition party. If you are going to take the votes that were polled before the 17th of December, you will be completely ignoring the Act. The Act says that you shall endorse the candidates within five days after nomination, and if you have endorsed them within five days after nomination, how are you going to apply those votes which were given while there was not a candidate in the field? Under the circumstances I have not heard any answer which would justify sending back to the committee the whole question which the committee has decided not to consider any further, but to submit to another body. The committee has referred the matter back to the House. Why should we, as members of the House, saddle the members of the committee with the responsibility of deciding the matter? If legislation is necessary for a reference, let us have it. We can pass it If the House decides that we should pass legislation and say: In the matter of the Yukon Territory, we shall count the soldiers' votes, although, according to law, we are not entitled to do so by any interpretation of the Statute as it exists, let us pass such legislation; but why refer the matter back to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? If Parliament is supreme, Parliament ought to take the matter in hand and respect the wishes of the committee which are expressed in the resolution saying: We want to refer the matter to the Supreme Court; we do not want to assume the responsibility of deciding it. If Parliament thinks the Supreme Court

should not be given the matter to decide, let Parliament take the matter in hand themselves and legislate accordingly. I do not think it is fair to treat the committee in the way it is proposed to do. We are all members of this House and we have expressed our views. If what is in the minds of those who wish the matter to be referred back to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, is that, when it is so referred back, a candidate will be elected as a result of that reference, I say: Let us act as a whole; let us take the responsibility of enacting the legislation. It is not fair to saddle this matter on the committee for the committee to pass judgment, to sit as a Court of Appeal and say what decision should be given in regard to the matter, and then, when the decision of the committee comes to the House of Commons, the House will say: The report is concurred in, and that will be the end of it. A full discussion should take place as to what legislation we should enact and as to how the matter should be disposed of. I suggest that, if there is any irregularity in the report, we should correct it. If there are any suggestions to be made, let us make them. The Prime Minister has said that the two judges of Ontario should not be mentioned, in the motion. Let us strike out that part and refer the matter to the Supreme Court. If a case has to be stated, the Governor in Council, who has been willing to take the stated case of the general returning officer, ought not to object to have the stated case prepared and agreed upon by Mr. Hogg submitted to the Supreme Court. I think the Governor in Council does not think less of the Committee than of the Supreme Court, and what is good for the Committee ought to be good enough for the Supreme Court to inquire into. As Mr. Hogg has said, the question is—shall those military votes be counted or not, and under the Act as it now stands, can we, by any method of interpretation—I do not care how elastic it is—say that the Military Voters' Act goes as far as to say that votes polled before a candidate was in the field should be counted for a candidate who later on comes into the field for election? This ought to be looked upon as a by-election as it did not come on at the time of the general election. The general election meant all elections that took place on the same day and the nominations for which took place on the same day. At the time we passed the War-time Elections Act, we made an exception for the Yukon; we forgot it, and I submit that it is up to Parliament, if we come to the conclusion that we are to do justice to the soldiers, to legislate to repair that injustice, but we should not saddle the committee with the interpretation of that law and then put the responsibility on it when the report of the committee is concurred in by this House.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak for a few minutes in regard to the feature of the case which is involved in the reference by the House of this matter to the Supreme Court or to any court. I am not in favour of the amendment because it involves an entirely new principle in the practice of Parliament, and because if a reference is made to the Supreme Court it will be utterly futile, as it will come back with the greatest celerity from the Supreme Court judges when they have looked into the law and the practice. To the hon. gentlemen who are attracted by the argument that they do not know the law and that it would be the best thing to do to refer the matter to judges who do know the law, I would point out that Parliament has never abrogated its rights to be the supreme decider of the law. The courts interpret the law made by Parliament, but Parliament is the law-giver; Parliament is the law-maker, and never, in the whole history of our jurisprudence or our parliamentary life, has Parliament given up to the courts what is its inherent jurisdiction, except in this one instance that, in a private Bill, which does not affect public rights at all, with which Parliament chiefly has to deal, the opinion of a court may be had in regard to it, under section 61 of the Supreme Court Act.

What cases may the Governor in Council refer to the Supreme Court?—they may refer cases in which the Governor in Council may have doubts upon a question of law. Then the Cabinet, but not Parliament, may refer the point to the Supreme Court. Let us make a clear distinction between Parliament and the gentlemen who form the Cabinet, and who in administering the law may have some doubt on a question arising. The Cabinet is an entirely different thing from Parliament. Parliament is the law-giver, the law-maker, the supreme body, and if Parliament has any doubts as to its past legislation Parliament can make a new law to declare what it means. In the whole history of parliamentary institutions, Parliament has never left it to another body to say what the law shall be. If Parliament makes a mistake it should right that mistake.

It was pointed out by the Prime Minister that under section 60 of the Supreme Court

Act the reference is by the Governor in Council. Now, if we passed this motion referring the matter to the Supreme Court, the judges of the Supreme Court would at once say "What right has Parliament to send this matter to us, we can only act under the statute which creates us; we are governed by the Supreme Court Act, and if our jurisdiction is to be extended, another Act must be passed." Therefore, if we sent this half-baked resolution, drawn without proper consideration and without pondering over the wording of the Act, to the Supreme Court, back it would come again to Parliament, and I do not want to be a member of a parliament that would be subjected to that. That would be the inevitable result of our passing this amendment, and therefore I say we should be very careful before we pass a motion of that kind. It was pointed out in the committee, of which I am a member, that it was not competent for Parliament to refer these things to the Supreme Court. I myself pointed out that it was beneath the dignity of the House to do so, but the decision of the committee passed through very quickly, and in my view without mature consideration.

We could not refer the matter to the Ontario judges either, because there are what seem to me vital objections against that, and I suggested that my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) should take the responsibility of moving the adoption of a report by the committee, which would involve his own motion of a few days before, but he declined to do so, saying that that was not the practice of the committee.

But that is to some extent technical, and we want to get down to the meat of the matter. It is true we must all approach this thing with the idea, not of being partisans, but of doing justice, and that I believe is the spirit that prevails in every one of us. The point is how can we best do justice? Have we in our minds the easy road by which we can dump this matter on to the judges and make them decide it for us, or have we the spirit that says: "This is something entirely within our jurisdiction, and we will deal with it whether or not we know as much law as we think we ought to." Then we have to consider this: to whom have we to do justice? Have we in mind only the two eminent gentlemen who have been referred to in this House as irreproachable candidates, or have we in mind those who voted for those candidates? That to my mind is the supreme question, and while I respect both candidates, I have a very slight acquaintance with them, and in my opinion the conservation of the vote of every one of those 325 soldiers who voted for one or other of the candidates is more important to me than whether Mr. Congdon or Mr. Thompson shall be elected. And I shall hesitate a long time before aligning myself with a movement which may have the effect of taking away the votes of those soldiers who voted overseas, and in Canada. Conditions at the front are constantly changing and if a new election were held it would be impossible to get the same vote as before. While I have come to the conclusion that this is a matter of law and of justice with which Parliament itself should deal, yet, and one cannot escape this if he is a man at all—having received and taken advantage of the votes of soldiers in my own constituency, I am not going to say that when it comes to the Yukon, that constituency shall be placed in a different position from the constituency that elected me.

There is another reason, it seems to me, why the proposal in this amendment should be beneath our dignity. I intended to say that a mistake had occurred in the drafting of this act. Undoubtedly the Committee of the Whole which considered the Act clause by clause last year made this slip: everybody forgot the Yukon. I am glad to see that what would have been my contention has been amply supported by the leader of the Opposition and by my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), who said that "somebody blundered." Somebody did blunder. It is no use now trying to place the responsibility on any one in particular. The whole House must share the responsibility for leaving the Yukon out of reckoning.

Suppose we sent this case on to the Supreme Court for determination, because we had blundered in drafting the Act, they would say: "This is not a case for our interpretation of your deliberate opinion, but it is being sent to us simply to get out of the effects of a blunder you made yourself, we cannot and we will not decide the case for you." That is the answer that would come back. The judges of the Supreme Court, you know, are very sensitive about the questions submitted to them. They think their duty is to decide points of litigation between man and man, and while they have to decide theoretical questions that are submitted to them by Order in Council—that is the only way in which it can be done—they try to avoid them in

every possible way, and judge after judge of the greatest eminence has declared that it is not the function of the Supreme Court to decide these questions. The same opinion has been expressed by the Privy Council in England. Here is a case where the Supreme Court judges would say: "This matter does not come to us under authority from the Governor in Council." Because, if this amendment passes, we cannot compel the Governor in Council to pass it on; the Cabinet is a body of men of independent judgment, and we cannot force them to do it, and, therefore, the case would inevitably go to the Supreme Court direct from Parliament, and, as I said before, the judges would return it, respectfully saying they could not deal with the case. Why, therefore, should we take such a futile proceeding? No matter what the Supreme Court does, no matter what kind of a stated case is made on which to get their opinion, the case is bound to come back to this Parliament. There is no power under the statute enabling the Supreme Court judges to say that So-and-so is elected in such a case as this. All the court can do is to find on facts, and give their opinions thereon. Why should we postpone this case and keep these two gentlemen, who I believe are now in the gallery of this Chamber, in suspense for a year or more, if the case is appealed, instead of taking it up ourselves and deciding at this session what is the just thing to do, not only as between these two gentlemen, but as regards the men who voted?

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee which drew up the report now under discussion, I wish to express my views and also state to the House why I came to the conclusion in which the majority of the committee concurred. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), who preceded me, summed up his whole speech in one argument, and that argument was that Parliament, having passed the electoral law, was the only power in the land to interpret that law, and that therefore this matter should not be referred to the courts of justice. If that is a legal proposition to be admitted, if that is a legal thesis to be ratified by the majority of this House, let us forthwith introduce a law abolishing all tribunals because Parliament passes Federal laws, for the interpretation of which we have Federal tribunals, and the provincial legislatures pass provincial laws and they have provincial tribunals to interpret them. If the contention of my right hon. friend is right why should we have tribunals to interpret these laws and why should not the Federal Parliament and the provincial legislatures sit permanently to interpret the laws which they pass?

The right hon. leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden) made one main argument also, in which he parcelled up all the others and his argument was as follows: Should we, the elected representatives of the people of Canada, deprive the soldiers at the front, the boys in the trenches, of the votes that they have cast? Both sides of the House agreed that the boys in the trenches, the soldiers who are fighting the fight for Canada and the Empire, were entitled to cast their ballots and choose their representatives in this Parliament. But if the Prime Minister thinks for a moment that because the soldier cast a ballot on the other side that gave him a right not to be deprived of that ballot, how is it that the Government gave power to the returning officer to deprive 15,000 soldiers of their votes as he did? If this House should decide to concur in the report of the committee as laid before it, is it fair, is it logical, is it reasonable, to claim that we are depriving the soldiers of their votes? We are not giving any decision. We are not stating that the soldiers on the other side shall be disfranchised. By concurring in that report we are not saying that the soldiers who voted either for or against Mr. Congdon or either for or against Mr. Thompson are deprived of their votes. We are simply saying that we refer the matter to the highest tribunal in this land, a tribunal composed of competent men, a tribunal representing judicial science in this country in its highest degree. We simply put the case in the hands of fair-minded men who can give the best judgment, we refer to them the whole matter and we say that if the soldier is entitled to cast a vote, give it to him. If the soldier should not be entitled to a vote, take it away from him. But we members of the Canadian Parliament, faithful to the traditions left to us by the greatest of Parliaments, that is the British Parliament, refuse, as partisans and politicians, to sit as judges. I think that is the whole question.

The British North America Act establishes in this country the same constitution and institutions as exist in England, to wit, the executive power, the legislative power and the judicial power. Our constitution will work well, our constitution will produce results, our constitution will improve the condition of things in this coun-

try so long as the three powers remain each within its own province. I do not think it would be wise for this Parliament, being the legislative power, to take to itself the judicial power. Why so? The question now before us involves one election, one seat, one member. Suppose the member for the Yukon sits on your right, Mr. Speaker, suppose the member for the Yukon sits on your left, is that a question of sufficient moment to justify us in changing the basis of the whole constitution of this country? I claim it is not. In the old days, when elections were controverted, they were, as has been pointed out, decided by Parliament. But the abuses were numerous and the Parliament of Great Britain, in 1830 or 1832, rightly decided that controverted elections should be decided by tribunals and courts of justice. The same principle was also adopted in Canada in 1873 by a Bill introduced by Sir John Macdonald, then Premier. It was confirmed in 1874 by a Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr. Fournier, then Minister of Justice. Since that time controverted elections have been decided by the courts of justice and never by the House, composed of politicians and partisans. I heard an hon. member on the other side saying that we had no right to leave this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada. I beg, Mr. Speaker, to take issue with that hon. member. If we read Bourinot, page 219, 3rd edition, we find that the whole law is there interpreted and the author lays down a theory which ought to be accepted in the case which is now under discussion before the House:

> In the session of 1887 the subject of the powers and duties of returning officers, and the jurisdiction still possessed by the House in controverted elections was discussed. It appears that the returning officer for the county of Queen's, New Brunswick, instead of declaring Mr. King, who had the majority of votes at the general election of 1887, duly elected to represent that electoral district, decided that his nomination paper was invalid on the ground that the deposit was not legally made. He returned Mr. Baird as the representative in Parliament. It was proposed in the House to amend the return, by erasing Mr. Baird's name and inserting Mr. King's in its place, but after a long debate the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In the course of the debate the Minister of Justice, (the late Sir John Thompson), strenuously supported the principle of non-interference with the jurisdiction of the courts over matters of controverted election, "but he thought it quite competent for the House to refer the case to the Committee for the express purpose 'not of trying the case, but of finding' whether the court is already exercising jurisdiction therein, and of inquiring into precedents governing such matters."
>
> The Committee, after full investigation of authorities, reported as their opinion that the House "ought not to declare that the said George F. Baird is not entitled to sit in the said House, but should leave the case disposed of under the provisions of the Controverted Elections Act, it being the intention, spirit, and policy of Parliament that all questions as to the validity of the election of members to the House of Commons should be decided by the ordinary legal tribunals of the country instead of the House of Commons.

This is the constitutional law as laid down by Bourinot, and this was the decision given by the House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, any reader of British constitutional law will feel higher admiration for the House of Commons as it exists in England, because that House of Commons in all matters pertaining to the interpretation of the law always lays aside politics and partisanship, and gives justice and nothing but justice. I think the occasion has now come for this Parliament to act in a similar way, and to follow the course that was adopted by the House of Commons in the case which I had the honour to quote a minute ago.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House in giving particulars or details as to the present case, which are well known. The question involved is purely a question of law. Being a matter of law I submit that it ought to be decided by the courts by the submission of a stated case, and the preparation of such a case is a very easy task because the contentions of both parties are set forth in the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I do not think that a serious or real difference would arise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to one fact: This case is exceptional in many ways. For instance, the Prime Minister declared this afternoon that the Government had not the right, or had not the power, by Order in Council to order a reference to the courts because there was nothing in the Election Act giving such power to the Government. I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of this contention, but I wish to say this: If the Government has no right by Order in Council to change the law, how is it that not later than the 26th of February, 1918, the Government took upon itself to change the law by Order in Council by saying that as far as the Yukon election is concerned the returning officer should make no report? Such an Order in Council was passed and the first paragraph of the recommendation reads:

5 p.m.

> That the general returning officer shall not declare any candidate to have been elected to represent the said Yukon Territory.

Have the powers of the Government decreased within two or three months? Has our constitution changed within that time? Are the powers of the Government the same to-day as they were in February? I defy any member of this House to say that the Imperial Parliament interfered in respect of our constitution so that there might be any such change, alteration or modification in it. Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister of Canada, declared that he cannot do such a thing by Order in Council I hold in my hand the evidence to show that the right hon. gentleman did three months ago what he says to-day he cannot do. If an Order in Council could be passed to prevent the returning officer from making a return of the Yukon election, I submit very humbly that an Order in Council could be very easily prepared referring this case to the Supreme Court for a decision. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this Order in Council which was passed changing the electoral law as embodied in an Act of Parliament deprives Mr. Congdon and Mr. Thompson of the right of petitioning the courts to have their interests safeguarded. The moment the returning officer was not empowered to make a return, naturally, the election could not be contested before the courts, and both the gentlemen named are in the position that the Government has deprived them of the right to go before the courts to contest the election in the Yukon territory, and to-day, because the Committee on Privileges and Elections wants to give the Supreme Court of Canada authority to decide an exclusively legal question, the Prime Minister says: An Order in Council cannot be passed to change the Election Act. I submit that this argument cannot be very serious in the face of what happened three months ago.

There is one last point to which I desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker: The House of Commons must act according to constitutional usage and according to its own rules, and cannot act otherwise. As far as the powers of the House in respect to elections are concerned the only rule upon which we can base our conduct is rule 80, which says:

> If it shall appear that any person hath been elected and returned a member of this House, or endeavoured so to be; by bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such bribery or other corrupt practices.

My contention is that the House of Commons since 1874 has the power of inquiry only into the acts of bribery, and in this special case no act of bribery is alleged, and therefore we have absolutely no competency. We cannot go outside the rules of parliamentary procedure; we cannot go outside the limits as laid down and determined by the law of 1873-74. I claim that in this case this question ought to be decided by the courts, and that Parliament has no jurisdiction. Parliament has jurisdiction to reprimand its members, and to act upon anything pertaining to its members. But in this particular case we are not dealing with members of the House. Neither Mr. Congdon nor Mr. Thompson is a member of the House, consequently we have absolutely no jurisdiction or competency. This Parliament, as regards elections, cannot go beyond its limitations. We have our rules and our laws. We can act as far as our members are concerned, but these two gentlemen not being members of the House, we cannot act in their special case.

I will end these few remarks by saying that in this country we are all proud of our British institutions. We look to the British House of Commons as the mother of all Parliaments for example and guidance. Let us do so in this special case. If we refer to such cases as have come before the British Parliament, the latest, I think, is the case of Colonel Arthur Lynch, who was elected for an Irish constituency during the South African war. Colonel Lynch was elected although he was fighting for the Boers at the time. His case came before Parliament, and what did Parliament do? It took the usual course in all such cases, Parliament stuck to the old traditions and rules, and would not interfere with judicial duty. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to rise above party ideals and aspirations and narrowmindedness of partisanship. We should not remain Liberals, Tories or Unionists, whatever we may call ourselves. We ought to rise to the great status the law has given us in this Parliament, we ought to rise to the status of judges. And being judges in this special case we ought to say that, having to choose between the two parties as belonging to one party or the other in this House, we are not fit judges, because we have not the required impartiality. And if this House takes that decision, it will lay down a precedent that will compare with all precedents laid down by Parliament, and we will have shown that when questions of a judicial character arise we can lay aside our politics, our small, mean interests, and become men who understand

their duties and wish to perform them according to justice and equity.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in the very few words that I shall address to this House on this question, I need scarcely tell you or the House that I do not speak as a lawyer. Edmund Burke said somewhere that while legal training increases greatly the intensity of the human intellect, it does not add correspondingly to its breadth. And Edmund Burke, sir, was a very great man. Leaving on one side the righteousness or the wrongness of Burke's opinion, I do think, Sir, that this discussion has fallen perhaps too much into the hands of the legal profession and I approach it purely as a layman. And it seems to me to be one of those questions that can be settled by the rough commonsense of Parliament, or its committees, better than the superfine distinctions of the legal mind. The distinguished layman from Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) who spoke on the question for once in a way became more legal than the lawyers, if such criticism will be considered by him fair and courteous. He referred at some length and learnedly to precedents. Well, that is just what the judges would do. They would settle this thing along the lines of precedents. Why, Sir, all precedents were thrown to the winds in the last election.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: And my friends opposite say, "Hear, hear." The most striking precedent in regard to the election was thrown to the winds by my right hon. friend opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he extended the life of Parliament. The election was a year late in being held. My right hon. friend agreed to throw precedents to the winds in an oration as noble, persuasive and eloquent as was ever addressed to this or any other Parliament. Precedents were thrown to the winds because we are in the midst of an unprecedented war.

What was important in the last election was that the mind of Canada should go forth with no uncertain sound that the Kaiser and the Allies and the whole civilized world should know that on the part of this proud young country there was going to be no faltering until we carried this war to victory. Speaking as a layman, and looking at this question as a layman what is the one question that I have to settle? What the judges would settle the lawyers have not told us; they have a shrewd suspicion, I am quite sure of that. They know how the judges would go about the consideration of the question. Why they would call up all the precedents of John Mitchell and O'Donovan Rossa and the others we have heard of from the other side of the House. They would look into the musty documents of the past and give an exact technical decision as to the legality or otherwise of the election. What I am perfectly sure the majority of the people of this country want to know about the election is this: What set of opinions will represent the mind of the majority of the electors of the Yukon Territory as they voted in the election, whether in the Yukon or overseas? That is the one question which appeals to my mind. And I agree very much with the remarks that fell from my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) that the opinion of one soldier in this election is of as much importance as the right of either Mr. Congdon or Mr. Thompson to sit in this House. That is the one question that would appeal to me as a layman, and that is the one question I think that would appeal to the great majority of the people of this country.

With regard to the gentlemen concerned, I endorse every word that fell from my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) about the House being fortunate if the Yukon was represented by either of the candidates in the last election.

With regard to Mr. Congdon especially, I have enjoyed his intimate personal friendship for many years, so that my opinion on this subject is most dispassionate. I have always admired his wide culture, his great reading, and his fair and well-balanced mind. If I had anything to say against Mr. Congdon, however, I should say that in the last election his political affiliations were, to say the least, elastic, flexible and adaptable. I do not think anybody who knew how Mr. Congdon conducted that election could be quite clear that he was a supporter of Union Government. I think there was grave room for doubt on that subject. On the other side, you have an undoubted supporter of Union in the case of Dr. Thompson; there is no doubt about where he stood in the matter. The majority of the votes of the Yukon and the men overseas were cast for Union, and Dr. Thompson was the Union candidate. That is the consideration which I believe will sway the minds of the people; it will certainly sway mine—were the votes for Union or against it, and which of the candidates was for Union and which against it?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is it not true that Dr. Thompson was named by the Prime Minis-

ter as his candidate and Mr. Congdon by the leader of the Opposition as his?

Mr. MURPHY: No, it is not.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I really could not say about the endorsation in this case.

An hon. MEMBER: It is in the return.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: So far, so good. But I have far more regard for what was in the minds of the candidates than I have for the endorsation of leaders. That is how we decide whether a man was for or against Union.

Stripped of all legal trimmings and the refinements of the law, what have we in this amendment which has been submitted by the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin)? It is a mere move in the party game. I was charmed with the sentiments expressed by the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) just before he took his seat. Apparently there is no partisanship in Dorchester. Let us rise to view this thing above the lines of party. This amendment is an attempt to take advantage of an oversight in an Act of Parliament to gain a supporter, or a semi-supporter, if you will have it so, by the disfranchisement of the soldiers from the Yukon who voted overseas. If I talked all night I could not say anything better than I have just said, and viewing it in that light I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, as a layman I wish to answer the layman who has just sat down (Mr. Michael Clark). I shall not go into the legal aspect of this question. The member for Red Deer says that the question is: How would the soldiers have voted? As a matter of fact, how would the soldiers have voted had they known who the candidates were and what they represented? If I were a soldier at the front and had been asked to vote for either Mr. Congdon or Dr. Thompson, certainly, if I were a Liberal-Unionist—or a pretended one, like the member for Red Deer—I should have voted for Mr. Congdon, on the principle of Liberalism and on the principle of Unionism. The boys at the front did not cast an intelligent vote when they were voting on a ballot the first blank space of which was prepared for the name of the candidate, not for the Government, not for the Opposition, not for an independent or labour candidate. They could not have the name of the candidate if there was no candidate; so how were the boys to vote? The probability is that the majority of the votes would have gone to Mr. Congdon, because the bulk of the men at the front are Liberals. Most of the Canadians fighting to-day on the fields of France and Flanders are Liberals, fighting for Liberal principles. What is Liberalism? It is anti-Germanism. Gentlemen on the other side of the House do not seem to recognize that they are the representatives in Canada of Prussian polity and Prussian principle.

The proper thing to do in this case is to refer the matter to the judicial tribunals of the country. All questions as to the validity of elections have been referred to the judicial authority. In this case, owing to the peculiarity of the vote and of the election, it was impossible for either of these gentlemen to lodge a protest. If one of them had been declared elected, the other could have filed an election petition; but in this case neither was declared elected. The Government stopped the returning officer from declaring one of these men elected, and thus preventing the other from entering the courts; consequently it is proper that this House should give back to that man what they took away from him illegally by Order in Council.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Devlin, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Baldwin,	Lavigueur,
Boivin,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Leger,
Boyer,	Lemieux,
Bureau,	McCoig,
Cahill,	McCrea,
Cannon,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cardin,	McMaster,
Chisholm,	Marcile (Bagot),
d'Anjou,	Mayrand,
Déchêne,	Michaud,
Delisle,	Murphy,
Demers,	Pacaud,
Desaulniers,	Papineau,
Deslauriers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Pedlow,
Duff,	Pelletier,
DuTremblay,	Power,
Ethier,	Prevost,
Euler,	Proulx,
Fafard,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fielding,	Robb,
Fortier,	Ross,
Fournier,	Savard,
Gauthier,	Seguin,
Gauvreau,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Gervais,	Tobin,
Jacobs,	Trahan,
Kay,	Truax,
Kennedy,	Turgeon,
Lafortune,	Vien,
Lanctôt,	White (Victoria).—67.
Lapointe (St. James),	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Anderson,	Long,
Andrews,	Mackie (Edmonton),
Argue,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Armstrong (York),	Maclean (Halifax),
Armstrong (Lambton),	McCurdy,
Arthurs,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Ballantyne,	McGregor,
Ball,	McIntosh,
Best,	McIsaac,
Blair,	McLean (Royal),
Blake,	McLeod,
Bolton,	McQuarrie,
Bonnell,	Maharg,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Manion,
Bowman,	Marshall,
Boyce,	Meighen,
Brien,	Merner,
Bristol,	Mewburn,
Buchanan,	Middlebro,
Burnham,	Mowat,
Burrell,	Munson,
Calder,	Myers,
Campbell,	Nicholson (Queens, P.EI.),
Carvell,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Chaplin,	Nickle,
Charters,	Paul,
Clark (Bruce),	Redman,
Cochrane,	Reid (Grenville),
Cockshutt,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Cooper,	Richardson,
Cowan,	Rowell,
Crerar,	Scott,
Crothers,	Sexsmith,
Crowe,	Shaw,
Cruise,	Sheard,
Currie,	Sifton,
Davidson,	Simpson,
Doherty,	Smith,
Edwards,	Spinney,
Finley,	Steele,
Foster (Sir George),	Stevens,
Foster (York),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fraser,	Stewart (Lanark),
Fulton,	Sutherland,
Glass,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Green,	Thompson (Hastings),
Guthrie,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Halladay,	Tolmie,
Harold,	Tremain,
Harrison,	Tudhope,
Hartt,	Turriff,
Hay,	Tweedie,
Henders,	Wallace,
Hocken,	Wigmore,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Wilson (Wentworth),
Keefer,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Knox,	Wright.—118.
Lalor,	
Lang,	

PAIRS.

(Pairs are furnished by Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Clements,	Molloy,
Stacey,	Sinclair, J. E., (Queens, P.E.I.),
Chabot,	Verville,
Douglas, J. M.,	Hunt,
Hartt,	Copp,
White, Sir Thomas,	Lesage,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Casgrain,
Doherty,	Marcile,
Clarke (Wellington),	Lapointe (Montreal),
Boys,	Brouillard,
Elkin,	Fontaine.
Maclean W. F.,	Gladu,
Porter.	Denis.

Mr. COPP: I was paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Hartt). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. HUNT: I was paired with the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. J. M. Douglas). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I was paired with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: My attention has been drawn to the fact that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), with whom I was paired throughout the last Parliament, whom I have not seen during the present Parliament and who, I understood, was not coming here, understands that the pair still stands. Of course, under those circumstances, I would beg, if it be possible, to be allowed to withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret that, according to the rules, a vote once given cannot be withdrawn.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to move to the motion as it now stands. I have felt throughout this debate, to which I have listened very attentively, that a considerable number of hon. members, including myself, are not satisfied with either the main motion or the amendment moved by the hon. member for Wright. Some of us have voted for the amendment and some have voted against it, including myself.

It seems to me there is a sort of middle course to pursue, a course which, if I understood him correctly, is in accord with the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister. This is a large question, and in my humble opinion it will not be settled by adopting either the motion or the amendment. The question which we want to determine is the procedure to be followed not only in the present instance but when cases of this kind occur in the future, and we make no progress in that direction by voting for either the motion or the amendment. If the matter is referred back, the committee have carte blanche to do what they like, and if they decide who shall represent the Yukon constituency we shall still be in the dark as to the procedure that should be followed in similar cases. Like my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) I would sweep to one side all technicalities and meet the issue fairly and squarely. There is no one on either side

of the House, I believe, who does not want to do full justice to the soldiers and their votes. There is no question here of distinguishing between justice to the soldiers and justice to the candidates, because if justice is done to the candidates, justice is done to the soldiers, and vice versa. If one candidate gets soldiers' votes that he is not entitled to, he is not getting justice nor are the soldiers. The question is how would the soldiers have voted? The candidates had not been nominated when the soldiers voted, so there was no candidate for whom they could vote personally. I also understand there was no Opposition candidate in the field, because both candidates favoured conscription and both were supporting Union Government. If I knew that one of the candidates was not supporting the Government policy I would have nothing to say at this time, although technically and from a legal standpoint that would not alter the merits of the case. But all the reports I have received are to the effect that both candidates stand on practically the same platform. There was no difference as to policy, but there was doubtless a preference amongst the soldiers as to the man who should be elected to support and carry out that policy. As far as I am concerned I might, as I do, stand for Union Government and the Union Government policy for conscription, but the candidate opposing me might also be doing the same thing, and soldiers would undoubtedly prefer one of us to the other to carry out their policy. The question is now as to the disposal of these soldiers' votes, and whether they can be allotted as the soldiers intended that they should be, or whether they should rightfully not be counted, as was the case in many other instances. If a reason were wanted as to why this should be decided by a judicial body instead of by a committee of the House, I think we have been furnished with a very clear reason this afternoon, in the debate on the question. I do not think any hon. member will say that this House or a committee of this House would approach the case from an absolutely non-partisan standpoint. I therefore think the only thing to do is to submit it to the highest court of the Dominion. I do not know just how we can overcome the technicalities in the way, but there certainly ought to be some means of submitting the case to that court. What are those means? I take it from the speeches we have heard from hon. members of the Government that there are means of accomplishing this, but that the method is not indicated in the amendment which has just been declared lost. Therefore, without taking up further time as the question has been very fully argued, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding):

That all the words after the word "that" at the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor:

The report be referred back to the committee for the purpose of devising means of submitting the matter in dispute to a competent judicial authority in accordance with the long established practice of this House to have controverted elections tried by the courts and not by the House.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): As a choice between the motion by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) and that of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), I prefer the latter although, as may have been gathered from some of the remarks, the wording of the amendment of the hon. gentleman for Wright might have been improved. The essence of the difference is this: The hon. member for Calgary was strongly of opinion, as he said in his speech, that this was a matter which should be settled definitely and finally by the committee, while the hon. member for Wright advanced the view that the matter was one for judicial decision. As between these two theories I have no hesitation in supporting the idea of a judicial decision, but I think the amendment moved by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) presents the matter in a form that ought to be acceptable to the whole House.

The Prime Minister did me the honour of saying that he agreed very heartily with nearly all I had said on the subject. That was a great compliment, which I appreciated. The right hon. gentleman will remember, however, that the burden of what I said was this, that following the precedents in this House for a great many years, this House by itself or by a committee should not undertake to deal with a matter of this kind, but should devise means by which a decision could be reached. The Prime Minister having said that he agreed to nearly everything I said, I have a right to assume he agreed to that principle. He went on to say that he thought I had laid a good foundation for the argument that the case should be referred back to the committee, presumably in order that the committee might do something to the end

which he had in view. I want to ask the House now to consider whether they will not deal with this question as essentially this: Shall this House go back to the bygone days when these matters were decided by committees with a partisan bias? I wonder if it could be said that there is not some partisan bias on some of us to-day in this matter. I heard one hon. gentleman speak about "pairs." Pairs relate to party divisions, and therefore if this question of pairs exists, the question has been decided, so far as we have decided it this afternoon by a partisan division. I submit that we have in this very transaction given evidence of the fact that however good our intentions may be, it is almost inevitable, as has been shown in the long experience of the Imperial Parliament and this Parliament, that when matters of this kind are dealt with by the House there is imported into the case some element of partisan feeling. I think the motion my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) has just made meets the objection that the first proposal to refer the matter back to the committee was too vague, and he has also met other objections that might be raised. If the House approves this motion, we refer the matter back to the committee, but with the full understanding that it is not the desire of the House that the committee shall finally settle it, but shall rather advise as to the best means of getting this matter before a legal tribunal. It seems to me that this is a motion which ought to command the support of the whole House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If I might be permitted just one sentence I would say that the proposal embodied in this amendment seems to me to amount to this: that we are not to leave this matter free to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but are to give them a direction that they shall find the means of avoiding a technicality which stands in the way of referring this matter to the court, in order that a technicality which prevents the soldiers' votes from being counted may be maintained and perpetuated. I cannot agree with that for a moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question now is on the amendment of the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. J. A. Campbell):

That all the words after the word "that" at the end of the motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

The report be referred back to the Committee for the purpose of deriving means of submitting the matter in dispute to a competent judicial authority in accordance with the long established practice of this House to have controverted elections tried by the courts and not by the House.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. J. A. Campbell, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Baldwin,	Lavigueur,
Boivin,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Leger,
Boyer,	Lemieux,
Bureau,	Mackie (Edmonton),
Cahill,	McCoig,
Campbell,	McCrea,
Cannon,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cardin,	McKenzie,
Chisholm,	McMaster,
d'Anjou,	Marcile (Bagot),
Déchêne,	Mayrand,
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Murphy,
Desaulniers,	Pacaud,
Deslauriers,	Papineau,
Devlin,	Parent,
Duff,	Pedlow,
DuTremblay,	Pelletier,
Ethier,	Power,
Euler,	Prevost,
Fafard,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fortier,	Robb,
Fournier,	Ross,
Gauthier,	Savard,
Gauvreau,	Seguin,
Gervais,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Jacobs,	Tobin,
Kay,	Trahan,
Kennedy,	Truax,
Lafortune,	Turgeon,
Lanctôt,	Vien,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	White (Victoria).—70.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Long,
Anderson,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Andrews,	Maclean (Halifax),
Argue,	McCurdy,
Armstrong (York),	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Armstrong (Lambton),	McGregor,
Arthurs,	McIntosh,
Ballantyne,	McIsaac,
Ball,	McLean (Royal),
Blair,	McLeod,
Blake,	McQuarrie,
Bolton,	Maharg,
Bonnell,	Manion,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Marshall,
Bowman,	Meighen,
Boyce,	Merner,
Brien,	Mewburn,
Bristol,	Middlebro,
Buchanan,	Mowat,
Burnham,	Munson,
Burrell,	Myers,
Butts,	Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Calder,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Carvell,	Nickle,
Chaplin,	Paul,
Charters,	Redman,
Clark (Bruce),	Reid (Grenville),
Clark (Red Deer),	

Cochrane,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Cockshutt,	Richardson,
Cooper,	Rowell,
Cowan,	Scott,
Crerar,	Sexsmith,
Crothers,	Shaw,
Crowe,	Sheard,
Cruise,	Sifton,
Currie,	Simpson,
Davidson,	Smith,
Edwards,	Spinney,
Finley,	Steele,
Foster (Sir George),	Stevens,
Foster (York),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fulton,	Stewart (Lanark),
Green,	Sutherland,
Guthrie,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Halladay,	Thompson (Hastings),
Harold,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Harrison,	Tolmie,
Hartt,	Tremain,
Hay,	Tudhope,
Henders,	Turriff,
Hocken,	Tweedie,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Wallace,
Keefer,	Wigmore,
Knox,	Wilson (Wentworth)
Lalor,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Lang,	Wright.—113.

PAIRS.

(Pairs are furnished by Chief Whips.)

Messrs.	
Clements,	Molloy.
Stacey,	Sinclair, J. E., (Queens, P.E.I.),
Chabot,	Verville,
Douglas, J. M.,	Hunt,
Hartt,	Copp,
White, Sir Thomas,	Lesage,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Casgrain,
Clarke (Wellington),	Lapointe (Montreal),
Boys,	Brouillard,
Elkin,	Fontaine,
Maclean, W. F.,	Gladu,
Porter,	Denis.

Mr. J. A. ROBB: After you had put the question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members for Welland and Halton entered the Chamber. I wish to know if you have recorded their votes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the question to the hon. member for Welland whether he was present in the House and heard the question put?

Mr. E. E. FRASER: I was not in the Chamber, I was just outside.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to Bourinot, the hon. gentleman must answer the question either in the affirmative or in the negative. I therefore put the question again: Was the hon. member present in the House and did he hear the question put?

Mr. FRASER: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case the vote of the hon. member must be stricken from the record. I now ask the hon. member for Halton: Was he present in the House and did he hear the question put?

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON: I heard the question put by Mr. Speaker before I went out of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must answer in the affirmative or the negative.

Mr. ANDERSON: Then I will answer yes.

Mr. LALOR: I beg to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that an hon. gentleman on the opposite side, with whose name or constituency I am not familiar, entered the Chamber after the question had been put.

Several hon. MEMBERS: Name, name.

Mr. LALOR: I am unable to give the hon. gentleman's name. He came in after the question had been put and my statement can be corroborated by several other hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentleman in question is now sitting beside the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the same question to the hon. member for St. Mary's: Was the hon. gentleman in the House and did he hear the question put?

Mr. H. DESLAURIERS: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Hartt). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. A. B. HUNT (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question now is on the main motion (Mr. Tweedie). I declare the motion carried on the same division reversed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

REGISTRATION IN EAST PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Who is appointed Registrar under the Act for man-power registration in East Peterborough?

2. Who recommended the appointee?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. R. B. Rogers.

2. On recommendation of the Superintendent of Registration.

APPOINTMENTS NOT BY EXAMINATION.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. Is the Government aware that constituencies hold their representatives responsible for all appointments not made by examination?
2. Is the Government aware that it is impossible to shift this responsibility to others?
3. Does the Government therefore intend to refer appointments to the representatives concerned, for approval?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With reference to this question I do not know that I can add very much to the reply which was given to the hon. member on 6th May, and which is to be found at pages 1536-1537 of the Unrevised Hansard. The Government, in respect to appointments to the public service, is responsible to Parliament; Parliament is responsible to the people. In making such appointment the Government is, of course, desirous of obtaining the best possible information that may be available as to the qualifications of the persons proposed to be appointed. It will always be very glad to receive suggestions or recommendations from members of this House in regard to such appointments.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. What appointments will be made to the Public Service by recommendation and not by examination after the regulations respecting the Civil Service now existing and in contemplation become law?
2. Who will make these recommendations?
3. Will these recommendations be founded upon inquiry made by those making them?
4. Of whom will those making such recommendations seek information?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. That depends, of course, on the provisions of the regulations and the Civil Service Act in its final form.

2. 3. and 4. The word "recommendation" is capable of two meanings. If it is intended to ask as to recommendations to members of the Government by others, it would be impossible to foretell in advance who might desire to offer such recommendations or on what inquiry they would be founded. If, on the other hand, the word is intended to allude to recommendations to Council for such an appointment, it is obvious that the recommendations must be made by the responsible minister in whose department the appointment is to be made.

MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF OFFICERS FOR OVERSEAS.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Since the outbreak of war has it been a military rule that all officers receiving commissions and appointments in overseas forces should submit to a medical examination and receive a certificate of physical fitness before receiving such appointment?
2. If any appointments in the Military forces have been made or commissions granted in active service in the C.E.F. without such medical certificate as to physical fitness, is it the policy of the Government to grant pensions to such individuals who may have been suffering from physical disabilities before their appointment and who may claim pension after a period of service?
3. Did Colonel Labatt, member of the Pensions Commission, secure a certificate of physical fitness before receiving appointment in the C.E.F.?
4. What was the date of Colonel Labatt's appointment as a member of the Pensions Board?
5. What was the date on which the pension was granted to Colonel Labatt by the Pensions Board, and from what date did such pension take effect?
6. How much has Colonel Labatt drawn in pensions?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (for the Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. No information is available as to medical certificates of officers of the First Contingent concentrated at Valcartier, but, through inquiries made, it is understood that all officers had a medical examination before proceeding overseas with the First Contingent.

2. Where there is evidence that a disability pre-existed enlistment, a pension is awarded for aggravation of such disability on service, if not due to intemperance or improper conduct.

3. It is understood that Colonel Labatt did have a medical examination as to physical fitness at Valcartier before proceeding overseas with the First Contingent.

4. September 11, 1916.

5. Pension was awarded November 27, 1917, to take effect from October 16, 1917.

6. $1,334.11.

STEAMBOAT HELENA.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. Is the steamboat Helena in the employ of the Government at Sydney Harbour, N.S.?
2. If so, who is the owner?
3. How much per day is being paid for this steamer?
4. What was the total amount paid during the year 1917?
5. Is it intended to keep this steamboat permanently on the service?
6. What duties is she performing?
7. What is the total amount paid for the services of this boat since first employed?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Finlay MacDonald.

?. $15 per day, owner to supply gasolene and oil and a man to run the boat.

4. $3,975.

5. The engagement is only for temporary service, paid by the day.

6. This motor boat has been employed for the purpose of enabling Customs and naval officers to board steamers while in port before coming into the dock, in connection with the Naval Detention Service.

7. 1914-15, $2,130; 1915-16, $4,065; 1916-17, $3,855; 1917-18, $3,855.

CASUALTY RECORDS OF CERTAIN SOLDIERS.

Mr. KENNEDY:

*1. Is there a casualty record attached to any of the Overseas soldiers represented by the following regimental numbers, viz.:—2085431, 166045, 402736, 1042448, 2304223, 1033209, 435837, 243248 and 340263?

2. If so, what is the nature of the casualty in each case, when did it occur, and are any of these soldiers discharged from active service?

3. If so, on what dates were said men discharged?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (For the Minister of Militia and Defence): If the hon. member (Mr. Kennedy) would give further information as to the names and units of the men above referred to, the desired information will be obtained. It may be explained that regimental numbers have no significance other than as a verification of identity, and no records are maintained on a numerical basis.

THE KENT HOUSE AS HOSPITAL.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Has the Kent House, a hotel situated at Montmorency Falls, Quebec, been recommended as suitable for a military hospital by some medical board? If so, when, and what are the names of the persons on said medical board?

2. Did the Government get an estimate as to the amount required to put said Kent House in suitable condition to receive patients?

3. If so, from whom, what is the estimated cost of repairs, alterations or additions, and how many patients can said Kent House accommodate?

Hon. Mr. Burrell (For the Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes. Colonel I. H. Cameron, President; Colonel J. D. Courtenay, Lt.-Colonel D. McGillivary, and Lt.-Colonel R. J. Wilson, members.

2. Under consideration.

3. Under consideration. Officers, 89; Other ranks, 165.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the total number of the families of soldiers deceased since the beginning of the war, who receive pensions from the Government?

2. Of this number, how many reside in Great Britain, how many reside in Canada, and how many reside elsewhere?

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

RENEWAL OR POSTPONEMENT OF PAYMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS.

House again in committee on Bill No. 87, supplementary to chapter twenty-four of the statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway system—Hon. A. K. Maclean—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Guarantee on renewal or postponement of payments:

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker, last evening when the House adjourned, it was my intention to offer a few remarks in connection with the Canadian Northern Bill. Earlier in the session, on the Budget, I took occasion to say a few words in reference to the management of this road and to express myself pretty thoroughly in that connection. I noticed particularly to-day and yesterday that the Government papers are giving a good deal of attention to the so-called "Ginger group" and saying that we have not accomplished very much. During yesterday's proceedings we had a most excellent speech from the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden); in fact, the best I have ever heard him deliver since we were in Opposition when he used to thunder against the iniquities of the Transcontinental, the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. He was back again to his old form, and the facts that he laid before the House were such as to give us reason to congratulate ourselves. As a member of that so-called "Ginger group," I am particularly pleased to know that the policy which we have enunciated so far during the session, of eliminating those railway magnates who come down and want subsidies every day, and want to take charge of the municipalities and town and water-powers of the country, is being adopted by the Government. The Government appear to have assumed an attitude adverse to the claims of these men. That is our policy.

Several very important announcements were made by the leader of the Government. He made a definite statement to the effect that Mackenzie and Mann will be eliminated entirely from the management of the Canadian Northern railway. We all know very well that desperate efforts were made by those gentlemen to retain their hold upon the road. I am pleased to know that

when the new board of directors is constituted these gentlemen will be eliminated. The only thing I regret is that we have no assurance that, whether the arbitration tribunal now engaged upon the task of placing a value on the stock of Mackenzie and Mann have or have not arrived at an award by the date set, the first of June, the Government will take over the road, as it should, and that Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann will then be asked to resign. That applies not only to these two gentlemen but to those others who have been associated with them in the transactions connected with this road, with the exception of Mr. Hanna who is a purely operative man and who is a very fine and reliable gentleman. Mr. Hanna is, indeed, one of the great railroad men of the continent. Outside of him, it is believed, the so-called Mackenzie and Mann influence will be eliminated from the road. I say that for this reason, that I fully expect an effort will be made by these gentlemen in some way, to stay on in some advisory capacity probably to attach their influence still to that road. And if they do, we will find that the coal will be supplied to the Government by a Mackenzie and Mann company; the wood will be furnished by another Mackenzie and Mann company; the oil for the journals on the cars will be sold by some organization of Mackenzie and Mann; the lamp chimneys and everything else needed on the road will be furnished by some concern which these gentlemen control; and the result will be that if they are allowed to do that, this country will every year have a sucked orange on its hand, and there will be nothing left for the people after they get through with it. I have only to refer to the manner in which they left the shareholders of the Winnipeg Street Railway—and Mackenzie and Mann are still acting in an advisory capacity on that road. They have got out of the Toronto Street Railway, but are still acting in an advisory capacity on the board of that road; and we all know that the shareholders have no hope of getting their money back from that road as long as these men are attached to it. An effort has been made on several occasions to get rid of them, but it seems impossible. The Government will have a job on its hands also getting rid of them.

Now a word with reference to the amount of money that these gentlemen are supposed to put into this road. We all know that the Grand Trunk people put $25,000,000 of cold cash into their western lines. There is no doubt about that. The figures speak for themselves. The Grand Trunk claim they have advanced $28,000,000, but we will concede that they contributed $25,000,000 in cold cash—real money, not stage money. The Canadian Pacific railway, as we were told by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) the other night put up $25,000,000 of honest-to-God money in the common stock of that road. If you at the beginning take all the anti-aircraft searchlights of London city, and all the high power microscopes in the world, you cannot find that the Canadian Northern promoters paid one cent for their common stock, for the reason that they never put one cent of real money of their own into the road or into the common stock. For that reason I say that the country would be well justified in saying to these gentlemen: "You have no interest whatever in this road; you have not put any money in it, and it cannot be said that you are making any loss." It is true they may have lost some of their valuable time. But they have done well in other things outside of this, such as townsites and other exploits of their own in the West, and they might be very well satisfied. If the gentlemen who are arbitrating the valuation of this common stock should be good enough to give these two gentlemen a cheque for even one million dollars each, I do not think they will starve for the remainder of their lives; and I do not think it is so absolutely necessary that they should be given ten millions. I heard some hon. gentlemen here stacking up figures for this road that would make any one believe that we had secured an enormous asset available immediately, and that we are taking away from these gentlemen an equity of something like $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. The evidence in Toronto was that as matters stood this common stock would not pay for itself inside of twenty-five years, and for that reason I do not think it is of very much value now. A stock that cannot possibly pay anything in twenty-five years has not very much value at the present time. That is too remote a period of time, and possibly some other means of locomotion may be devised before then. I say without any hesitation that the people of this country will not stand for any side-door influence of Mackenzie and Mann in this road, no influence that will throw all kinds of little contracts their way or to companies connected with them. The public will not stand for these promoters getting $10,000,000, because, as I say, they have not put

a single dollar in this common stock, whilst the evidence shows that the Grand Trunk people put $25,000,000 of cold cash in the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific invested $25,000,000 of their own money represented by common stock. There is no great difference between the condition of the other propositions and this Canadian Northern.

I am sure every member of the House will be satisfied that the Grand Trunk is to be taken over by the country in connection with the Grand Trunk branch lines in the West. I have here a book, Poor's Manual of Railways, containing the statistics of all the railways, showing the number of box cars, passenger cars and all classes of rolling stock equipment, and details of earnings, and so on. Anybody with a fondness for statistics on railway matters can consult Poor's Manual, which will be found in the Library. I do not intend to hand out a lot of statistics to the people or to this House, because we have had a tremendous lot of statistics already. We have had statistics on this Canadian Northern until I was not surprised to reach the House the other day and be told that they had a surplus of something like $35,000,000. They may have an operating income of that amount, but it is a very remote date till they have $35,000,000 net income. The actual facts are these. The possible deficit on the Canadian Northern for perhaps many years to come, if things were allowed to remain as they are, will amount to about $12,000,000 annually. Everybody can understand that. That was virtually the deficit reported for last year. The deficit on account of the Grand Trunk is something like $9,000,000; I am told it may reach $11,000,000 this year, making a total of $20,000,000 or $21,000,000 of a deficit on these two roads that this country will have to meet by votes every year. How are we going to meet it? We are going to take these roads over, and we must meet that deficit some way. There is no use arguing that these roads will pay when we are face to face with that deficit. Unless there are betterments they can never pay. That is the reason the Government is asked to do something for them. The deficit on the Canadian Northern will be met to the extent of $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 a year by the increase in freight rates recently put in force. About $7,000,000 more will be added to income from that source. About $4,000,000 or $5,000,000, perhaps $6,000,000, will come from the Grand Trunk also from a similar source. That is to say, we have increased the freight rate fifteen per cent, and having increased the freight rate we must naturally expect an increase in the income of these roads, with the result that there will be virtually 15 per cent added to their income. Against that there will be an increase, however, in the operating expenses. We cannot expect men to stay loyally with these roads as they have been doing without getting something in the nature of a war bonus to assist them in maintaining their families, and they will hardly be satisfied to receive the same rate of wages as before. Altogether we might expect that one-half of this deficit will be met by the increase in the income from traffic. The Canadian Pacific railway will put up $7,000,000 more, making $17,000,000 out of the $22,000,000; and the Government will have to make up the balance unless something unforeseen arises. Fortunately something has arisen. The railway operations are now controlled by a war board. I made a calculation from the figures given by the Prime Minister yesterday, which led me to the conclusion that if the savings to be made by this board were such as they stated we might expect an additional $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 as a result of the operations of the board, one-half of which would go to the railways owned by the Government. This would mean that we would have about $6,000,000, which would practically wipe out our deficit. If that is done and care is exercised in the management of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk, there is still hope for these roads.

We have heard a great deal about the matter of wiping out the investment in these companies. The investments in these companies consist of practically three things. First, a funded debt covered by mortgage. Against this there is a fixed charge which we must pay for twenty or thirty years unless we extinguish it in the meantime by a sinking fund—and we cannot do that, because in order to establish a sinking fund we should have to continue to buy up the stock out of earnings. Second, guaranteed debentures or stock, third the first, second, or third preference stock. Sometimes these stocks are guaranteed, as in the case of the Grand Trunk, by floating mortgage constituting a charge on all the valuable property of the road, similar to a second mortgage on a farm or building. These are known as debentures, as distinguished from bonds. Bonds are generally first mortgage charges; debentures are second mortgage, or floating charges funded. When a man gets a railway debenture he knows that he is getting a second mortgage on something, the road,

the equipment, or the net income. The stocks are preference stock; first, second, third, or fourth, with a fixed dividend, and last of all, the common stock. We need not take into consideration the common stock of these roads. The common stock of the Canadian Northern has never paid anything, and, so far as I can see, never will. So that we might as well eliminate that $100,000,000, though we shall always have to carry on our books the $35,000,000 that we pay Mackenzie and Mann for the common stock, and on which we must consider that we are entitled to interest. The common stock of the Grand Trunk paid a small dividend once or twice, but it can also be eliminated by the payment of a very small sum. So that so far as the Can-

9 p.m. adian Northern is concerned, the charges narrow down to, first, the mortgage bonds, and, second, the debentures. Most of these bonds are guaranteed. If this matter were placed before arbitrators or judges they would certainly decide that if there were a deficit every year in the operation of the Canadian Northern the provinces should pay their proportion of that deficit, because these mortgage bonds and debentures in certain cases, are guaranteed by the provinces. A fair proportion of the annual deficit on the bonds and debentures that the provinces have guaranteed would be as follows: Ontario has guaranteed some $7,000,000 worth of bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The province's annual payment in respect of its proportion of the deficit would, at three or three and one-half per cent, amount to about $210,000 a year. Manitoba has guaranteed $25,500,000 worth of Canadian Northern bonds; its proportion would be about $750,000 a year. Saskatchewan has guaranteed $14,000,000; they would pay about $420,000 a year. Alberta has guaranteed about $19,000,000; their proportion would be about $550,000 a year. British Columbia has guaranteed $40,000,000, and would have to pay about $1,000,000 a year.

The securities of the Canadian Northern are of three kinds, so far as the bonds are concerned: first, bonds guaranteed by the provinces; second, bonds guaranteed by the Dominion; third; bonds and debentures not guaranteed. I have given the amount of bonds guaranteed by the provinces. Bonds to the value of $104,000,000 have been guaranteed by the Dominion, and of unguaranteed securities there are $147,000,000 worth. We might eliminate the unguaranteed securities altogether and take over the road if it went into the hands of a receiver, but it has been pointed out that that would be a very bad thing to do; and it is only right that we should act fairly to those who have put their money into the road. But there is a very large issue of debenture stock, which is a guaranteed security. Nobody knows who holds that debenture stock, I am told, and nobody knows what was paid for it. An effort should be made by the arbitration now proceeding in Toronto to find out at what discount those debenture stocks were sold, because if we are to undertake to pay for them one hundred cents on the dollar somebody is going to reap a rich harvest. I am satisfied that they did not sell to the public at over 60 or 70. The arbitrators, when they are ascertaining the value of the common stock, should ascertain also the value of that other debenture stock which stands between the common stock and the value of the road. It is a matter of public interest.

I understand that the short-date notes, for which collateral was put in the banks, were under a very heavy discount in New York. I do not think that the railway got more than 75 or 80 cents on the dollar for them. Nobody knows how much was received for them, but they are to be renewed in a few days by the Government, and, of course, the moment the Government goes on those notes they become worth 100 cents on the dollar. Somebody will make a million or two there. These are matters of detail which the Government should take under advisement and which the arbitrators in Toronto should consider in connection with their inquiry into the value of the common stock—what was the actual loss on the sale of debenture stock and short-term notes?

I understand that a number of branch lines are to be built in connection with the Canadian Northern. In the statement given the other day we were informed as to the estimated requirements for the year 1918. Item 5 in that estimate reads:

> Construction: completion of western branch lines already graded; terminals, etc., as per statement, etc.

That means that during the current year the minister expects to spend $7,185,000 on further extending the Canadian Northern. That expenditure may not be remotely removed from the fact that Mackenzie and Mann want to hang on to the road, possibly until the contracts are made for these extensions. I have gone into the question of what these extensions are. The Acting

Minister of Finance should explain very clearly to the committee what extensions it is intended to continue and to complete this year. There is an extension from Calgary to Macleod which absolutely parallels the Canadian Pacific. The House should, during the war, frown down on this paralleling of roads. The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) yesterday told us we could pull up the rails on the Canadian Northern between Ottawa and Sudbury. I agree with him. There is hardly a pound of traffic between those two points. He also stated that the rails on that road between Napanee and Toronto could very well be pulled up. Between Napanee and Toronto, the Canadian Northern runs within 150 or 200 yards of the Grand Trunk all the way. If we take over the Grand Trunk, what is the use of maintaining stations along that portion of the Canadian Northern? It will not be the first time in the history of Ontario that roads have been pulled up to obtain efficiency. If you travel along the Canadian Pacific from Smith's Falls to Toronto for forty miles, if you look out of the window on your right hand side, you will see the bed of a road which was built twenty-five or thirty years ago and which was pulled up, everything being removed, but the grading, in order to bring about greater efficiency and economy. It is, therefore, not a new thing to pull up rails and ties on a road. The road between Strathcona and Calgary—that is virtually between Calgary and Edmonton—also parallels the Canadian Pacific. I cannot, for the life of me, see why we should build 32.66 of a railroad there. The proposed 103 miles of railway between Calgary and Macleod will parallel the Canadian Pacific all the way and yet it is mentioned by the Government in the list of roads they intend to build this year. Those extensions are all set forth on pages 1773 and 1774 of Hansard in the report of the speech delivered by the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) the other night, and he stated that these proposed lines would cost in the neighbourhood of $17,000,000. It would be well for us, if we have $17,000,000 to spend on extending the Canadian Northern, to wait until the war is over, and then after the men come home from the war, looking for work, we can utilise them to good purpose in constructing those extensions. The map shows not only the paralleling system of the Canadian Pacific, but other parallel lines. There are five proposed lines running within a short distance of each other. Charters were obtained for these, but I think most of the charters have elapsed.

The Swift Current branch runs southwest, if I remember aright, paralleling the Canadian Pacific. It runs to Vanguard.

Mr. MAHARG: The hon. member is wrong.

Mr. CURRIE: I have the map right here. The map shows that the road runs from Swift Current southeast, and, as I stated, parallels and crosses the Canadian Pacific extension from Swift Current to Vanguard.

Mr. MAHARG: When it is completed.

Mr. CURRIE: Well, then, what is the use of saying that I do not know what I am speaking about? I know quite well what I am speaking about. I hold the map in my hand. I was over the road before the hon. member ever was.

Mr. MAHARG: I know every part of that country. I have travelled back and forth over it for the last twenty-seven or twenty-eight years. The proposed extension runs out fourteen miles from Gravelbourg. If the hon. member looks at the map, he will see that fourteen miles from Gravelbourg is a long way from Swift Current.

Mr. CURRIE: All I can say is that the railway item in the estimates reads, "from Swift Current southeast."

Mr. MAHARG: Quite right.

Mr. CURRIE: If it is not intended to commence the line from Swift Current, that is all right. I have stated what the map shows. What is proposed to be done afterwards does not matter very much, but it is a deliberate paralleling of the Canadian Pacific, if that extension is constructed in the manner shown on the charter. That country is already fairly well served with railways. I think from the station at Vanguard you can see the station of two or three roads. The next branch, which is known as the Elrose extension, runs from Moosejaw to Kerr-Robert, and is fifty miles long.

Mr. MAHARG: It does not run within eighty miles of Moosejaw.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member may be right. These new names puzzle me somewhat. The next branch is from Medicine Hat to Hanna. I know that ground. That runs in a northerly direction and crosses the Red Deer river at Walsbury, and all that country that is fit for settlement along the Red Deer river is virtually served by the Empress branch of the Canadian Pacific, and that is the extension in regard to which

I notice there is in the press an article stating that work on it is going to be proceeded with during the summer. That extension is to be 145 miles long.

Mr. J. D. REID: The extension is from Hanna towards Medicine Hat, not from Medicine Hat the other way, and the proposed extension of fifty miles is from Hanna to the river that runs between Medicine Hat and Hanna, and in that section there is no railway at all. This will serve a population that has been there for many years without any railway facilities at all.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I might supplement the statement of the minister by saying that if those railways are not constructed, settlers in the country about which the hon. member has just spoken will be compelled to haul their produce thirty or forty or fifty miles to a railroad.

Mr. CURRIE: But in the province of Ontario there are places, for instance, in the county of Huron, where the settlers have to haul their produce thirty or forty miles to a railroad. The country that I was speaking about is arid country, only fit for ranching. The hon. member cannot tell me that there are any settlers north of Medicine Hat, until you get near the Red Deer river, along which there are settlements served by the Canadian Pacific Railway line. From the river it goes to Hanna. I do not know if it runs as far as Big valley. That country is largely arid ranching country, and for twenty years before the war was given up to sheep ranching. I say without any hesitation that the people of this country should be well advised before they ask any Government to adopt and any Government should be well advised before adopting the policy of building branch lines and pioneering when the country is now sweating blood in this war and requires every dollar for the war. I do not think that north of the Red Deer river valley, as it is called, there are ten settlers. I know the country; it is a ranching country, largely from Hanna south, and for that reason, whatever may be the case in the near future—I grant the hon. member that possibly ten years from now, when all the rest of that country gets filled up fairly well, they will need a railroad there. They do not at present need one. If you go through that country, or if you look at the map, you will see that the Grand Trunk Pacific has a road projected running through by Kennersley to Empress and across that same country. I do not wish to be understood as opposed to the West getting branch line railways, but I say that one-half of the railway mileage built in the last ten years was not required. It was paralleling existing, useless duplicating. What use was there in the Canadian Northern paralleling the Candian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Toronto? It was of no earthly use whatever. There was not enough traffic there to keep one road going. What use was there in paralleling as far as Napanee? What use was there in building a road from Sudbury through the wilderness to Ottawa here? There are no settlers in that country, and the territory was well served by the old Booth road or the Canadian Pacific railway. I say that without hesitation the same of Ontario as in the West. When the Grand Trunk Pacific was built in the West, if the management of the road had been allowed to build it as they wanted to build it, through the country they wanted to build through, the road would have served a far more useful purpose than it does now. The original intention was that the Grand Trunk Pacific was to keep fifty or sixty miles away from the other roads, so that it would be a colonizing road and open up new territory. But the minute they started to build through the West deputations came down, political pull and pressure was exerted, and the road was compelled to go from one point to another all over the West through what would be known as competitive territory. Now the day has gone by when we need any competition in railways; in fact we have had to raise the rates and put the railways under an operating board, which is convincing evidence to everybody that the day of competition as far as railway rates and service are concerned, is not now over. The Railway Commission that was constituted fixes the freight rates, and if two roads run into one town it simply means that they will divide the freight between them, and the rate will remain the same. The only other form of competition, and it was the form of competition that nearly destroyed the railroads, was competition in service. At one time three magnificent trains pulled out of Ottawa every night for Toronto within half an hour of each other. Everybody knows that one train would have been sufficient, and in fact the service has been cut down one-half all over the province of Ontario. An effort has been made to prevent duplication of service. The saving will be $6,000,000 per year. While it is a great hardship to a town to have only one train in and out every day it undoubtedly saves the railways from financial destruction,

and saves the people of this country from bearing greater burdens than we are now bearing and must continue to bear for a few years.

When I speak of extensions, I want the minister to understand that we in the East do not intend to vote money for any further extensions into territory in the West already served. I go to the West about twice a year, and not only to one point, but pretty well all over it. I know the various towns and cities growing up out there and the magnificent country around them. I know it would be far better for that country if the railways and speculators which own the land all through that country along the right of way were compelled to give it up and place it at the disposal of settlers, and that would avoid the building of many branch lines forty miles out from the main line to give the farmers access to a market. From Saskatoon westward on the Goose Lake line one-half of the land on each side of the road, as every member who lives up in that district knows, is not even settled, but is held for speculative purposes. Would it not be far better if the railways and speculators were compelled to give up that land, which is the best in the West, for the use of settlers? At the present time the settlers have to drive out with an ox team fifty miles away from a railroad to get land, and I have seen lots of them do that when there was rich virgin land lying idle all along the line of railway. Under the present policy the settlers who go out forty or fifty miles from the railway will in time build up a farming settlement, and then some one will come down to Ottawa and demand money to build a branch line out to that settlement, and the branch line to reach that settlement will have to cross these vacant lands owned by the railways and speculators. If the Government are going to take these roads over, they should take very seriously into consideration the question of also taking over large sections of the farming lands alongside of the roads. When Ontario was first settled we had "string" or narrow farms extending back along the main road so that there would be enough houses built and families settled along the waggon roads to keep them in repair. The same policy should have been adapted in the West. When the railways wanted extensions they should have released at least a portion of the land along the line, so that the settlers could go in and take them, then the country would have been better served by the different railways as they went through.

I have this to say in connection with competitive extensions, and I think I am supported by the majority of the members in this House, that this is not the time to expend seven, eight, or ten million dollars in such extensions until we know exactly where we are in our expenditure on the war and on the railways of this country. Within a year or two the railways may be all under one system, and then what use would it be to have, say, a parallel line from Macleod to Calgary? Nothing of the kind is desired. Why the Canadian Northern railway in many cases were not satisfied with paralleling other roads, but if I had time to describe their operations I could show that in several places they have even paralleled themselves or have acquired railways running parallel to their own line and are still running both roads.

Nothing has been said about the finances of the Grand Trunk railway, but I want to say this: You can read Poor's Manual from cover to cover and you will not find a road with as small a funded debt as the Grand Trunk railway, and Poor gives them credit for that. He says their funded debt is almost infinitesimal. I think possibly ten millions would cover the funded debt of the whole Grand Trunk railway with all its branches. The securities against the Grand Trunk railway are guaranteed stock against which there is a floating charge or mortgage, and guaranteed first, second and third debenture stocks. Now you can wipe out a stock, but not a bond security, because a bond security is a mortgage, and you will always have to pay interest on it until the mortgage is extinguished; but you can always wipe out a stock, unless it is a guaranteed one. So I think the securities of the old Grand Trunk railway, so far as the common stock is concerned, could be wiped out, except $25,000,000; but the preferred stocks, for instance, have received dividends from previous to the time the Grand Trunk railway went into this unfortunate speculation.

The speech of the Prime Minister yesterday was notable. I hope that when a board is formed the ablest men in the country will be appointed to it. If you figure out what the War Board has saved to this country during the last year, since it has been in operation, you will find it has effected a saving of about seven million dollars. I trust the War Board will continue to operate these roads, and that we shall only build such extensions as are absolutely necessary. The question is, where are you going to get the steel? None of the big roads are able to get steel

enough, as the hon. member for Algoma said, to replace the rails that are broken and wearing out every day, and broken rails have to be cut up and inserted here and there to patch the roads up. I think altogether seven hundred miles of new road are shown in the minister's abstract. Now what is the use of undertaking this work when we cannot get the rails? The great railways of Canada would buy another one hundred million dollars' worth of rails if they could simply for renewals. They have asked the minister for that, but they cannot get the steel anywhere, because it is required for shells and other munitions. And why should we rob the munitions industry to extend our railways into new country? I say that the service our railroads are giving at the present time is sufficient for our purpose. I know that some members from the West will say: "Colonel Currie is going after the West, and does not want railways built there." If hon. gentlemen will read what I said in the House—

Mr. J. F. REID: May I interrupt? Would the hon. gentleman be willing to stop the building of canals in Ontario and build branch lines in the West?

Mr. CURRIE: Exactly. But the hon. gentleman does not apparently know that since this war began the building of canals in Ontario has entirely ceased. The Welland canal extension was well under way, but the machinery for that has virtually been scrapped and the work has stood idle since the war commenced. All canal construction has been stopped in Ontario, and we are quite agreeable to that. Ontario never got one-eighth of the public works that the West has got in the way of railways and public works. We do not kick about that, but I want to remind hon. gentlemen that the Ontario farmer puts his own crop into his own barn and he does not ask for any public elevators. He pays his own money for the things that he needs. The West is quite capable of taking care of itself. It is the richest part of the country, and if they want to take care of themselves let them put their own money into their own enterprises as Ontario does. The West has come back with a full representation in this House and it is not fair that the farmers of Ontario, Quebec and the East should be asked to go down in their jeans for $7,000,000 a year to spend on duplications of branch lines in the West where they are not needed at the present time. Let them supply their own railways. From the time that I first came into this House I protested against this mistaken policy of building competitive transcontinental railways through the West. Every western member hooted me when I spoke in that way. But the chickens have come home to roost. If the money spent on transcontinental railways had been spent on branch lines in the West there is not a remote section in the West which would not now be unserved. The West was not contented until it had got the Hudson Bay railway. Now nobody in the West has a good word to say about that Hudson Bay railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, yes. There is no hope for that railway. I was told in the West, when speaking about the Hudson Bay railway: "It is a very good thing to talk about if you want to sell town lots." The West has been pretty liberally dealt with and we are quite willing to do the best we can for that part of the country, but there are other parts of the country which are doing their duty just as well as the West. If the building of duplicate branch lines everywhere in the West is going to be the policy of the new board from now on, I feel satisfied that this country will be bankrupt inside of ten or fifteen years. The United States did not build its western roads to any extent. They were built by private capital. Outside of the Union Pacific and one or two lesser or greater roads, none of the western roads was built with public money. In Minnesota and through country in the United States similar to our West, you will not find half of the mileage that you find in our West. The West has the best system of railways that you can find in any section of the world to-day. The Canadian Northern needs grading much more than it needs branch lines. If it is provided with steel bridges, station houses and terminals it will be able to take care of its branch line extensions itself later, because the Canadian Pacific have shown us that once a road gets upon a paying basis it can build extensions wherever it wants them. For goodness sake, let the people of this country have a breathing spell for a minute or two before you start building parallel lines in any part of the country either West or East. What would be said of a proposal to parallel the roads in Ontario and Quebec? I do not think Ontario will need any roads for a long time, especially leading to and from the West. There is a part of the riding represented by the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) where

there were thousands of settlers—that is Manitoulin Island—and because of the lack of railways at one time many of them had to leave that section of the country, which is fairly fertile, and go where there were roads. Yet, they did not send deputations down here howling for competing branch lines; they took their medicine. There are parts of the province of Quebec where they need colonization roads just as badly as they do in any part of Canada. I think I have dealt sufficiently with that feature of the question. Any declaration of an intention to make another grab at the treasury for branch lines until this war is over will be resented by the country.

With reference to the railways, I think I have covered all the ground that is necessary. I wish we had some substantial analysis or an abstract with reference to the Canadian Northern prepared by, say, Price-Waterhouse, or some competent auditors, on the same lines as the other statements that have appeared in Poor's Manual so that we would know how to compare the condition of the Canadian Northern railway with the condition of other roads. We would then know what we were getting. I am satisfied if the proper policy is pursued with reference to this road, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk, the result will be very much more satisfactory to the country. I do not look for anything but deficits for the next five or ten years. If the management is any good, I am satisfied that in ten years these railways will be self-sustaining and that in twenty-five years they will be able to take care of their own branch lines, their mileage will be materially increased and large portions will be double tracked. They will be a great asset.

This Railway War Board which has taken charge of our railways has inaugurated a policy of switching the traffic. The traffic which arises on the Canadian Pacific is switched to the Transcontinental, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. It would be very easy for that board, if they so desired, with that policy to destroy the premier security of this country—the Canadian Pacific. In that way the Canadian Pacific would be deprived of half its traffic in the West and the traffic routed over these non-paying lines. In this way they can make the other lines pay but they will destroy the Canadian Pacific. I trust that is not the policy that the minister would stand for. The Canadian Pacific has consented and is quite willing to have this tax of $7,000,000 handed over to the other two roads. It would have been much easier if an adjustment had been made of the amount of money that should have been collected in rates from these two roads and if a proper war board had been established at the time the war broke out, there never would have been any real deficit from these roads at all. But the deficits stare us in the face, and it will be necessary to increase the freight rates payable by the people, and to take one-half of the amount realized from those increased freights and turn it back into the public treasury. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) was quite right in his statement that this increase is pretty hard on those who pay these freight rates. If the charges were increased one-half under a war board they would take care of most of the deficits, but the rates have got to be doubled, and what the Canadian Pacific makes out of the increased rates is taken away from them by Order in Council and turned into the public treasury. I do not think myself that is just to the Canadian Pacific. Every dollar which that company has made since the war it has invested in far securities, in fact I think they have put into war bonds over $100,000,000. They are behind the credit of Canada just as much as the greatest public institution in the world. There is no other railroad in the world, for example, that can give you a through bill of lading to any point on the globe, under peace and ordinary conditions, like the Canadian Pacific. A Canadian who wants to ship goods to any part of the world by the Canadian Pacific railway can go to that company's agent at any station and get a through bill of lading to the uttermost parts of the earth. What is more, if he wants to have his bill collected, he can send it C.O.D. Canadian Pacific to Ceylon or to any part of China, Australasia, or South Africa, and the Canadian Pacific agent at that point will collect his money. Furthermore if he buys goods in any part of the world and wants to check up the weight of those goods or anything else, he will find a Canadian Pacific freight agent there who will do it for him. After the war those agents are going to be a most potent influence in favour of this country in securing a share of the world's trade. For this reason we should be very careful not to do anything to disarrange the operations of that road. If anybody thinks that a reduction of freight on every road is going to help the country let me say that the Canadian Pacific can carry freight cheaper than any other line and make money on it. All of these other railways

that have been built have beeen loaded up with tremendous fixed charges so that none of them will be able to carry freight as cheaply as the Canadian Pacific, at any rate not for twenty-five years. Now, Mr. Speaker, the debate over this Bill of my hon. friend the Acting Finance Minister has been considerably prolonged, and I regret very much that my remarks have been at greater length than I intended, but their length was due in large part to interruptions.

Hon. J. D. REID: I do not intend to discuss the merits of the Bill before the committee, but I would like to correct a few statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) who has just taken his seat. In the latter part of his remarks, he spoke of the work of the Canadian Railway War Board in Montreal. Let me expand the hon. gentleman's observations on that subject a little and explain the workings of that Board, because I do not believe the people of Sanada realize the good work which it has accomplished. The board was organized in October last, when the heads of the several Canadian railways came to Ottawa for the purpose, and it was agreed that it should operate the several railways of Canada practically as one road. The organization of that board was fully described by the Prime Minister and its record is set out at length in his speech as reported in Hansard. I only wish to say that the Department of Railways and Canals have been working in harmony with the board, and the several Canadian railways have also displayed a similar spirit of co-operation. Where freight was congested at any terminal one railway has not hesitated in the slightest to hand it over to another in order that there might be the least possible delay. The intention of the War Board is to continue operating the Canadian railways as they have been doing during the last six months so long as the present war continues, and perhaps for some time longer.

It was not with reference to the operations of the War Board, however, that I desired particularly to speak. There is a point that seems to call for a word in fairness to the Government, the people and the Canadian Northern. The Canadian Northern railway has been taken over by the Government; it is owned by the people of Canada; and it is indispensable for the continued operation of the system that it should be financed by the Dominion Government. I feel that it is hardly doing justice to the Canadian Northern or to the Canadian people that we should continue "knocking" that system from day to day now that it has become the property of the people. It is necesary for the Finance Minister to go into the open market and raise money to finance the Canadian Northern, and as I said a few days ago, those to whom we apply for the next loan will no doubt have been reading the remarks made by hon. gentlemen in this House, and it certainly will not assist the Finance Minister in raising that money for hon. gentlemen to continue attacking the past history of the Canadian Northern, and giving the public the impression that it does not possess the value, and is not of the good character that it really is. The hon. gentleman makes the statement that the Government, now that it has assumed the ownership of the Canadian Northern railway, is starting out to build branch lines in the West in connection with the system that were never heard of before. That is the impression I gathered from his remarks, but it is not in accordance with the facts. As I understand the situation, the Canadian Northern, prior to the war, laid out branch lines from certain points along its system in the Northwest. Those branch lines were graded, and in some cases the ties were laid down. Settlers went into those districts and located there, believing that the Canadian Northern, having expended a lot of money and done a certain amount of work, and having promised to build lines, would go on and complete the work. Hon. members have asked whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out the promises, honest promises, that were made by the Canadian Northern in that regard. In view of the promises that were made to settlers that if they would go in along the route of the proposed lines, settle there and cultivate the land, these branch lines would be built, and in view of the large expenditure of money that has already been made on these lines, I do not think it is right for the Government to repudiate the promises that were made to those people that they should get branch lines as soon as they could be constructed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Do these lines parallel existing lines, or are they colonization railways?

Hon. J. D. REID: I am going to deal with that question. So far as the four lines that it is proposed to construct are concerned, I have gone into the matter thoroughly and there is absolutely no truth in

the statement that they parallel either the Canadian Pacific or any other line.

Mr. CURRIE: These four lines?

Hon. J. D. REID: As far as I can remember, I have not the record here. There is an extension of fourteen miles from Gravelbourg on one line. Between the Canadian Pacific and another road, I do not recall at the moment whether it is the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern, there is a large expanse of country, and the road from Gravelbourg is fourteen miles into a country without railway facilities for many miles on either side of the proposed line. Then there is the Elrose extension. If I remember right—and members from Saskatchewan will correct me—that is an extension to another point where it will connect with the Canadian Northern. If this line goes on it will connect with the Canadian Northern and save a long haul, and in addition will give the farmers of that section the railroad they were promised years ago, and which they would have had if the war had not prevented the Canadian Northern from carrying out its promises. Then there is the Oliver branch, simply extending the present line in that district some twenty-five or thirty-five miles further on, where the road is already graded and ready for the rails. The statement is made that we are spending $7,000,000 for these few extensions, but that is not in accordance with the facts, because all we are doing is simply laying the rails on the grading already done. And what the Government are suggesting to the Canadian Northern is that the second-hand rails we are taking up on the main line, where we are putting the 85-pound rails, should be put on these branch lines. Then there is another line from Hanna south. I believe the hon. gentleman stated that there were very few settlers in that section of the country. My information from members knowing that country is that there is one of the best settlements of farmers between Hanna and the river to be found in the great Northwest. The mayor of Medicine Hat came down here and assured me that the farmers were in there, and had been in there for some years, that they had this promise, and that it was unfair that these branch lines had not been built. I went into this matter thoroughly, and my information is that if those branch lines are extended millions of bushels of wheat will be raised during this coming season and will be brought out, which never would have been done if these lines were not extended.

Another remark of the hon. member was with reference to the Hudson Bay railway. We all realize that when that railway was built it was not expected that it would pay for some time. But since the Hudson Bay railway has been built, it is very evident that we must do something with it. Last year it was operated because we were told that there was a quantity of fish which could be brought out, and which was necessary for food for the western provinces, and also that there were some mines along the railway which could be developed. The result of the operation of trains, which I think ran twice a month, was that the operating expenses were paid with simply the receipts from the fish and the mine traffic.

Mr. CURRIE: How far was it operated?

Hon. J. D. REID: The most of the freight was hauled about one hundred and twenty miles.

Mr. CURRIE: Is the road operated from the bay itself?

Hon. J. D. REID: It is not operated from the bay. The rails are laid 324 miles, speaking from memory.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. minister gave the House the impression that the fish had been brought from Hudson bay.

Hon. J. D. REID: There was none from the bay. But there are lakes all along the railroads. Fish was brought from these lakes, and there was freight from the mines.

Mr. CURRIE: You have not carried on any construction work for a couple of years, I understand?

Hon. J. D. REID: We are not doing much work on the Hudson Bay railway, simply keeping the line in order as it is.

Mr. CURRIE: Could the minister give me off-hand what the loss was on the operation of the Hudson Bay line?

Hon. J. D. REID: There was no loss on the operation carried on during the winter just ended. I think it is twice a month the train runs up and down. It has not cost the country anything for the operation.

Mr. CURRIE: Is the contractor running the road?

Hon. J. D. REID: Yes, it has not been taken off the contractor's hands. So far

as the province of Ontario is concerned, I come from that province, and I wish to say that we have all the railways we require at the present time. The hon. member has stated that Ontario has not been building many railways of late, that the great Northwest has been getting them all. If my memory serves me aright, within the last five years we have had a thousand miles of railway built in Ontario by the Canadian Northern between Port Arthur and Ottawa. Then we have had the Canadian Northern built from Toronto to Ottawa, and many other lines have been built in the province of Ontario. So that we have had a great deal of railway construction in this province. I am free to admit that a great deal of it should not have been built, there is no doubt about that. I agree with the hon. member that the line from Toronto to Ottawa should not have been built.

Mr. CURRIE: For part of the way.

Hon. J. D. REID: Yes, and a great deal of the road from Port Arthur to Ottawa. I only wanted to emphasize the fact, however, that we have had all these railways built in Ontario. Although we have many railways in Ontario, there is a great influence at work in the province to give us more railways, which will parallel each other, too. When the Canadian Northern Bill was up in the Railway Committee a few days ago for extension from Toronto to Niagara Falls, undoubtedly the impression left on the committee was that an electric railway should run from Toronto to Niagara Falls instead of the Canadian Northern system. If that railway is built between Toronto and Niagara Falls there is no doubt but that it will parallel two railways that are now in operation. I am not saying that I am in favour of the road between Toronto and Niagara Falls being built by the Canadian Northern system; I am not advocating that at all. But what I do say is that I cannot see at the present time, why there should be another road, electric or otherwise, built by any other corporation from Toronto to Niagara Falls, to parallel the two existing roads. When the hon. member stated that in the West the Canadian Northern are now commencing to parallel other lines, I want to say as Minister of Railways, and on behalf of every member of the Government, that we are not paralleling, and we will not parallel other lines. We will see that the Canadian Pacific railway gets its territory; we do not want to build any railways where they will build them. We will keep the Canadian Northern away from the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other line; the Government will not parallel any lines. The paralleling of lines is being urged in Ontario by other railway corporations; that policy has my disapproval in Ontario as it has in the great West. It is the duty of this Government and of the provincial governments to prevent the paralleling of railway lines. That is my policy and I shall carry it out so long as I am a member of this House.

Mr. CURRIE: Is it the policy of the Government not to continue the program of paralleling that has been the program during the last four or five years?

Hon. J. D. REID: The Government are now the owners of the Canadian Northern. If paralleling has been the policy of the Canadian Northern in the past, it will be stopped at once; it will not be proceeded with by the Government.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not object to colonization roads when we have the money to build them, but I do not think it is necessary to parallel now.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is not necessary to parallel at any time.

Hon. J. D. REID: I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) to say that the Government were proceeding with construction work on the Canadian Northern and that the lines which we were extending paralleled other railway lines than the Canadian Northern. That is not in accordance with the facts. Our policy is not to build parallel lines, and we are not doing that, in the case of the few lines that we are extending. Why hold a post mortem on the policy of the Canadian Northern in the past? The Government have taken over the Canadian Northern and put in a new set of directors, or commissioners—call them what you like; men who go there with a business-like policy, men who know that the Government will not undertake to build parallel lines. When hon. gentlemen know that these directors cannot construct a mile of railway without having the money voted by Parliament, surely it is in the best interest of the Canadian Northern, of the Government and of the people

10 p.m.

that we forget the past, that we start anew, that we do not try to disparage in the markets of this country and in the eyes of the people of Canada this railroad that we own.

Mr. BUCHANAN: In my judgment, the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) un-

derstands western railway conditions a good deal better than the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). Mention has been made of the proposed Canadian Northern line between Hanna and Medicine Hat. The section of country from Hanna south to the Red Deer river is thickly settled; it embraces settlements which are fifty or sixty miles from the Goose Lake branch of the Canadian Northern. This district has no railway facilities. I am not in a position to say whether south of the Red Deer river there is sufficient settlement to justify railway construction, but certainly there is from Hanna south to the Red Deer river. I am an advocate of the construction of branch lines during the war. The people living in the section of the West from which I come have been patiently waiting until the war is over before they make any demands for the construction of branch lines. Settlers who, even for the last three or four years, have been hauling their products from forty to fifty miles to reach railway communication in the constituency which I represent originally went into those sections of the country because charters had been granted by Parliament to the Canadian Northern and other railway companies to construct lines into those districts, and the people had been promised that those lines would be built. In one section of my constituency the people who have to haul their grain forty or fifty miles to a railway have been there since 1909. The member for North Simcoe mentioned the people on Manitoulin Island. I happen to have a colony of Manitoulin people in my constituency; they are living in what is probably the oldest homestead district in Southern Alberta. But they have no railway facilities; they haul their grain twenty or thirty miles to the nearest station. These people have been contributing to the development and enrichment of the country, and we shall have to provide branch lines very soon to give them railway communication, or we shall lose them; they will leave Canada and go to some other section of the continent. I went over most of my constituency a few months ago, and in places twenty or thirty miles from a railroad I saw as fine dwellings and farm buildings as you would see in some of the oldest districts in Ontario. That is indicative of the faith which these people have. They are patiently waiting for the construction of branch lines. I have not been pressing the matter on the minister, but the Government would be mistaken in not considering the construction of branch lines in the West, because lack of attention to this subject may mean a great loss to our country through the departure of many of the settlers in the western provinces.

I am satisfied with the position taken by the leader of the Government with regard to railway policy. I do not believe in the Government rushing to a quick decision concerning railway affairs. Proper consideration should be given to them, and after that consideration has been given it will remain with supporters of the Government and members of the House to decide whether or not the policy adopted by the Government is proper.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the general railway situation, nor do I intend to present the railway needs of any particular locality. Were it necessary for me to do so, I am rather dubious as to the reception any representation that I might make would meet at the hands of the Government. I desire to come back to a discussion of the Bill before the committee. I have refrained from doing that in order to give my colleagues in the House who desired to discuss railway matters generally an opportunity to ventilate whatever views or grievances they might desire to place before the Government and the country.

When the Bill was in committee yesterday, just before the House rose at one o'clock, I had drawn attention to the fact that the difficulty in getting information from the Canadian Northern Railway Company, which has attended every piece of legislation brought before this Parliament, is a prominent feature of the arbitration proceedings now in progress in Toronto.

I was surprised at a statement by the Minister of Railways that the country's interests were admirably protected because the country was represented there by an eminent counsel in the person of Mr. Tilley. Following the lead of the Minister of Railways, the Prime Minister was unlucky enough to repeat that statement. I drew his attention to the fact that I had in my hand a clipping from a newspaper giving expression to a statement made by Mr. Tilley at one of the sittings of the board, that he, the Government counsel, and assumed to be the representative of the people before that board, could not get the information to which he was entitled. I have that clipping here for the information of any person who may be curious to look at it.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Will the hon. member read it?

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Joseph Read) asks me to read this clipping. He is always so reasonable in his requests that I shall comply with this one. The despatch in question is from Toronto under date of April 9, and it details the proceedings at the meeting of the Board of Arbitration sitting in that city on that date. It goes on to say:

> Mr. Tilley, K.C., chief Government counsel, sprung a mild sensation just before adjournment for the night when he announced that he was unable to get any information from the railway officials as to what the gross earnings and operating expenses have been since October 1st, 1917. Sir William McKenzie declared that no one in attendance possessed the information requested.

It will be within the recollection of the Committee that yesterday after I had checked up the Prime Minister with that item, he hurriedly consulted with one of the officials of the railway department in attendance on the floor of this House, and then he qualified his remarks by saying that he was informed that Mr. Tilley did make that protest, but that the information was on the way to him at that time and that he received it afterwards. That statement, as hon. members will observe, hardly squares with the statement made by Sir William Mackenzie that there was no one in attendance who possessed the information required.

Hon. J. D. REID: I noticed that item in the press the next morning. I asked Mr. Tilley if there was any truth in the statement that he had not received all the information, and in a telegram or a letter—or it may have been in a conversation over the telephone—Mr. Tilley assured me he had received all the information he asked for at that time, and almost immediately after he made that statement. It was on the way to him at the time he made the statement.

Mr. MURPHY: Of course, I am not in a position to discuss this new phase now interjected by the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) but I venture to say a very slight inquiry will establish the fact that this is only one of innumerable protests made by Mr. Tilley against the withholding of information. We have had experience of that in this House year after year. No matter what comes up in connection with the Canadian Northern, the committee may take it for granted in advance that they will not get the information necessary to discuss the matter intelligently. The time of this House has been taken up by hon. gentlemen on both sides with demands for information; that information is never forthcoming. I am going, in a few minutes, to put the minister to the test in order to illustrate to this Committee that even now the Government have not the information to justify it in going on with this legislation. Before I come to that, I want to emphasize this point, that the Canadian Northern railway, unlike every other company or body in this country with which Parliament is called upon to deal, will not supply information. When that attitude is assumed towards me in my ordinary business or private relations, I am willing to accept the challenge, and if I were dealing with the Canadian Northern railway, they would either give the information or get not one farthing of what they were after,—the information would be forthcoming first, and afterwards a decision would be reached as to what they were to get. I refer to this matter now, because if a stand is not taken upon it by this new Parliament, we shall have the same thing repeated over and over again during the lifetime of this Parliament. I feel I am discharging a necessary public duty in once more drawing the attention of the House to this feature of every transaction with which the Canadian Northern Railway Company and Mackenzie, Mann and Company, Limited, are connected.

I agree in the main with my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House who have dealt at length with the provisions of this Bill and with the attitude which the country as a whole should assume towards the Canadian Northern Railway system. I could point out differences of opinion, differences of view that exist as between them and me, but at the present stage I do not think any good purpose would be served by taking up the time of the Committee in doing that, and so I shall pass on.

I want for a moment or two to refer to the speech delivered last night by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), in whose utterances I always take a great interest, but who, like the rest of us, is fallible, and who will not think it unkind of me if I draw his attention to a few slips that he made in the course of his very interesting address. My hon. friend, as was natural in such a general review as that in which he indulged, dealt with the question of railway mileage in this country and the relation which it bore to the population of Canada. I think I am correct in saying that the deduction drawn by my hon. friend from that comparison was that we had too many miles of railway, and that several

railways need not have been constructed. He proceeded to apportion the responsibility, and if my memory again serves me correctly, he apportioned the greater part of the responsibility for that state of affairs to the Government previously led by the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I did not happen to be a member of that Government at the time any of its railway policies were determined upon, but I was a member while some of them were being carried out. I do not, however, wish to be understood as disclaiming responsibility for anything for which that Government may fairly be held to be responsible. My hon. friend, in the same connection, spoke of the Drayton-Acworth report, and as he seemed to set great store by that report and to be in general agreement with it, I may be pardoned if I direct his attention to what is stated in it with regard to the mileage of railways in Canada and the proportion which that mileage bears to the population of the Dominion both now and in decennial periods past. At page 10 of the report the members of the committee say:

> We may put the same thing in another way. The growth of the mileage has far outstripped the growth of the population. In 1901 with a a population of 5,371,315, Canada had 18,140 miles of railway in operation; roughly, a mile of railway for every 300 inhabitants. In 1911, the population had increased 34 per cent to 7,206,643, while the mileage had increased by forty per cent to 25,400 miles; a mile of railway to every 284 inhabitants. Since 1911, the population has, it is understood, not much increased, but the railway mileage open and under construction has grown to 40,584 miles. In other words, Canada has to-day, taking the present population as 7,500,000 only 185 inhabitants to support each mile of railway.

Running over that, for the purpose of giving a summary comparison, it will be observed that in 1901 the total mileage was 18,401; in 1911, after a period of ten years, it was 25,400, or an increase of 7,260 miles. Starting with the mileage of 25,400 in 1911 the mileage had grown between that year and 1917 to 40,584, or an increase of 15,000 miles—an increase, mark you, which had taken place under the Government of which the present Prime Minister was the leader. I am not advancing this argument, but rather applying it because it has been advanced by the hon. member for Springfield. So that if a mistake has been made in building too many miles of road, if the responsibility is to be placed anywhere, I submit that according to the report which was cited by my hon. friend himself the burden of the responsibility must be placed on the shoulders of the Government of which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was the head.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: When was the building of that 15,000 miles of railway projected and determined upon? When was the country bound to the policy by which that 15,000 miles became a necessity?

Mr. MURPHY: I would be glad to give my hon. friend exact information on that point if I had it at hand. I do not happen to have it at hand, but I would point out this: that if we had too many miles of railway then, as the Government claim now that we have, that discovery should have been made by the Government between 1911 and 1917.

My hon. friend from Springfield also referred to a statement which he attributed to the Government of which my right hon. leader was the head, and which he expressed in these terms:

> We were assured by the Government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the railway (the Transcontinental) would only cost the country $13,000,000.

My hon. friend has been out of Parliament for some years, much to the country's loss—and I say that in all sincerity—but had he been in Parliament he would have heard that fable exploded over and over again by hon. gentlemen among whom he is now sitting and by members of the Government of which he is now a follower. The last time I have a distinct recollection of that argument being taken up and refuted was by the hon. Mr. Justice Lennox, the former Conservative member for South Simcoe, I believe, at all events one of the Simcoes; and when I have time I will refer my hon. friend to the page in Hansard containing Mr. Justice Lennox's refutation of that argument.

My hon. friend from Springfield also referred to the investigation which was carried on by the commission appointed by the late Government into the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, a commission known as the Gutelius-Lynch Staunton Commission. My hon. friend asserted, without referring to the findings of that commission, but using a phrase which has done great service in the headlines of the Conservative press in this country, and which has been worked to death on Conservative platforms all over the Dominion, that the finding of that commission was that "there was $40,000,000 of graft money in connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental railway." Now I wish to give that statement made by my

hon. friend—made in good faith I have no doubt, and without having looked at the report of the commission—the most emphatic and unqualified denial. No such finding was made by that commission, because no such finding could have been made, and no such report was made by that commission. What did the report of that commission say? It said:

> We find that without including money which was unnecessarily expended in building the railway east of the St. Lawrence River, $40,000,000 was needlessly expended in the building of this road.

And then the commissioners go on to say what they mean by "needlessly expended." They say that the permanent work should not have been permanent, but temporary work, that trestles should have been put in instead of fills and bridges, and that the road, instead of being constructed on a four-tenths grade in one direction and a six-tenths in the other, should have had velocity grades; in other words, that the character of the road should have been cheapened, and that if this cheapening process had been carried out from start to finish the cost of the road would have been $40,000,000 less. That is the finding of that commission, and not that $40,000,000 of graft was obtained in the construction of the road. I mention these things because from my limited experience in Parliament I find it is a mistake to let such statements go unchallenged. It is an injustice to new members who may not know the facts, and who, if the statements are left unchallenged, will believe them and give them circulation throughout the country. That is the reason why I have gone to the trouble of quoting chapter and verse for my hon. friend from Springfield, who I know desires to be fair in this as in all other matters of public criticism.

Coming to the Bill itself, I submit that it is open to the same objections as were urged againt two measures introduced into this House a little earlier in the session, one of the them by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I refer to the measure by which he proposed to withdraw from Parliament control over a certain annual expenditure. Hon. gentlemen will recall that opposition to that measure was so marked and so general in this House that the minister wisely withdrew his Bill. I submit that the Bill we are now discussing, Bill No. 87, is open to the very same objections. This Bill, if passed, will deprive Parliament of the control of the expenditure made in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway system, and I am sure that that has only to be pointed out to hon. members, and particularly to those who have already criticised the Canadian Northern Railway management and who know something of the manner in which the management carry on their transactions, to secure their approval of a proposal that this Bill should be so amended as to make it apply to the expenditure for one year only; so that the Government and the company will have to come before Parliament each year and submit a statement of what the expenditure has been and is to be and secure approval for that which has been spent and authority for that which is to be expended in the current or the coming year. If we do not do that, if we pass this Bill in its present blanket shape, this Parliament will, with its eyes open, have divested itself of all control of these expenditures. Parliament, I am certain, does not intend to do that. It is quite possible that in the rush of work this session, and owing to the continuous strain upon members, due to the long sittings, that feature of the Bill may not have presented itself to them.

I am trying to draw attention to it now. My submission is that both the first section and the preamble should be entirely re-cast so as to make this Bill apply only to the expenditure of the current fiscal year. The Government can come back to Parliament next session, give us a statement of the amount which has been expended and secure authority, which Parliament will willingly give, for the expenditure that has to be made in the next fiscal year. I want also to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that, in addition to remodelling section 1 and the preamble of the Bill, there ought to be a further section added, making it the last section, containing a schedule of the securities maturing in the year. Members of the committee will recall that when making his statement in the House on Friday May 10, the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) gave a list of the securities maturing this year. My proposal is that the list of securities maturing this year should form the schedule to this Bill so that the House will know that it is authorizing this Government to arrange or postpone the payment of indebtedness amounting to $67,370,607, and no more, on account of the Canadian Northern railway system during the current fiscal year. The House, knowing that, will proceed with this legislation with confidence and certainty. It is my firm conviction that that is what hon. gentlemen on both

sides desire to do. I agree entirely with what the hon. member for Springfield and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have said, that this is a burden that is upon our hands. We must deal with it as best we can and in the light of the best intelligence that we can apply to the solution of the numerous and intricate problems connected with it. But I do ask the committee and the House not to make that difficulty greater still by proceeding in the dark and by giving a blanket authority, such as this Bill would give, thereby making it certain that each year Parliament would have its time taken up and would be distracted with discussion based on insufficient information; making it certain that members of the Government of the day, no matter what Administration it might be, would be bombarded from the beginning to the end of the session by members on both sides with requests for information which they would not be able to give; making it certain that unless the commmittee pass this amendment we will perpetuate for an indefinite length of time all those things of which hon. gentlemen on both sides have so severely complained. Now, my suggestion in concrete form is that section 1 and the preamble of the Bill be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor:

Whereas, five-sixths of the shares mentioned in section 3 of chapter 24 of the statutes of Canada for the year 1917, have been transferred as required by said Act, His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The Governor in Council may assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any company included in the Canadian Northern Railway System, in renewing or postponing the payment of any indebtedness of any such company maturing in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919, on such terms as may be agreed on, by guaranteeing in whole or in part the payment thereof with interest, or the notes or obligations given for such renewal or postponement: Provided that the amount of principal to be so guaranteed shall not exceed the amount of the indebtedness the payment of which is renewed or postponed.

In a word, it is proposed by this suggested amendment to make the Bill apply solely to payments to be made during the fiscal year ending the 31st March next, the expectation being—in fact it was so stated by the Prime Minister or one of his colleagues—that the Government would come back to the House next session for such legislation or other authority as might be desired. After the other sections of the Bill are passed, I propose to move another section. I shall read it now merely for convenience and to give hon. members an idea of the general proposal I am making. I propose to add, as section 4 of the Bill, the following:

The securities of the said company maturing in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919, and to which this Act shall apply, are the securities mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed.

Then follows the schedule which is taken verbatim from the list of securities given by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance as being the securities maturing in the present year.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Would the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) tell us what rate of interest has been paid on the securities maturing this year and at what rate of interest does he expect he will be able to renew these liabilities? A great many figures have been given to this House by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the hon. Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) regarding the cost of this railway (C.N.R.). During the last election the people took a great deal of interest in this question. Might we have a complete statement of the liabilities to date of the Canadian Northern railway, of the amount that has been paid by the Government to the company to date, and how much it is expected it will cost to extinguish the interest of the balance of the stockholders in the preferred and common stock or other claims in order that the country may become the sole owner of this property? The minister could perhaps also tell us what the policy of the Government will be in case the commission sitting at Toronto to fix the amount to be paid to Mackenzie and Mann do not agree, or if one of the parties does not accept the award.

It has been stated that the Canadian Northern company may appeal from the award of the arbitration board, if they do not approve of it, and if so the proceedings may drag on for a year or two longer. The Government has bought the road but it does not control a majority of the directors though it has the majority of the common stock. The country having invested hundreds of millions in this railroad, would be interested in knowing what policy is contemplated by the Government in the event of any such delay as I have referred to.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman has asked what rate of interest the Canadian Northern is paying on its short term loans. I am informed that it is paying five and

six per cent on those loans that will be retired shortly. The hon. member also asked what rate will be paid on the loans that are renewed. He can see that it will be impossible for me to give that information because it may be several months before some of the loans are taken up and renewed. As to what the total cost of the Canadian Northern has been to the people of Canada I would refer him to the Prime Minister's speech as reported at page 2070 of Hansard, in which he stated that the total cost would be $438,264,367.67, that is if par were paid for the outstanding securities. On the same page of Hansard will be found a list of the total liabilities, as follows:

Funded Debt	$285,795,420 61
Equipment, Trust obligations	13,526,000 00
Demand and short term loans secured by collateral	58,056,961 11
Due to other companies on construction account, secured	30,502,392 04
Current liabilities	19,408,495 79
Accrued interest	4,730,069 93
Reserves for taxes and insurance	1,245,038 19
Total	$413,264,377 67

The Prime Minister after giving the foregoing figures stated:

> I add to that total the amount of the five per cent income charge convertible debenture stock, $25,000,000, making a total of $438,264,377.67.

That is if we were retiring all those liabilities and paying par for them.

The hon. member also asked what would be the policy of the Government after the new directors are installed in office. The Prime Minister also went into that matter yesterday, and I could not add to anything that he has already said. I hope that the hon. gentleman will find that the Prime Minister answered his questions fully in the statement of yesterday.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It appears to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murphy) who proposed the amendment must be losing sight of the fact that the Canadian Northern is the property of the people, upon whom all of the outstanding securities of the Canadian Northern are a direct obligation. The Finance Minister will not be renewing obligations for a private railway company when he renews, either this year or next year, any obligations that are outstanding or maturing, chargeable against the Canadian Northern Railway property, and I submit this question: Will the Canadian people or the Parliament of Canada be acting wisely in tying the hands of the Finance Minister? If the opportunity arises during the present fiscal year of renewing any part of the outstanding obligations of the Canadian Northern Railway system on the basis of an interest charge similar to what they have been carrying for the past ten years, will he be wise in renewing them or will he be not? Let me put it this way: I assume, and I believe that every hon. member in this House will assume, that many of the obligations maturing this year are held by parties who hold obligations that will be maturing next year. Now, if the opportunity is presented to the Finance Minister during the present year of renewing both sets of obligations on the old terms, will he not be wise in availing himself of that privilege? If we tie the hands of the Finance Minister and say to him that he can only renew the obligations that are maturing up to 31st March, 1919, we are placing him in a position that will not make it possible for him to take advantage of the fact that you can without question extend the time of a large block of securities much more readily than you can a small block of securities. If the Minister of Finance can, during the present fiscal year, extend the time on every single dollar of outstanding securities that the Canadian Northern have for a period of ten or fifteen years, he would be doing good business to seize the advantage and do it, because we know these securities were sold at a price and at a rate of interest that could not possibly be obtained if we went into the markets of the world and endeavoured to sell new securities to-day. So that I say that the House will be acting very wisely if it does not tie the hands of the Finance Minister in any degree in extending the time on any part of these securities, if it is possible for him to do it.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to endorse what the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said. I think it would be very foolish for us, now that we have assumed a big undertaking of this kind, to tie the hands of the Finance Minister from year to year. It would be very unwise for him not to try and renew the indebtedness which is falling due in the future as well as that which is falling due this year. No man doing a large business who had an indebtedness of that kind falling due would want to wait until the indebtedness was due before he tried to renew the same, any more than any firm, or any corporation, that had a large discount at the bank would want to wait until the discounts were due, or until the bills matured, before it tried to renew them. I hope my hon. friend

from Russell (Mr. Murphy) will see the matter in that light and withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY: In response to the request made by both the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken, let me say that I do not propose to tie the hands of the Finance Minister at all. I propose to take the very statement submitted to the House and embalmed in Hansard by the Acting Finance Minister himself, and say that this legislation shall apply to those securities. If there are others to be added, very well; I am quite willing that they should be added. My point is that we should know what we are doing; we should have them now. Really the most acceptable form for this Bill, the form in which it ought to pass would be with a schedule of all the indebtedness and of all the renewals that are to be made. I know very well that the Government have not got that, that so long as they are dealing with the Canadian Northern system they will not get it. And it is because of that that I propose to limit the application of the Bill to the present fiscal year—not to tie the hands of the Acting Finance Minister, as my hon. friend has said, but simply to accept his own statement and make it the schedule of the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry that I was not in the House at the time the member for Russell proposed his amendment. As the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) stated a few moments ago, the hon. gentleman deals with this matter as if the road was not the property of the people of Canada. He knows, Parliament knows, what the maturities of the road are for this year; they have been given to the House in detail, and all we ask is power to renew these from time to time. It seems an absurd suggestion to me to limit the power of renewal just for one year, thus obliging the Government to come back to Parliament year after year. For what purpose? To renew securities which must be provided for in some way. There is a provision in clause 1 that the amount of principal that is guaranteed by way of renewals "shall not exceed the amount of the indebtedness the payment of which is from time to time renewed or postponed." We cannot increase the liabilities of the Canadian Northern through any power granted to the Government under this Bill. The suggestion is not business-like. It is unfair to seek to impose that amendment in this legislation, and I ask that the House do not adopt it.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 47; nays, 75.

Mr. CAHILL: In view of the fact that we are not able to get the information asked for repeatedly as to where this money is going, are we to assume that the deal is so shady that the information will not be furnished?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What information is it the hon. gentleman wants?

Mr. CAHILL: Where the money is going. We are told it is going to the Canadian Northern, but we are also told that the Canadian Northern is the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Any money that is paid will be paid to those to whom it is owing.

Mr. CAHILL: Who are the owners of the debenture stock? Why can we not find where this money is going?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does my hon. friend mean to say we should tell him who are the holders of bonds that are maturing during the present year?

Mr. CAHILL: And last year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is that what my hon. friend wants? There is maturing in July or August of this year certain notes which were purchased by the brokerage firm of W. A. Read & Co., New York, to the amount of several millions of dollars. These notes have probably been sold all over the United States. Does my hon. friend mean to say that we shall submit to the House the names of the holders of these notes? The request is not fair, and it is impossible for us to get that information, even if we wanted it.

Mr. CAHILL: In the statement last year there is an item of $12,500,000 payable to the Canadian Northern railway. But as the Canadian Northern railway belongs, we are told, to Canada, we are taking the money from one pocket and putting it into the other. Who did the Canadian Northern pay it to? Where can we get that information?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I gave all that information to the House, and the Prime Minister gave it much more fully yesterday. It is impossible to do anything more.

Mr. CAHILL: There is nothing further in that information than that it was paid to the Canadian Northern?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand the difference

between paying money and not paying it at all. This is a Bill enabling us not to pay but to postpone obligations due to various banking firms, the names of which the hon. gentleman has. It is not to pay a dollar to the Canadian Northern Railway or any subsidiary railway, but to enable us to postpone and renew obligations of the company to various banking firms of the world. I do not know that anything more can be done except to repeat that over and over again to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL: You are not asking for any money in this Bil?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are asking power to renew securities that are maturing this and when necessary to guarantee the securities renewed.

Mr. CAHILL: What am I to understand by retiring the debenture stock of $12,000,000? What is the meaning of that? Are you renewing that too?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We hope to renew everything that is maturing this year. Surely the hon. gentleman would not say it was not good business to pay in full any of the securities maturing during the present year if we can renew them upon favourable terms, and during the war period?

Mr. CAHILL: Did the Prime Minister not tell us yesterday that we would retire $12,000,000 of debenture stock?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another matter altogether. That is payment of the $25,000,000 which Parliament advanced last year. We showed where that money went. That has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. CAHILL: Why not? Whom did the Canadian Northern pay the money to? There is also an item here of $12,000,000 to pay on debenture stock this year. To whom is that to be paid?

Section 2 carried on division.

Bill reported.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: When shall the Bill be read the third time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Next sitting of the House.

Mr. MURPHY: I object to the third reading of the Bill now. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) desires to make a statement regarding it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Next sitting of the House.

WAR REVENUE ACT, 1915, AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill No. 83, to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915—the Minister of Finance—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 5, 19B, subsection 1—tax on articles in schedule:

Mr. McMASTER: Is this tax to be paid when the goods are completed and put into stock, or when they are sold to the retailer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is payable when the goods are sold.

Mr. McMASTER: Is that clearly stated in the Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The words used are "manufactured and sold".

Subsection agreed to.

On section 5, 19B, subsection 2—automobiles and jewellery in stock on 30th April liable to tax:

Mr. BUREAU: This subsection says:

There shall be levied, collected and paid upon automobiles and jewellery imported into Canada.

I understand, when an automobile is imported into Canada, this duty will be paid.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: If it is imported for sale?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The subsection says for sale or manufacture. I understand when an automobile is imported into Canada it is generally manufactured. It is all set up except the wheels which are tied on the side. When the automobile is taken out of the car, the only thing to be done is to put the wheels on. Does the word "manufacture" apply to the word "automobiles" or just to the word "jewelry"?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It applies to both.

Mr. BUREAU: If the automobile is imported into Canada, it cannot be for manufacture unless the parts are to be manufactured.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The word "imported" comes first. The word "manufacture" should be "manufactured". I move that the word "manufactured" be

substituted for the word "manufacture" in line 42 on page 3 of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McMASTER: I have to renew the objection which I made to the resolution concerning automobiles when the Acting Minister of Finance brought down his Budget. I take the liberty of again pointing out to him that the word "automobile" is a very broad term and could properly be applied to such widely separated vehicles as tractors or heavy trucks and the most expensive and luxurious touring cars or limousines. From replies made to me by the minister when I was endeavouring to criticise the Budget speech, I understood that the word "automobile" was practically restricted to pleasure cars. If that be so, it should be so stated in the Bill. The term is so wide that there is bound to be misapprehension and confusion unless it is more closely defined.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Was my hon. friend's attention drawn to the schedule to this Bill? The word "automobile" is there defined:

Automobiles adapted or adaptable for passenger use.

It was intended that the tax should apply only to such classes of automobiles.

Mr. McMASTER: I am afraid that definition, although it helps a great deal, does not altogether clear away the difficulty. I am afraid it will suggest to people's minds that automobiles adapted or adaptable for passenger use are automobiles for the carrying of passengers who pay money for that privilege. Let us take Ford cars with an interchangeable rear part which are used as express cars, but which can be used as pleasure cars. Would such cars be exempted?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. They would not be liable to the tax.

Mr. McMASTER: The schedule says: "adapted or adaptable for passenger use."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Passenger automobiles are sometimes used for delivery purposes by the removal of the body from the truck. That class of automobiles would be subject to the tax.

Mr. CURRIE: Is it the intention to give people who have a stock of those cars an opportunity to dispose of them before the tax is collected, or has the manufacturer to pay the tax as soon as a car is manufactured? An excise tax is generally payable only when the article is sold. The article is supposed to be in bond until it is sold to the consumer. I was called up by long distance telephone to find out in regard to this matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The tax will be paid only when the car is sold.

Mr. CURRIE: That is to say, the numbers of the cars that have been imported and stored in the warehouses can be handed in to the department and the tax paid as they are sold to the buyers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is, if they were imported before 30th April, and in stock at that time, the tax will be paid only at the time of sale.

Mr. CURRIE: What about cars manufactured in Canada?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The tax on cars manufactured in Canada is payable at the time of sale.

Mr. McMASTER: The duty on automobiles being now 42½ per cent if you add this 10 per cent duty on automobiles that are imported, although you do attempt to equalize that by the exercise tax on automobiles manufactured in this country, you are practically putting the users of automobiles at the mercy of the automobile manufacturers of this country, because our import tax of 52½ per cent on automobiles will absolutely reserve the whole market for the Canadian manufacturers. The 10 per cent excise tax will be altogether inadequate to equalize the situation as between the manufacturer and the importer. The minister should carefully consider whether, in imposing this extra 10 per cent import duty, he should not very substantially increase his excise tax on automobiles manufactured in Canada. If he puts the consumers at the mercy of the Canadian manufacturers, he will get a 10 per cent excise tax, but if he shuts out altogether the importation of automobiles he will lose the 42½ per cent he is collecting now on cars brought in, and the last state, so far as the treasury is concerned, will be worse than the first.

Mr. CURRIE: As we are putting a tax on automobiles I think the minister should consider the advisability of fixing the price of gasolene of the price prevailing in the United States. Over there they pay twenty-two cents, compared with our thirty and thirty-five cents per gallon. Would it not be advisable to put a tax of five cents per gallon of gasolene? That would bring the

price of gasolene in Canada up to about thirty cents and the Government would get five cents a gallon in taxes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not give any consideration to the fixing of the price of the gasolene when considering the imposition of this tax, but I may say that the matter of the price of gasolene has received some attention from the Government, and it is to receive further attention very shortly. I do not think the difference between the price of gasolene in Canada and the United States is as great as the hon. gentleman suggests. In the first place he must remember that gasolene is sold in the United States by a different measure from ours, and that accounts for a difference of three cents per gallon. Then the question of transportation enters very largely into the cost.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: If gasolene now comes in free, I cannot quite understand the argument of my hon. friend.

Mr. CURRIE: There is no argument in favour of charging the people of Canada ten cents more for gasolene than the people of Windsor and Detroit are paying. It is true there is no duty on gasolene, but I cannot understand why gasolene can be purchased in the United States at twenty-five cents an imperial gallon at Detroit or Buffalo, and as soon as you cross the river it costs thirty-five cents. This country is not benefited at all by this additional price, and I think it would be advisable for the minister to take into consideration the fixing of a price for gasolene, just as the price is fixed in the United States, making an allowance for the difference between the imperial and the wine measure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the price fixed in the United States?

Mr. CURRIE: It is, because you can buy the wine gallon for twenty to twenty-three cents in the remotest parts of the Southern States. At Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, and all through that territory it sells for from twenty-three to twenty-five cents, but when you cross the river it is thirty-five cents. I think the Government, when putting a tax on automobiles, which are a luxury, should also take into consideration the fixing of a price for gasolene for these automobiles, because gasolene is very much used by the farmers nowadays both on the farm and in trucking. I think the price of gasolene should be fixed so that Canada will not be imposed upon, and a little tax upon gasolene might probably get the Government more revenue than the tax on automobiles.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not know where my hon. friend found the price to be twenty-three cents per gallon in the United States and thirty-three cents in Canada. The last time I was over there the bigger gallon sold for thirty cents, as compared with thirty-three cents here, and thirty cents there is exactly equal to thirty-six cents here.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand that gasolene is cheaper in Toronto at the present time than in Buffalo. It is very difficult to explain the spread in price, but had I known this question was coming up to-night I would have had some information on the subject which would have helped in the discussion. I may assure my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) that certain representations have been made to the Government in respect to the price of gasolene, and we are proposing to make some inquiries into the matter.

Mr. BUREAU: I think the question raised by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is very apropos. He wanted to know whether big motor trucks would be subject to this tax.

Mr. McMASTER: That has been explained.

Mr. BUREAU: Personally, I do not know of a motor truck that cannot be adapted to passenger service. Let me give an illustration. A truck was imported, something like the ones that are seen in the streets of Ottawa sprinkling water. It wore out, and was sold to a couple of fellows who took off the tank and put on seats, and now the car is being used to transport passengers between two villages. That goes to show that any automobile is adaptable to passenger purposes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was not in that condition when it was imported.

Mr. BUREAU: Who is going to decide if it is adaptable for passengers when it is imported? I say there is no truck that is not adaptable for passengers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think there will be any serious attempt to evade the tax by importing an automobile as a motor truck, and afterwards converting it into a passenger automobile. I do not anticipate there will be any trouble on the part of the officials of the Customs Department in giving a satisfactory ruling in every instance. You can convert possibly almost any motor vehicle into a passenger car, but I would point out that the cost of a motor truck is very much greater than the cost of a passenger automobile.

Mr. DECHENE: Is the tax applicable only to automobiles brought in for sale or for manufacture?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Applicable to every automobile imported.

Mr. DECHENE: The clause reads, "Automobiles imported into Canada for sale or manufacture."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is in respect of stock on hand on the thirtieth of April, stock already imported.

Mr. PEDLOW: I should like to make a suggestion with reference to taxing automobiles, and the object of my suggestion is not only to increase the revenue but by taxation to discourage the purchase of luxuries and unremunerative articles. I would suggest that instead of a flat rate of ten per cent on motor cars a sliding scale be adopted, taxing motor cars costing $1,000 or under say ten per cent, cars costing $2,000 twenty per cent, and on the more luxurious cars and limousines costing $3,000 or over, a tax of thirty per cent of the selling price. I think motor cycles should also be included in this scheme of taxation. They cost anywhere from $300 to $500, and, of course, are pleasure vehicles. I do not see any reason why motor cycles should be excluded. You would derive an increased revenue from this source. The imposition of a tax on the lines as suggested might discourage the investment of money in luxuries. I would endorse the proposition made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that a tax of five cents a gallon should be levied on gasolene when used for pleasure purposes. Gasolene as used for industrial or utility purposes should be exempt, but when it it used for purely pleasure purposes I do not see any reason why you should not levy a tax on it. In the Old Country they prohibit the use of gasolene entirely for pleasure purposes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be very difficult to administer a tax on gasolene unless it were made applicable to all uses. Gasolene is used very largely by farmers, particularly in the western provinces, and by fishermen on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. The question of the taxation of gasolene received very considerable attention. I do not know that I should state to the House what considerations influenced me in not including such a tax in this Bill. Possibly it may be imposed next year. The price of gasolene is now very high and possibly it may go higher owing to the fact that the cost of crude oil has advanced between 200 and 300 per cent. Crude oil, from which gasolene is made, sold before the war for 95 cents a barrel. Three weeks ago it was selling for $3.95. It is believed in the United States that it will go a great deal higher. The supply of crude oil in the United States to-day will not meet their own wants for fuel purposes. It was that consideration which largely influenced the Government in abandoning the idea of a tax upon gasolene for this year at least. The suggestion about grading the tax on automobiles has merit, of course. However, as long as it is based upon the selling value, the more expensive car will pay more than the cheaper one. The larger proportion of automobiles purchased or manufactured in Canada cost under $1,000. In Canada last year there were manufactured 68,000 automobiles which were sold at a price under $1,000. There were 8,000 sold at a price between $1,000 and $2,000, and 400 only over $2,000. The number of imported automobiles costing over $2,000 was very small indeed. It was for that reason that I thought it better to make the tax applicable to all.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I see no definition of the word "jewellery" in the Bill. The only paragraph I can find, having reference to the matter, is that in the schedule to part IV, which says:

> Articles commonly or commercially known as jewellery, whether real or imitation, for personal use or for adornment of the person.

Will that include medals given as rewards in schools, convents, colleges and universities? Many of these medals are manufactured in Montreal, and I have received some inquiries as to what would be included under the word "jewellery." Will religious medals be included? The paragraph reads in such a way that these medals might be classed as "jewellery," because it says that the tax shall apply when these articles are acquired for personal use or for adornment of the person. Some of these medals are worn because they have been bestowed as a reward or a distinction.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think I may safely say that a medal will hardly come within the definition of the word "jewellery."

Mr. PEDLOW: The Acting Minister of Finance did not deal with the suggestion to include motor cycles in the articles subject to taxation. I do not see why they should not be. A motor cycle is as much a pleasure car as any other car, and it should bear taxation as well as the cheaper motor cars.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it was not intended to include them.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think they are a great nuisance, and if they were taxed out of existence it would not be a bad idea.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not wish to importune the minister, but it was a serious argument I advanced which he has not replied to, namely, that when he puts the duty as high as 52½ per cent he will in a large measure reduce the revenue to be derived from that source. It may possibly be that that is the object—to stop imports from the United States.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That was one of the objects.

Mr. McMASTER: If that is so, well and good, but it will not help the revenue.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: The minister has not given answer to my question as to whether medals are included within the term "jewellery."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I could not speak definitely about that matter, because the department administering the Act will have to frame regulations as to what will come within the definition of jewellery from time to time. I am only giving my opinion, which is that medals would not be classified as jewellery. I think the Department of Customs would take the definition of medals that is found in the Customs Act, and exclude them from the tax:

> Medals, of gold, silver, or copper and other metallic articles, actually bestowed as trophies or prizes and received and accepted as honorary distinctions, and cups or other metallic prizes won in bona fide competition.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will this tax apply to watches, including wrist watches?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I think the clause should be amended so that it would be demonstrated beyond all doubt that it does not apply to medals.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think it is an important matter anyway, because the amount taxable would be very small. I think my hon. friend can afford to let the matter drop.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 3—Tax on tea.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This subsection is indefinite. It refers, as far as I can understand it, to tea that was in warehouses on April 30, and does not cover tea that was purchased after that date.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is the excise tax. The other is in the Customs Act.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Could not the minister get along without this tax on tea? It is very unpopular. Tea is a beverage of the poor man and the poor woman, in fact of everybody. The fact of whisky being prohibited makes it all the harder—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should think that would make it easier to pay the tea tax.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: —harder that this heavy tax should be imposed on the only beverage that is left for the people. I think the minister ought to be able to carry on without this tax on tea. It is one of the taxes that we have not levied in the past, and it appears to me that he ought to give the matter some further consideration. My view would be that this tax should be struck out.

Mr. PEDLOW: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) in regard to the tax on tea. I think if the minister were to transfer the tax from tea to gasolene he would obtain as much revenue, or more, and would please a lot of people. To change this tax from tea to gasolene might displease some persons, but I am sure the pleasure that the tea-drinkers would derive would more than overcome any displeasure that such a change might cause.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A tax upon anything is unpopular. But, unfortunately, we must have a revenue, and it must be imposed upon things that enter into consumption. The consumption of tea per capita in Canada is about four and a quarter pounds per year, so that after all the tax will not be a very onerous one. I would be very pleased indeed if we did not have to impose it, but I think the people of Canada will accept it in good spirit.

Mr. McMASTER: I can quite understand that it is as impossible to tax and be popular as to love and be wise, but when when we are taxing tea let us proceed in accordance with proper principles. I am urging once more—and it is only proper that I should do so—that this excise tax on tea should be ad valorem and not a specific tax. You are taxing at ten cents a pound the thirty-cent tea used by the poor, which means an imposition of 33⅓ per cent, while the tea costing fifty or sixty cents a pound, used by the richer people, is only taxed to the extent of fifteen or twenty per cent. This is not a fair

or a right way to impose taxation. In the second place, I see no reason for departing from the principle introduced in 1897 of a British preference. A British preference should be granted to the tea growers of Ceylon and other parts of the world where the British flag flies. I see no reason for departing from that policy, and I would urge upon the minister even at this eleventh hour to change his tax to an ad valorem one, and to preserve the British preference in regard to tea.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it is absolutely impossible to have an ad valorem tax on tea. In the first place, it would be very difficult to administer such a tax, and in the second place it would yield very little revenue. If you have an ad valorem tax upon tea importations it must be upon the price in the country of production. In India, China, and Ceylon, tea sells at four, five and six cents a pound. It would not be fair to the British exporters of tea to this country. Then I am informed by the officers of the department that almost all the countries of the world regard an ad valorem tax upon tea as being practically impossible. The only countries which have an ad valorem tax are Turkey, China and Egypt. At the present moment the British tax upon tea is a shilling a pound; in France, I think, it is twenty-four cents a pound, and in Italy it is even higher. I think I may safely say that an ad valorem tax on tea would yield very little revenue, and it would practically be impossible of administration. Now, as to a preference to importations from British countries, I repeat what I said a few days ago, that the suggestion is worthy of consideration. At the present moment we are in need of the revenue and we thought it advisable to put this tax in the same category as the tax upon tobaccos and liquors; in regard to which a preference is not given to any of the British countries. However, the matter may receive the consideration of the Government later. I want to point out also that for the present year a preferential rate for the British dominions would not carry any advantage owing to the impossibility of getting shipping to forward tea. The suggestion of my hon. friend, however, is a very fair one, and I quite agree with him that it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: Does not the minister think that the tax should be 20 per cent ad valorem? The man who buys tea for 25 cents or 50 cents a pound would then pay 5 and 10 cents. And if he bought tea for $1 a pound, he would pay 20 cents. The minister has referred to the consumption of tea in France. Tea is not drunk in France, not because it not used, but because coffee is drunk to a greater extent, and the drink of the poor man is not tea, but coffee. So the poor man is not hit as hard by that tax in France as we are here.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Tea is the great article in Great Britain, not coffee, and I think Canada is a tea-consuming country.

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely. Tea is the poor man's drink in Canada. If we made the tax 20 per cent ad valorem, the tax on fifty-cent tea would be 10 cents and on dollar-tea 20 cents.

Mr. LALOR: Is there any dollar-tea?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes. I think I have paid as much as $1.50 for tea.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no such thing as importations of tea costing 50 cents. The export prices now from British India are 7.27 cents per pound; Ceylon, 6.56 cents; China, 5.1 cents; Japan 7.10 cents. The export prices are just as I have given, and the 50 cent tea sold in Canada is blended by Canadian tea houses. Of course, blended tea also comes from Great Britain.

Mr. DECHENE: Does the section provide that this tax shall only apply to dealers holding 1,000 pounds of tea at a time? In a great many cases, especially in the big towns, there are many small dealers holding only a few hundred pounds of tea.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They do not pay.

Mr. DECHENE: But they are charging ten cents to the consumer just the same. The consumer is paying at this time of the year in Ottawa 10 cents excise tax which the corner-store dealer pockets. When the departmental inspector goes to the dealer, he will prove that he has not a stock of 1,000 pounds of tea, nevertheless he is charging 10 cents to the consumer just the same. Why is the provision limited to a minimum stock of 1,000 pounds? There is no way of the consumer getting back his money, and the dealer will usually be sharp enough to get the ten cents. If the consumer is paying the tax, the Government should take means to get it, and not allow the dealer to pocket it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think it is correct that in all places the dealer has

added already the tax to the price of stocks now on hand. If stocks of tea on hand regardless of quantity had to pay the tax, it would cost more to collect the same than we should receive. It might be possible to have collected the tax upon all stocks on hand in the large cities. But if the Department of Customs and Excise were obliged to send their officers all over Canada, through the country districts collecting ten cents a pound on every pound of tea held by merchants, my hon. friend will readily see that that would be a very expensive operation, the net result of which would be that the treasury would be out of pocket. We had to fix a limit and we thought 1,000 pounds about right.

Mr. DECHENE: I understand that. But in order to collect the tax at all, your collectors will have to visit every store, to find out what amount of tea is on hand.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Now they do, but hereafter the tax will be paid through the customs.

Mr. TOBIN: What amount does the minister expect to get from this tax on tea?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: About $3,200,000.

Mr. DECHENE: As many hon. members have said, a heavy tax is being put on tea. But I think coffee should not be neglected.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Oh, we have not forgotten coffee.

On section sub-paragraph (4)—Tax on moving picture films:

Mr. PEDLOW: I would suggest that a different basis would be, perhaps fairer on taxes of this kind and not decrease the revenue in any way. Instead of a flat rate of 10 cents, or whatever the rate is, a graduated rate on films and moving picture theatre tickets and other theatre tickets might be imposed. For instance, it is hardly fair that expensive tickets costing $1.50 and $2 should only pay a minimum tax of 10 cents each. I think any one who is flush enough to spend $1.50 or $2 on a theatre ticket can well afford to pay 25 or 50 cents in addition. I think that feature should be looked into if it has not been already.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the war continues very much longer there will be ample time to create further additional taxes, if up to the present time we have overlooked any. Theatre tickets are now taxed by all the provinces. In some places there is a municipal tax as well. I think it is better that we do not enter into conflict with the provinces and municipalities in matters of this kind, at least so long as we can avoid it.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 11.59 p.m.

Friday, May 17, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

REPORTS.

Annual Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce.—Sir George Foster.

Report relative to mail subsidies and steamship subventions.—Sir George Foster.

Report of the Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. —Sir George Foster.

CANADIAN WAR RECORDS OFFICE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I lay on the table of the House the second Annual Report of the Canadian War Records Office for the year 1917. It is a very interesting report, and later it may be proper to move that it be printed at once. I shall be glad to make that motion if the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, after looking over the report, concurs in my view.

OFFICIALS OF THE HOUSE.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. W. H. DICKSON AS OFFICIAL REPORTER.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid upon the table of the House on the 13th instant, respecting the promotion of Mr. W. H. Dickson to the position of Reporter of the Official Debates of the House of Commons, be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the Civil Service Commission reported on this promotion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and has given its certificate.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. P. A. CHEVASSU AS TRANSLATOR.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid upon the table of the House on the 11th instant, respecting the appointment of Mr. J. P. A. Chevassu to Hansard Division of the Translation Staff of the House of Commons, be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has this also been before the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the certificate of the Civil Service Commission has been issued. The appointee is a returned soldier.

Motion agreed to.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 102, for the relief of Emily Kathleen Cochrane Lackey.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 103, for the relief of Alfred Frank Scott.—Mr. Harold.

Bill No. 104, for the relief of Alonzo Jesse Chapman.—Mr. Copp.

Bill No. 105, for the relief of Margaret Bell Charlesworth.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 106, to amend The Companies Act in various particulars.—The Secretary of State.

FLOUR MILLING COMPANIES PROFITS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): I am informed that before his resignation, Mr. W. F. O'Connor, of the Cost of Living Branch of the Labour Department, made a report on the profits of the flour companies of the Dominion of Canada. I understand that that report was submitted about a month ago. Is it the intention of the Government to bring down that report, and if so, when? It is important that it be brought down before the end of the session.

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. O'Connor has made no report concerning the milling industry of this country. Another officer of the department has collected a large quantity of information and has a report now in course of preparation, but Mr. O'Connor has nothing whatever to do with that report.

EXPORTATION OF BRAN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): May I ask the Minister of Customs when I may expect a return to an Order of the House dealing with the exportation of bran into the United States?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON: That matter is not under the Department of Customs. It is under the control of the Department of Agriculture through the Canada Food Board.

Mr. KAY: Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will give me the information.

Mr. ROBB: As I understand it, the hon. member for Missisquoi desires information as to the quantity exported.

Mr. KAY: I put a question on the Order Paper and my question was changed to an Order for a return.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I shall look into the matter and get the information the hon. member desires.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT: I wish to draw the attention of the House to this item in this morning's Citizen:

Plan to deal with hardships resulting from military call.

The Government has under consideration steps to deal with cases of extreme hardship which would result from the abolition of exemptions, without any exception between the ages of 20 and 22. It is probable that in each military district some one will be delegated authority to deal with such cases and grant leave of absence from service.

I simply want to know if there is any truth in this report.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The statement to which my hon. friend alludes has not been made on behalf of the Government.

PAYMENTS MADE TO NEWSPAPERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): If the Secretary of State were in his seat, I would ask him when we may expect returns to Orders passed several weeks ago regarding payments made to certain newspapers in Toronto and Ottawa.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: In connection with the Victory Loan?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: That was laid on the table of the House some days ago.

Mr. MURPHY: Not only payments in connection with the Victory Loan, but payments generally over a stated period of time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really could not give my hon. friend any information about the matter, but I shall draw the attention of the Secretary of State to the inquiry. If my hon. friend will be good enough to send me a memorandum, so that I shall not forget the matter, I shall be much obliged.

Mr. MURPHY: All right.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

BILL TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TO BRING THE OUTSIDE SERVICE UNDER ITS PROVISIONS.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe):

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to amend same by substituting the following for section 30.

30. Subject to the provisions of section three of this Act, power to remove or dismiss any deputy head, officer, clerk or employee, shall vest in the Commission.

Before exercising such power, the Commission shall require a statement in writing, from the minister in the case of a deputy head, and from the deputy head in all other cases, giving the causes, reasons and facts invoked for such dismissal.

Upon receipt of such statement in writing the Commission shall forthwith communicate a copy of same to the deputy head or other employee whose dismissal is sought.

The deputy head or employee shall within ten days after the receipt of copy of said statement file with the Commission a statement in writing in answer to such charges in default of which the Commission may proceed on the statement submitted asking for dismissal.

I do not want to make any further remarks on this amendment except this: When the Bill was before the House, it provided that the power of dismissal should be vested in the Governor in Council, but no power of appointment was provided in the Bill. The only section that had any reference as to how employees should come into the service was the one providing that, on the request of a deputy head, the commission should, as it saw fit, in its best judgment, supply the proper person. We had the Bill amended to vest the power of appointment in the commission by substituting the word "appoint" for the word "supply." Consequently the amendment which I have just moved should be passed so as to make section 30 conform with the rest of the Bill. When I moved that amendment the first time I explained my reasons for it. I then stated that it was only fair that the body which had the power of appointment should also have the power of dismissal, and I wanted this amendment to carry for another reason. My contention is that even if the power of dismissal rests in the Governor in Council, any one whose dismissal is asked for should have an opportunity of stating his case and submitting his answer to the power which is to dismiss him. My amendment is, I think, just and fair, and the Civil Service employee is entitled to a certain amount of protection by being allowed, whenever charges are made against him or whenever his dismissal is asked, at least to submit his case. It was argued in answer that this might involve a good deal of work on the part of the commission. Certainly we cannot expect that there will be a trial each time a dismissal is requested, but the least this House should do is to give the employee, who is charged with any offence or whose dismissal is requested, the privilege of putting his reason in writing and having them made part of the record of his dismissal.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The amendment proposed by my hon. friend was very thoroughly discussed when the Bill was being considered in committee, and there is nothing that I can add to what I said at that time. The intent of the Civil Service Act is to provide a different method so far as the appointment of civil servants is concerned. It was not intended that we should change the existing method of dismissing officials.

Mr. BUREAU: The purport of the Bill was to abolish patronage.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Patronage in the matter of appointing officials.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Not in the matter of dismissals?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend contends that the Civil Service Commission have the power of dismissing even deputy ministers and deputy heads, and I submit that is not a fair proposition and should not receive the support of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: On the recommendation of the minister?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On the recommendation of anybody. I wish to repeat what I have already said on more than one occasion in this House, namely, that civil servants are employees of the Crown. They

are paid by the Crown, and the power of dismissal should rest in the Crown and in no other body, the Crown being responsible to Parliament.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Bureau which was negatived on the following division.

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lavigueur,
Baldwin,	Leduc,
Boivin,	Leger,
Bourassa,	Lesage,
Bureau,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cahill,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	McMaster,
Casgrain,	Marcile (Bagot),
Copp,	Michaud,
Déchêne,	Morphy,
Delisle,	Murphy,
Desaulniers,	Pacaud,
Duff,	Papineau,
DuTremblay,	Parent,
Ethier,	Pedlow,
Euler,	Pelletier,
Fafard,	Prevost,
Fournier,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Gauthier,	Ross,
Gauvreau,	Savard,
Gervais,	Sinclair (Antigonish &
Jacobs,	Guysboro),
Lanctôt,	Trahan,
Lapointe	Truax,
(Kamouraska),	Turgeon,
Lapointe (St. James),	Vien,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	White (Victoria).—52.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Knox,
Anderson,	Lalor,
Andrews,	Long,
Argue,	Mackie (Edmonton),
Armstrong (York),	Mackie (Renfrew),
Arthurs,	Maclean (Halifax),
Ballantyne,	McCurdy,
Ball,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Blair,	McGregor,
Blake,	McIntosh,
Bolton,	McIsaac,
Bonnell,	McLean (Royal),
Borden (Sir Robert),	McLeod,
Boys,	Maharg,
Brien,	Manion,
Buchanan,	Marshall,
Burrell,	Martin,
Charters,	Mewburn,
Clark (Bruce),	Mowat,
Clark (Red Deer),	Nesbitt,
Clarke (Wellington),	Nicholson (Algoma),
Cochrane,	Nickle,
Cockshutt,	Pardee,
Cooper,	Paul,
Cowan,	Redman,
Crerar,	Reid (Grenville),
Cronyn,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Crothers,	Richardson,
Crowe,	Rowell,
Cruise,	Sexsmith,
Davidson,	Shaw,
Davis,	Sheard,
Edwards,	Sifton,
Fielding,	Simpson,
Finley,	Spinney,
Foster (Sir George),	Steele,
Foster (York),	Stevens,
Fulton,	Stewart (Lanark),
Green,	Sutherland,
Guthrie,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Halladay,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Harrison,	Turriff,
Hartt,	Tweedie,
Hay,	Wigmore,
Henders,	Wilson (Wentworth),
Hocken,	Wilson (Saskatoon).
Hughes (Sir Sam),	—93.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Clements,	Molloy,
Stacey,	Sinclair, J. E. (Queens),
Chabot,	Verville,
Douglas (Strath.),	Hunt,
White, Sir Thomas,	Denis,
McGibbon (Muskoka),	McCoig,
Stevens,	Kay,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	McCrea,
Clarke (Wellington),	Fontaine,
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Boys,	Brouillard,
Burnham,	Kennedy,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Elkin,	Lemieux,
Fripp,	Proulx,
Harold,	Tobin,
Maclean (York),	Gladu,
Meighen,	Mayrand,
Middlebro,	Robb,
Munson,	d'Anjou,
Porter,	Fortier,
Wallace, T.,	Devlin,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Seguin,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lafortune,
Best,	Power,
Peck,	Cannon,
Sharpe,	Chisholm,
Tremain,	Deslauriers,
Loggie,	Demers,
Charlton,	Boyer.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, before the motion for the third reading of this Bill is carried, I desire to repeat what I said in committee that this Bill, instead of abolishing patronage, affords a greater incentive to the exercise of patronage than has existed in this country since 1908. I will prove that by a very brief reference to the old statute and to the Bill in its present form. The Act of 1908, section 42, provided that:

> No person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit or endeavour to influence any minister of the Crown or the head of any department with respect to the appointment of any person to the service, or with respect to the promotion or transfer of or an increase of salary to, any officer, clerk, or employee in the public service.
>
> (2) Any person who, directly or indirectly, solicits or endeavours to influence any minister of the Crown or the head of any department in favour of his appointment or promo-

tion or to increase his salary, shall be deemed to be unworthy of such appointment, promotion or increase, and it shall not be accorded him; and if he is employed in the public service he shall be liable to immediate dismissal.

When the Bill, whose third reading has now been moved, was drafted, the efficacy of that section was recognized because it was repeated in the Bill as section 9 and a third subsection was added in these terms:

Any person shall have the right to submit to the Commission a representation in writing with respect to the appointment of any person to the public service or with respect to the promotion, transfer of or an increase of salary to any officer, clerk or employee in the public service.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Suppose an officer of a department wanted to be promoted and placed a statement before the commission. would he contravene the Act?

Mr. MURPHY: Not under this. The question the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) asks reminds me that when this matter was under discussion a few days ago the right hon. the Prime Minister pointed out that the remedy of the official would be the very one suggested by my hon. friend.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perfectly proper.

Mr. MURPHY: Perfectly proper, as my hon. friend says, and yet this section, as it has existed since 1908 with this new subsection, was stricken out of this Act at the demand of an hon. gentleman supporting the Government and representing one of the Toronto seats. So that, this Act, not only does not preserve the safeguard against patronage that the old Act contained but it throws the door wide open to the exercise of patronage. I am of opinion, Mr. Speaker, that had the right hon. the Prime Minister been in the House at the time the demand came from the Government side of the House for the elimination of that section, my right hon. friend would never have acceded to it. However, that demand has been acceded to and the new Act shorn of that protection coupled with the fact that 15,000 or 20,000 employees of the Outside Service are still left outside of the operation of the Act, and coupled with the dual complexion of the support of this Government, convinces me that this Act not only does not abolish patronage, but that patronage under it will be more rampant than ever. From what I have heard, I am certain that a well known medical principle will be applied in the operation of this Act. It is that when a person takes poison an antidote is administered. I am satisfied that the principle that will be applied in the operation of this Act in future will be that when a Grit gets an appointment a Tory will have to get another to wipe out the effect of the first.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not the opportunity of replying unless he desires to ask the consent of the House. Having moved a motion, an hon. member exhausts his right to speak again.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, when the Bill was in committee I called attention to clause 38, which reads:

Nothing in this Act shall be held to curtail the privileges now enjoyed by the officers, clerks and employees of the Senate, House of Commons or Library of Parliament with respect to rank and precedence or to attendance, office hours, or leave of absence, or with respect to engaging in such employment during parliamentary recess as may entitle them to receive extra salary or remuneration.

I was told that that clause was in the old Act, and I understand it was continued in the amended Act. I made the suggestion that inasmuch as a great many of these employees were only employed during the session, their offices, or their services, might be availed of by the country during the recess, and, perhaps, a large saving to the country effected thereby. I was informed by the hon. Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), in whose hands the Bill is, that a report was being prepared by yourself, Mr. Speaker, on this question and upon receiving that explanation I did not press for any revision of this clause. I also took the opportunity of calling upon you and you were good enough to show me a report which you had prepared, a report which I thought was of very great importance, and, if adopted by this House, would result in a large saving to the country. I think the Acting Minister of Finance was not aware that that report was ready. However, at this stage of the proceedings I would not suggest that the Bill be recommitted and that we take any action, but in view of my information from having had the privilege of reading that report, I would have liked that we should have heard from Mr. Speaker on the whole question, because he, more than any other member of this House, is competent to inform the House as to the real situation and to make recommendations.

I would suggest that the report of Mr. Speaker, which will contain suggestions with

respect to economies that can be effected, and how money may be saved to the country by availing ourselves of the services of many of the officers of the House during recess, together with such recommendations as may commend themselves to the good judgment of His Honour, be printed and distributed during recess. Then, perhaps, we would be in a position to amend this particular clause of the Act in such manner as would result in a material saving of the public revenue.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the Internal Economy Commission of the House made any report to Parliament this year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Speaker is a member of the Commission of Internal Economy of the House, and in that capacity he has been making the inquiry alluded to by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). The report has not been brought to my attention yet—in fact, I do not know whether it is completed—but I have understood from His Honour the Speaker that he expects to effect very considerable economies in the affairs of the House by the new dispositions which he will propose.

So far as the observations of my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) are concerned, I cannot concur in the view which he has taken. It seems to me a singularly exaggerated view. The subsection which he condemns, as far as I understand his argument, is this:

> Any person shall have the right to submit to the Commission a representation in writing with respect to the appointment of any person to the public service or with respect to the promotion, transfer of or an increase of salary to any officers, clerk or employee in the public service.

The purpose of that section, as I understand, is to give reasonable opportunity to men employed in the public service to make their representations, in an open and proper way, to the Civil Service Commission. It seemed undesirable that they should be absolutely cut off from a representation either to the minister to whose department they belong, or to the Civil Service Commission itself. How this would lead to the increase of patronage in the ordinary sense is entirely beyond my comprehension. The exercise of patronage in the past, as it has been condemned on both sides of the House, is the exercise by ministers of the Crown of the power of appointment, not in the public interest, as it is said, but in a party interest. The Civil Service Commission is an absolutely independent body, which is bound to make appointments to the public service upon competitive examination, or for reasons which are absolutely in the public interest. To suggest, therefore, that the giving of this right to public servants to make their representations in written form and in an open manner to the Civil Service Commission will lead to the continuance, or the increase, of patronage, seems to me to be absolutely beyond the bounds of common sense.

With regard to the Bill as a whole, hon. gentlemen will realize that it necessarily has been prepared under very great stress, and possibly without the opportunity of giving to it the prolonged consideration which ought to be given to a very important Bill of this character. It brings under the control of the Civil Service Commission many thousands of employees throughout the country: I am informed by the Acting Minister of Finance, who has had charge of the Bill, that the number will not fall short of fifty-five thousand. To undertake that the appointments of so large a number of public servants shall be made under the direction of the Civil Service Commission is obviously a very great step in advance, and I should not be at all surprised if it were found necessary at the next session of Parliament to go over this Bill again, to improve it if possible, and to amend it in the light of the experience which will have been gained in its practical operation during the next six or seven months. There is a desire, I believe, on both sides of the House to make the Bill as effective and as workable as possible. We shall endeavour to join our efforts for that purpose at the next session, in so far as it may be found necessary by reason of the experience which will have been gained by the Civil Service Commission in the meantime.

12 n.

A reference has also been made in the House to the importance of having the commission strengthened in personnel by an increase of members.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And in salary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And in salary also, my hon. friend suggests. Well, those are matters which must be taken into consideration in the meantime. Obviously the extension of the scope of the Commission to fifty-five thousand public servants will entail upon the members of the Commission an enormously increased responsibility and very great additional labour. How those labours can best be discharged

we shall have to consider between now and the next session, if it turns out in the meantime that the Commission as at present constituted is not able to give to all these matters the direct personal attention which will obviously be necessary. In the past when discussing the question of Civil Service reform, and how it would be possible to deal with fifty or sixty thousand additional public servants by means of the Civil Service Commission, the suggestion has been made to me that possibly local boards might have to be established in each province in Canada for the purpose of reporting directly to a central board here. That would be one method. Another method, which has been suggested to the House, is the increase of the personnel of the Board by one or two members. However, the subject will be open at the next session of Parliament.

I need only add this further observation : Reference has been made to the desirability of having returned soldiers represented on the Commission. If it becomes necessary to increase the personnel of the Commission, I think hon. members may rest assured that the claims of returned soldiers will not be overlooked or forgotten. It is quite proper that they should be considered, and furthermore, that action should be taken upon that consideration. But I know the spirit of the returned men too well to believe that they would desire the personnel of the Civil Service increased unless it were in the public interest to do so. It may, and very probably it will, become necessary in the public interest to make some increase, and hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject along that line may rest assured that this matter —which has been under consideration before it was brought up in the House—together with any suggestions which they have made in that connection, will not be overlooked.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I would like, as a returned soldier, to put myself strongly on record in favour of having a returned soldier on the Civil Service Commission, and my reason for doing so is this: Either we are going to give some preference to the returned soldier when he comes back from the front, or we are not. We say that we intend to give them some preference. Taking that for granted, I think that the body of some four or five hundred thousand men who are serving at the front at the risk of their lives should be represented on the Commission. If they are not to be so represented then we should quit saying that we mean to give returned soldiers a preference.

I wish to say that I am very strongly in favour of a representative of the returned soldiers on that commission. The Ottawa Veterans Association passed, within the last week, what seems to me to be a very reasonable resolution suggesting one representative. I think there is reason in all things, and that I think is a very reasonable request.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend will realize, of course, that a preference has been established by Order in Council, and is confirmed by this Bill.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysboro): To my mind the great defect in this proposal is the fact that the railway employees have not been included, and there is no branch of the service in Eastern Canada that has been used for patronage purposes as have the Government railways. The Government are retaining the right to continue the old system, which is wrong and out-of-date, as every one admits; not only on the Intercolonial but all the Government railways. We were told the other day that the Intercolonial employs some twenty thousand men. And when the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern are taken in, the number of employees will be increased perhaps to hundreds of thousands. It is of the greatest importance that this question should be considered at this stage. I have not heard any good reason given by any member of the Government why the railways should not be included. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean) said in a former speech that instructions had been given to the management of the Intercolonial railway to discontinue the patronage system. He was asked to produce the instructions and to lay them on the Table, and he was not able to do so. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) himself, was pressed for a clear statement on that question the other night, and he admitted that he did not send out any instructions, that he had had a conversation with the general superintendent of the Intercolonial, in which he had told him that he had a free hand to abolish patronage if he wished to do so. That is no way to abolish patronage. Something more definite than that must be done. Instructions must be sent out. The system has existed so long that it has permeated the whole of Eastern Canada, and patronage will never be abolished merely by having a conversation with an official of the Intercolonial

The Government must announce to every superintendent and every foreman in the workshops along the line that they are to have a free hand to employ the men required. Why should a boy, who wants to be an engineer or a driver on the road, or to start in as a brakeman and grow up to be a conductor, have to go to a member of Parliament or to a patronage committee before he can be taken on? That is the present system. No young boy can get into the shops unless he is armed with a certificate from a member of Parliament or a patronage committee. That system exists in Nova Scotia, notwithstanding the declaration of the Prime Minister, and it is still as rampant as ever it was. And it is only a pretense to say that there was a conversation with the general superintendent of the road. If such instruction was given, it has never reached the superintendents or the men along the line who are foremen in the shops and who employ the men. If the Government is sincere about this they must do something more than they have done in the past. It is idle to say that we are abolishing patronage throughout Canada if we still continue it on the Government railways.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I was very much pleased indeed to hear the Premier's promise that if it is necessary to enlarge the Civil Service Commission a returned soldier will be placed on it. I may say that I would have been better pleased if one had been placed there already. I think it is absolutely necessary, as the hon. member for Fort William has said, that if we are going to do justice to the soldier, we should bring that justice into the realm of practical politics. Personally, it is very disagreeable to me, and to every boy who has served overseas, to have so much notoriety given in this House and in the newspapers to the returned soldiers. When a man in this House wants to draw applause he simply has to refer to something which has been done on the western front by the Canadians. I think we are all more interested in the future of the returned men than we are in the applause of this House; and I would like to see this matter brought into the realm of practical politics, where something can be done in a practical way to place these men in the public service. I do not see any way by which it can so easily and so well be accomplished than by having a representative on the commission. I am not pleading that the returned men should get any preference if they are not capable, for that would be fatal to their best interests. But other things being equal, I think they should have the preference. And if we are going to give them a preference, we should start about it in a practical way.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I do not wish to repeat the arguments set forth by the hon. member for Russell with regard to the disappearence from the Bill of section 9. But I wish to endorse everything he has said in that connection. I consider that section 9 was by far the most important section of the Bill, so far as doing away with patronage and political influence is concerned. I desire accordingly to move, seconded by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie):

That this Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House to restore Section 9 of the Bill as at first submitted to the House.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, when we were in committee on this Bill, section 9 was discussed and the opinion of the committee was that it was not advisable to have that section embodied in the Bill. The reasons for coming to that conclusion were advanced at that time, and, to my mind at least, they were sufficient to justify the leaving out of that section. I have listened to the arguments advanced with regard to the amendment which has just been voted down; and I have listened to the statement made by the Prime Minister with regard to what might possibly be done at the next session of Parliament if defects were found in the present Bill, which possibly was drafted rather hurriedly owing to the amount of work that has been before the Government.

Upwards of a year ago instructions were sent out that only those who had seen service at the front should be considered in the matter of appointments to the Civil Service both the Inside and the Outside service, where such men could be had, and I believe that that course was observed by those sending in recommendations to the Government from that time on. I cannot help but feel, in view of the fact that a Committee on Pensions is now sitting in this House, that this matter should have received some attention at the hands of the Government as well as at the hands of the representatives in Parliament. I do think that the soldiers would have felt that their interests were being safeguarded and looked after much better had a returned soldier been ap-

pointed as one of the members of this commission.

Under the proposal to reinsert this clause in the Bill, we are justified in considering the present personnel of the commission. It is not a pleasant thing to do, particularly when one happens to be acquainted with these gentlemen and to have a personal high regard for them. But in the selection of the members of the Civil Service Commission I do not believe that care has been taken to obtain men of outstanding administrative ability such as is necessary for the exercising of such tremendous power, influence and responsibility as will devolve upon this body. More than 55,000 men in the public service will be placed directly under the control of this commission. I submit that among returned soldiers men could have been found possessing the qualifications which I have mentioned; yet, for some reason, no returned soldier has been selected to fill one of these positions. The greatest problem of this country to-day is how to look after the men who are returning from the front. This problem will be before us for years, and I do not think that next session is the proper time to consider the matter, nor do I think that a commission of three is sufficient to look after it at this time. It has been intimated that local boards may have to be established throughout the country in order to facilitate the work of the commission. Under the clause which is proposed to be reinserted it would almost appear necessary that the members of this commission should be arrayed in uniform, or to have some distinguishing mark to indicate that they are the Civil Service Commission, and that it is not advisable for any representative of the people to go within speaking distance of them; otherwise it may be implied that somebody's interest is to be advanced or jeopardized. These men have ordinary human instincts; they have their social connections, and if a provision of this kind is inserted in the Bill many deserving applicants will be placed at a disadvantage and the cases of others will be advanced because of their social connection with the members of this commission. The representatives of the people should not be deprived of all responsibility in matters of this kind. Judging from my experience in the county from which I come, I do not believe that abuses have arisen in connection with appointments. When the subject was being discussed on the hustings members of the present Government referred more particularly to the expenditure of money involved under the patronage system than to the advisability of having all appointments made by the Civil Service Commission. In one of the first meetings held in Winnipeg the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar) said, as reported in the Manitoba Free Press, that he had already been approached by some one who wanted to dispose of a patent for certain purposes and by some one from Ontario who wished him to use his influence respecting an appointment to the Upper House. These were the things uppermost in his mind, apparently, when he was referring to patronage. Yet under no measure that has been introduced are the Government being freed from this patronage so condemned by them at that time. Under this provision the representatives of the people will not dare place before the Civil Service Commission their views respecting the qualifications of any candidate or applicant for a position in the Civil Service. I do not think it is possible to make a more severe reflection on the representatives of the people than is embodied in the clause which it is now proposed to reinsert in the Bill. I do not believe that it was in the public interest to introduce a Bill of this kind. You are creating a class corporation in this country. You are erecting a wall of protection around them. You are placing the most absolute power in the hands of this commission, and, under this clause, you seek to deprive the representatives of the people of the right to go near this body, upon whom you have conferred such vast powers, for an applicant to advance his or her claims for consideration. I do not think it is in the public interest that this clause should be reinserted in the Bill.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): With some of the features of this Bill I do not agree, but a body of opinion throughout the country is in favour of some such measure as this. Never having had great reverence for the doctrine of infallibility, however, I shall allow my judgment to give way to what I believe to be the judgment of the vast majority of the people and of most of the members of this House. No great harm can be done in the next six or eight months by allowing this Bill to go through now. I am satisfied that next session it will come up for reconsideration and, with our larger experience, we shall probably be able to improve it.

But I rise principally to endorse the remarks made by the members for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), and Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon), who supported the suggestion that a returned

soldier should be appointed to the Civil Service Commission. I think that should be done now. We have to consider the cost of all these things; it is right that we should be economical. But I will tell the Government where they can get the money to pay the salary of this returned soldier for at least a year as a member of this commission. They have only to make a certain gentleman whose name I dare not mention here refund $5,000 that he looted from the Treasury and that he did not earn. That will pay the salary of this returned soldier on the board for one year, and next year we may consider where we can get the salary for the future.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, if the amendment were that no person should approach the Civil Service Commission in the way indicated, I should be rather inclined to vote for the re-insertion of the clause, but the clause, as it appeared in the original Bill, was that no person should approach a minister of the Crown. I must say that, on careful consideration, that looks like an interference with responsible Government. Almost anybody should have the right in a respectful way to approach any minister of the Crown on any matter of public business. If, however, it were deemed necessary to move an amendment to insert a section that no person should approach the Civil Service Commission in that way, I am inclined to think I would support it, because the Civil Service Commission is supposed to be a judicial commission, and we would not, for one moment, tolerate the idea of any person approaching the judges of the land in order to exercise undue influence. But as respects the right to approach a minister of the Crown and discuss any matter with him and even to ask or advise him respecting appointments to any public office, I should not like to interfere with that right or privilege, although apparently that has been done in the past. I know that section has not been respected in the past, and I do not think it would be respected in the future.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I wish to endorse the view of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) as regards approaching ministers of the Crown. I take this ground regarding lobbying in this House in respect to appointments to positions, that it is the privilege of any citizen in the Dominion of Canada to approach any minister of the Crown, member of Parliament or member of the Civil Service Commission and to tell him about his qualification for such position; but it is the privilege of the minister of the Crown, member of Parliament, or commissioner to exercise his own judgment, show his back-bone and show that there is some manhood in him. Why should any person be suppressed? Why should he be chloroformed? Why should he be prevented from looking at a minister except through smoked glasses or at a Civil Service commissioner except through glasses equally opaque. Why should a minister of the Crown, member of Parliament or commissioner not have the back-bone to say: Here are the facts; I regard you as a proper person for the position, and I do not so regard the other party. Many of us can remember certain pre-election promises. If we get in, such and such a person will get the position; and then if the wheel of fortune turns, we find that the same promise has been made to ten other people. We want backbone on the part of ministers and other high officials. Then, let any person approach them in any manner, and the result will be all right. So far as the judges of the land are concerned, there are all sorts of stories in regard to people consulting judges in advance, but the judges, to their eternal credit, do not yield to such importuning, but rather count it against those who exercise undue influence.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) is quite within his right, but nevertheless I am sorry he is going to divide the House upon this matter. Personally I would have preferred that this section had been left in the Bill. I withdrew it because that seemed to be the unanimous opinion of the House at the time. I do not recollect any single person suggesting that the section should remain in the Bill. I think sometime afterwards the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) expressed his regrets that the section was dropped.

Mr. MURPHY: I objected at the time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Had I not been left with the impression that it was the unanimous view of the House that any person should have the right of approaching ministers of the Crown, I should not have dropped the section, and I regret the hon. member for Kamouraska is going to inconvenience the House by dividing it on this matter.

Mr. MURPHY: I made my view at the time as plain as words could make it.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am sorry I was not in the House at the time.

Mr. THOMAS HAY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that I am not in full sympathy with this Bill, although I do not purpose voting against it. I believe it will do no harm to try it out for at least six or eight months, and then, if necessary, it may be amended. But I feel that the Bill, as it at present exists, will not greatly improve conditions in this country.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I want to give expression to my unqualified support of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr Fielding). If there is anything this House ought to do, it is to make the Civil Service Commission absolutely independent of every outside influence, to surround it with all the safeguards vouchsafed to the judiciary of this country. It should not be permitted to be approached by any other than, at any rate, the ministers. I hope, therefore, my hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe) will amend his motion so as to make it conform with the suggestion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens.

The salaries of the commissioners are not high enough. Instead of having $5,000 a year, they should have $7,000. You cannot expect judicial service unless you pay a man a proper salary. The commissioners should receive the salary of a Supreme Court judge, and they should have all the sanctity that can be given to a commission that is absolutely judicial in its capacity.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E Lapointe) rose, I was under the impression that he was entitled to speak upon the main motion, and after consultation with the authorities, I find I was correct in that assumption. But, having seconded the first amendment moved, he is not competent to move this amendment. I, therefore, after a consultation, propose Mr. Parent as mover of the motion, to be seconded by Mr. McKenzie.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Parent, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Duff,
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fournier,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Jacobs,
Kay,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (St. James),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lesage,
Mackie (Edmonton),
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcile (Bagot),
Michaud,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Ross,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Vien,
White (Victoria).—61.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,
Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (York),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Calder,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Davidson,
Davis,
Edwards,
Fielding,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fulton,
Green,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Knox,
Lalor,
Lang,
Long,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McLeod,
Maharg,
Manion,
Marshall,
Martin,
Mowat,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nickle,
Pardee,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Richardson,
Rowell,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Spinney,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wright.—94.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Clements,	Molloy,
Stacey,	Sinclair, J. E. (Queens),
Chabot,	Verville,
Douglas (Strath.),	Hunt,
White, Sir Thomas,	Demers,
McGibbon (Muskoka),	McCoig,
Stevens,	Kay,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	McCrea,
Clarke (Wellington),	Fontaine,
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Boys,	Brouillard,
Burnham,	Kennedy,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Elkin,	Cannon,
Fripp,	Bourassa,
Hartt,	Desaulniers,
Loggie,	Deslauriers,
Maclean (York),	Devlin,
Meighen,	Gladu,
Middlebro,	Lafortune,
Munson,	Lemieux,
Porter,	Mayrand,
Wallace, T.,	Robb,
Tremain,	Tobin.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I desire to submit an amendment, and as I do not want to prolong the session I should like a division on it as soon as possible, but, of course, if other hon. gentlemen wish to speak to it, that is their privilege. The great majority of the members of this House owe their seats to the soldiers, and more particularly to the ladies. I have urged on the Government the advisability of giving representation on the commission to the ladies, and particularly to returned soldiers, but they have steadily declined, and I therefore propose to move, if I can find a seconder in the House—

Mr. PEDLOW: I will second the motion.

Mr. CURRIE: I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the Bill so as to give representation on the Board to returned soldiers and ladies.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have much pleasure in seconding that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask my hon. friend if he intends that these representatives on the board shall serve without salary?

Mr. CURRIE: Why, certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just going to point out that if they were to be paid, the amendment would not be in order, but inasmuch as it may follow that they may serve without salary, I will give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I submit that as the Bill provides that the members of the commission shall be paid a salary of $5,000, the amendment is clearly out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point of order is well taken, inasmuch as if the commissioners were appointed an increase in expenditure would be involved, and it is not competent for an hon. member to move a motion which involves an increased grant.

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to speak to a point of order?

Mr. CURRIE: I made a similar proposal to that contained in my motion when the Bill was under discussion, and I stated distinctly then that I knew the rules of the House precluded me from making a motion that would involve an increase in salary. I now desire to amend my motion so that it will read that these representatives shall serve without pay and let the Government provide for them. May I be permitted to do that. I should like this motion to be voted on, and for that purpose I will insert the words "without pay," so that the motion will be in order. We will see whether the returned soldiers have friends here or not.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think it is competent for the hon. member to make any such motion, because the Bill provides that members of the commission shall receive a salary of $5,000, and it would serve no purpose for the hon. member to have his motion put, leaving it to the Government to fix a salary, because the salary is already fixed by the Act, and there is no way of getting around it. Each of the commissioners must receive a salary. Therefore, I claim my hon. friend's motion is entirely out of order.

Mr. CURRIE: May I not be permitted to amend the motion to the effect that notwithstanding anything heretofore contained in the Act, these representatives may occupy positions on the commission?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is competent for the House of Commons, which passes an Act, to amend it in any form it desires, but at the moment I am charged with the duty of deciding whether the motion in my hands is in conformity with the rules of the House, and I feel disposed to rule that the point of

order raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) is well taken.

Mr. CURRIE: May I be permitted to amend the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is permitted to submit an amendment, but I doubt very much if he can get around the difficulty.

Mr. CURRIE: It is quite competent for members of this House to move to strike out salaries, but not to insert them, and I think it is quite competent for me to submit an amendment that does not involve an increased grant.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I appreciate, as everybody does, the motive of my hon. friend, but surely he does not suggest that a soldier, and particularly a lady, would undertake such onerous duties as are imposed by this Bill, without salary. I think his remedy is first to convince the members of the Government, who may then bring in a motion to the effect that he desires.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Section 3 of part 1 of the Bill says:

> The chairman shall be paid a salary of six thousand dollars, and each of the other commissioners five thousand dollars.

So it is very clear that if we appointed other commissioners they must receive salary.

Mr. CURRIE: That section limits the commission to three members.

Mr. RICHARDSON: No, it says: "each of the other commissioners."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am of opinion that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Halifax is well taken, and that the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Simcoe is not in order, and I so rule. The question is now on the main motion.

Mr. COPP: I desire to endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) with reference to withdrawing the employees of the Intercolonial and other Government railways from the operation of this Bill.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. COPP: When we separated at one o'clock I had just risen to express my very great regret that the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who is piloting this Bill through the House, was unable to persuade his colleagues to bring the employees of the Government railway system under the operation of the Civil Service Act the same as those of other departments. I am sure that any one who has any knowledge or experience of the great evil of patronage that seems to be in the mind of every hon. member of this House, must realize that if there is one department more than another in which it is present, in the greatest possible degree, it is that of the Government railway system. If, in order to abolish patronage the Civil Service Commission is to take practically complete control of the appointment and promotion of civil servants, I cannot understand why the employees of the Government railway system should not also come under the direction of the commission. The hon. the Acting Minister of Finance, during the past two or three years, took very strong ground against the evils of patronage and demanded that they should be abolished. The hon. gentleman's own constituency, and the Maritime Provinces generally, must be more affected by the Intercolonial than other parts of the Dominion and therefore, my hon. friend being a representative of that part of the country, has complete knowledge of the great disadvantages arising from the existence of the patronage system as applied to the Intercolonial.

Personally, I have very little confidence that the Bill will have any great effect in doing away with the patronage evil. But it will be of some use to the ministers because they will be able to employ it as a sort of buffer between themselves and the applicants when they desire to do so and they will use the Civil Service Commission as an excuse when they do not themselves wish to deal with any particular application. When asked to make an appointment or a promotion they will be able to say: "We have nothing whatever to do with this; the Civil Service Commission has charge of it." The hon. the Minister of Railway and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) says that in spite of the fact that Government railway employees are not to be brought under the Civil Service Commission, he has given instructions to the general manager that patronage must be abolished and that no influence may be used by any candidates, friends of the Government or otherwise to impress upon the general manager the advantage of appointing this, that or the other man. The general manager is given authority to appoint men to positions without regard to political influence or to pressure from any person whatsoever. I naturally accept that

statement of the Minister of Railways but it places the general manager of the Government railway system in a very peculiar position. Personally, I have not a great deal of acquaintance with him, but as far as I know he is a man of splendid ability and I believe he is very anxious to make a success of the railway system. It is hard for one to believe that a man occupying that position would stoop to petty political partisanship and patronage in connection with the operation of the road. Yet, during the past two years, men in the employ of the Intercolonial, who would naturally be entitled to promotion, have been kept in their same positions while men new in the service have been put over their heads. That is not only true in regard to more important positions, but also in regard to the very lowest employees. Even in regard to temporary employees, the patronage curse is being forced upon the people in that portion of Canada. A man who comes with his saw and hammer, and who wants a job to help to erect or repair a small building, is not recognized by the man who has charge of the work unless he is armed with a certificate from the man who has the patronage. As evidence in support of that statement, I want to draw the attention of the Government to a case that happened during the past winter in my own town. The Intercolonial required to erect a small roundhouse, or engine house, and the foreman was particularly anxious to get the work in progress as rapidly as possible. If the work were not proceeded with the engines would be left out in the cold and would suffer damage. The foreman tried to get men to go to work on that building. Finally he got a few men, and amongst them one man in particular who worked for four or five days. Then the foreman told him that unless he got a letter from the chairman of the patronage committee in the town of Sackville he could not continue on that work. How can the Government or the Minister of Railways and Canals expect us to accept the statement as to what they are going to do when we have such facts before us showing that instead of abolishing patronage, or making any attempt to abolish it, patronage is more rampant than ever and it is getting worse every day. In order to prove to this House the extent of the patronage evil in connection with the Intercolonial railway, and as an evidence why the Government railway system should be placed under the operation of this Bill, I will read the following affidavit:

[Mr. Copp.]

Province of New Brunswick,
County of Westmoreland, N.S.

I, Bernard Bowser, Builder and Contractor of the town of Sackville in the aforesaid county of Westmoreland, province of New Brunswick, being duly sworn make Oath and Say:—

That having been advised that skilled carpenters were required by the Canadian Government railway in the erection of a Roundhouse building at the railway yards in the town of Sackville aforesaid, I personally applied at the aforesaid premises of the railway for employment on or about the Thirtieth day of January A.D. 1918 and was employed and set to work by D. A. Seaman, foreman in charge of the said work, and continued at the said work for some five days.

That on the fifth day of my employment as aforesaid I was visited by the said Seaman, the foreman of the said work, and the following conversation took place between him and me:—

Seaman (foreman) "Can you get a recommendation?"

Bowser (employee) "It might be according to whom I got."

Seaman (foreman) "It is all right if it passes. Who are you going to get"?

Bowser (employee) "I might get Mr. Copp or Mr. McCord."

Seaman (foreman) "That won't do at all you will have to get some one from the Conservative Committee. Get Mr. Trites, some one that will pass it. It looks as if some of the party have written to Moncton saying you can not work without a recommendation. Can't you get Mr. Trites to give you a recommendation"?

Bowser (employee) "No, I wont ask Trites for any recommendation, the job is not worth more than a day's pay."

Seaman (foreman) "You had better leave your tools and see Mr. Trites, I do not want you to quit."

Bowser (employee) "No, I am not going to see Trites for any job."

Nothing further was said between Mr. Seaman and me on the occasion and I picked up my tools and quit the job and premises.

I am a native of the Parish of Sackville and have been active in my trade as a joiner and housebuilder for many years.

Sworn to at the town of Sackville, in the county of Westmoreland, province of New Brunswick this first day of April, A.D. 1918. Before me,

(Signed) Bernard Brown.

(Signed) A. W. Bennett.

A Commissioner for taking affidavits to be read in the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

My reason for reading the affidavit is to demonstrate to my hon. friends who, I believe, are in earnest in their determination to abolish the patronage evil, what is taking place on the Government system of railways, notwithstanding the fact that we now have a Union Government, and that one of the arguments in favour of the election of such a Government was that through its agency the country would be enabled to put an end to this evil. In the fall of 1917, we had the announcement that patronage was to be done away with, and yet

we find that as late as January, 1918, the system was still flourishing on the Government railways, and more particularly on the Intercolonial. In view of these facts, and in view of the realization on the part of hon. gentlemen, not only from the Maritime Provinces, but from the rest of Canada as well, of the extent of the patronage evil, in view of the announcement that we were going to have a thorough housecleaning with respect to patronage, the Acting Minister of Finance will not be doing justice to himself, to the employees of the Intercolonial, or to the members of this House, if he fails to make provision whereby the employees of the Government Railway system shall be placed with respect to this matter in exactly the same category as the civil servants in other departments of the public service.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): As a member from the Maritime Provinces, representing an extensive constituency traversed by the Intercolonial, I wish to put myself plainly on record in favour of abolishing patronage in all departments of the Civil Service, and more particularly in the system of Government Railways. On the occasion of four successive elections, with the responsibility of patronage on my shoulders, I went before my constituents and was elected by majorities varying from one thousand to fourteen hundred. Since 1911 my opponents have exerted the full weight of the patronage system on the Intercolonial against me, more particularly under the late administration, but I am glad to say, without result. I mention this to show how the system of patronage has been abused. In 1911, I was elected by acclamation and the change of Government left me entirely without any responsibility in the matter of patronage. I was greatly disappointed when this Bill was introduced to find that it did not apply to the Government Railways as well as to other departments of the Government. As my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) has so well stated, the ramifications of the patronage evil extend down even to working men in the matter of small appointments, and for the last four years it has been well nigh impossible for a workingman to get even a day's employment at repair work on the Intercolonial railway without having to go to the patronage committee of the parish in which he resided, and then only on his promising to observe the principles laid down by the members of that committee. The patronage evil strikes at the right of a citizen residing along the route of the Intercolonial to obtain employment on that railway, and if I may be permitted I will give an illustration of something which happened during the latter part of February or the early part of March, two or three months after the return of the Union Government, which claimed to be animated by a sincere desire to eliminate patronage with all its evils. An employee of the Intercolonial, with a record to his credit of from twenty-two to twenty-three years' service as a station agent and operator of the Intercolonial, had a young son who had acquired a knowledge of telegraphy under his father, and was eager to undergo an examination so that he might obtain some position on the Intercolonial for which his knowledge fitted him. The father wrote to the superintendent of the division stating that the son was prepared to pass an examination as a telegrapher, and expressing the hope that upon passing the examination his son would be given the first vacancy that occurred. In response to that letter there came a reply that the young man would have to get a recommendation from the Unionist member for the county, who was located in Northern New Brunswick. In compliance with the superintendent's request this man wrote to the member for the county, and was notified by him that he was sending his application to the patronage committee of the county. After all that circumlocution the father induced the son to pass the necessary examination, but the fact remains that the young man was regarded as not eligible for examination until he was in possession of the recommendation of the patronage committee of the county. The Minister of Railways has stated that he has given verbal instructions to the superintendent of the Intercolonial to abolish the patronage system, but it will be readily seen, from the illustrations which I have given, that it will require more than verbal instructions of that kind to abolish an evil the roots of which extend so deeply into the system of appointments on the Government railways. I repeat that I was greatly disappointed that this evil has not been dealt with by bringing the Government railways under the operation of the present Bill, and if, as the Government cannot see its way clear to accept an amendment having that object in view, I hope they will deal with the evil in some other way.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL —THIRD READING.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 87, an Act supplementary to chapter twenty-four of the Statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway system, was read the third time.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT ACT, 1918.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 81, to amend the Customs Tariff 1907, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 3—Commencement of Act:

Mr. PEDLOW: Before passing on clause 3, I would like the minister to explain the reason for the different rates on coffee and tea. There are two classifications here. Coffee, green, imported direct, etc., 5 cents preferential, and 7 cents intermediate and general tariff. Then there is coffee, green, n.o.p., 5 cents and 7½ per cent preferential, and 7 cents and 10 per cent intermediate and general.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The clause referred to by the hon. gentleman has already been carried. But with the unanimous consent of the committee we might revert to it. Is it the unanimous consent of the committee that we revert to section 2?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The reason for the different rates on tea and coffee is that the higher rate applies to indirect importations. The purpose is to control the tea trade and the coffee trade in Canada so far as possible, and to make as much as possible of it direct.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

BUSINESS PROFITS WAR TAX ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 84, to amend the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—Dividends paid considered a reduction of reserves, etc.:

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Will the minister explain this section?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the law as it stood, if a company earned $100,000 in profits during the year and did not distribute them, they could contend that that was part of their capital and that they were entitled to a deduction of 7 per cent upon that. This provides that if the profits are later distributed the amount cannot be counted as part of the capital. It is to prevent a possible increase of capital and resulting exemption.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Tax continued for another twelve months:

Mr. PEDLOW: When are these taxes to be paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The main Bill provides that the tax shall be paid each year within one month from the date of the mailing of the notice of assessment.

Mr. PEDLOW: At what time of the year will these notices be mailed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At all times of the year. Difficulties are sometimes encountered in determining the assessments of some companies. Departmental officers must determine the capital employed in companies of very large capitalization. Some companies in Canada have a share capital of say $50,000,000, whereas only about $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 of that is employed as capital. In such cases assessments must be made by the department, and this often takes a good deal of time.

Mr. PEDLOW: The intention is that the taxes may be collected at any time during the fiscal year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: I wish to direct the minister's attention to a method of payment which is under consideration in the United States. It is suggested that this tax should be collected not in one payment, but in quarterly payments spread over the current fiscal year. A provision of that kind would be quite an advantage not only to the Government in collecting the taxes, but also to the companies and firms assessed particularly those whose business is very large.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A regulation to that effect was suggested in the United States; but it has been overruled by the Treasury Department; it was decided that the plan was not workable. Their taxes are payable on June 15th of each year.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is there any reason why the Canadian Government should be opposed to it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I really do not see any necessity for such a provision. While to some firms it may be hardship to pay promptly, still, I think it is wise to provide that the tax shall be paid in one sum.

Mr. PEDLOW: It is more of an inconvenience than a hardship. The withdrawal from large businesses of amounts assessed by way of taxation may in some cases be a serious matter. Quarterly payments would be much more convenient.

Mr. ROBB: In introducing the income tax measure last year the Finance Minister created the impression that the Business Profits War Tax would cease at the end of the period named in the Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the Finance Minister made a statement to the contrary at the end of the session. At any rate, it is deemed advisable that the tax should be continued this year.

Mr. PEDLOW: I quote the following extract, from a firm doing a large business in my constituency, with regard to the methods of obtaining information as to those who come under the Act:

> With reference to the income tax, it seems to the writer that at the present time the matter of making a return for payment of income tax is, apparently, a voluntary matter. There does not seem to be a sufficiently comprehensive attempt to collect from all that should be liable, and if the matter has not been provided for I would suggest that it be part of the duties of the municipal assessor in each municipality to make out a list of all those in his district whom he has reason to think come under the income tax, and forward this list to the inspector of collector of income tax for the district, who could then follow it up. Unless something of this sort is done it seems certain that many will fail to make a return who should properly do so under the income tax law.
>
> Further, the income tax should cover all classes, special provision in the way of accounting being made to cover the various lines of business and industry.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN I am obliged to my hon. friend for the suggestion contained in the letter from which he has read. Of course, they are applicable to the Income Tax Act, not to this measure.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance), Bill No. 85, to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—definitions:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Subsection 1 says:

> Paragraph (e) of section two of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, chapter twenty-eight of the statutes of 1917, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—
>
> (e) "supertax" means the taxes authorized by paragraphs (b) to (m), both inclusive, of section four of this Act;"

Will my hon. friend state what that means so that the public may understand it? It is not clear in the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In section 4 of the Act as it now stands there are paragraphs from (a) to (g) setting forth the tax and the amounts of income. For instance, by paragraph (b) the tax is 2 per cent on incomes exceeding $6,000 and not exceeding $10,000; paragraph (c) has reference to incomes exceeding $10,000 and not exceeding $20,000, and so on. Paragraph (g), which is the last clause in the old Act, provides a tax on incomes exceeding $100,000. We have divided incomes in excess of $100,000 into several clauses. For instance, on incomes from $100,000 to $200,000 there is a separate tax, and on incomes from $200,000 to $400,000 there is separate tax. That necessitated amending the paragraph.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would be better to explain in general terms what is the meaning of the word "tax" and what is the meaning of the word "supertax."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The present Bill provides for a normal tax of 4 per cent, which runs right through the whole list of taxable incomes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Commencing where?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Commencing, in the case of unmarried persons, at $1,000 and the case of married persons at $2,000. In addition to that, there is the super-tax. In the present Act it commences at $6,000, and it is 2 per cent on incomes in excess of $6,000 and not exceeding $10,000; 5 per cent on incomes exceeding $10,000 and not exceeding $20,000 and so on. The Bill we are now considering provides for an additional tax to be known as the "surtax". That commences on incomes in excess of $6,000. The amounts of the surtax are to be found in paragraphs (n), (o), (p) and (q).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has reduced the amount which by the Act of last year was exempted from taxation.

That exemption was $3,000 in the case of married persons and $1,500 in the case of unmarried persons without dependents. Those amounts are now reduced from $3,000 to $2,000, and from $1,500 to $1,000 respectively. Does not my hon. friend think, if he requires additional revenue that the small incomes should be left just as they are and the higher incomes should be more heavily taxed? My hon. friend is aware that the cost of living is every day becoming a more and more anxious problem for families with average incomes. I do not know that the policy is wise of reducing the amount of exemption on incomes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My right hon. friend will remember that the tax is only 2 per cent upon incomes between $2,000 and $3,000 in the case of married persons, and between $1,000 and $1,500 in the case of unmarried persons. If he were considering this matter from the standpoint of revenue, it is quite clear that on the smaller revenues we would derive the greater revenue. That is true, I think, of all countries in the world. Our rates of taxation on the smaller incomes are less than they are in most countries except the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Last year we agreed that the average family should have a certain portion of its income exempt from taxation, and we placed that exemption at $3,000 in the case of a married person and $1,500 in the case of a single person without dependents. My hon. friend is reducing that exemption, and it seems to me that in these days when the cost of living is becoming increasingly heavy, he is going to get this revenue at the expense of a good deal of comfort on the part of families with average incomes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is absolutely necessary that we have a revenue, and the Government were of the opinion it was desirable to reduce the amounts of exemption.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why not increase the tax on the larger incomes?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My right hon. friend must not forget that the rate of taxation on the smaller incomes is very light, and that there is also a provision for granting an exemption of $200 for each child under sixteen years of age.

Mr. COWAN: If it is in order at this point, I should like to have a statement from the minister regarding the organization which he is providing for the collection of this tax. The organization which he has already provided in our section of the country is wholly inadequate, the result being that I am satisfied the Government is going to lose thousands upon thousands of dollars this year and is going to create against this tax a sentiment which does not at the present time exist. There should be created from the very beginning an organization which will bring the very best methods to bear on the collection of this tax, and that, I contend is not being done. The gentleman who has been appointed as our collector in my district is one of the most competent men one could get in Canada, and he is doing his best to see that this tax is collected properly. But what are the conditions? I find to-day in his office in Regina from twenty-five to thirty thousand letters remain unanswered. simply because the staff and equipment is not sufficient. I understand the inspector has not been authorized to increase his staff, and his quarters are wholly inadequate for transacting the business that is to be done in that province. The result has been that when the returns come in, a great number of them are incorrectly made out, and the officer of the department, not having the necessary staff and equipment to reply fully, simply sends back the return, and the recipient very often becomes rebellious and says he will not pay the tax at all. I am satisfied that the people of Saskatchewan are quite willing to pay this tax; in fact, they want to pay it, but at the present rate of progress I do not think this tax will be collected in Saskatchewan until next year's tax becomes due. I do not know what conditions are in other provinces, but that is the state of affairs in Saskatchewan. We have the very best man possible at the head of the organization and he will do everything he can, but, without assistance it will be quite impossible for him to give the results we want. I should like to know whether it is correct that the department do not expect to get this system of taxation into complete operation for four or five years. I see no reason for such a long delay as that, although I admit the Act will be difficult to administer, especially in our part of the country where probably more than a third of our population are foreigners, many of whom are liable to this tax. They are farmers, however, and are not banking their money, and some very complete organization will have to be devised to reach them.

4 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am instructed by the officers of the department that the

inspector for Saskatchewan has been given all the assistance he has asked for. There has been some trouble in obtaining suitable premises, and I shall be very glad to take into consideration what my hon. friend has said, and ascertain whether additional help is required. The department, of course, proposes to enforce the Act at once. My honourable friend's suggestion that it is going to take four or five years to put the Act into effect is not correct. Probably he has heard some one remark that it will take a long number of years to have the Act working properly, but that has been the experience in all countries. It is stated that it took Great Britain twenty-five years to approximate efficiency in the administration of their Income Tax Act, and the same is said of the United States. Difficulties and confusion will doubtless arise in Canada for the first few years, but I hope that gradually we shall be able to develop an efficient and capable organization for the administration of this Act.

Mr. COWAN: I am not blaming the Finance Department altogether. I have seen the deputy minister several times about the conditions out there, and I wish to repeat that the quarters provided are not at all satisfactory. Last year the same quarters were hired by the Imperial Oil company, and they got out because they could not keep the place heated. They had seven coal oil stoves going all winter to keep the place warm, and the staff naturally fell sick. Now we do not want anything like that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why is the unmarried woman on a different footing from the married woman?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no inequality. The unmarried and the married woman have the same exemption. "Married" includes both male and female. The married woman is exempt up to $2,000 and the unmarried up to $1,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that, but I want to know why an unmarried woman should have to pay a larger tax than a married woman. A married woman has a husband to take care of her, and is in a much better position to pay than the unmarried woman.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Paragraph (i) of section 1 says:

> "Dependent child" means a child under twenty-one years of age dependent on his parent for support.

In some provinces, in Quebec, for instance, there is a law compelling children to provide for the support of their father or mother or grandfather or grandmother. Would it not therefore be wise to add a definition of the word "dependent" somewhat to this effect: "relatives who are dependent upon the taxpayers for support according to the law of each province."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That matter was considered very thoroughly at the last session of Parliament when the income tax was introduced. It may be possible that the tax may be onerous on unmarried persons who may have to support relatives or other persons, but it is impossible to draft a provision providing for these exceptional cases.

Mr. LALOR: Is the income of a man and his wife regarded as one income or as two separate incomes?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As two incomes.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—par, relating to payments at source:

Mr. McKENZIE: How are you going to determine whether the child under sixteen years of age is dependent upon the taxpayer for support? Would it not be better to take for granted that every child under sixteen is dependent on his parents for support? Otherwise the onus is thrown on the parent or on some one else to prove that the child is dependent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There might be cases where children were in receipt of a large income from a trustee or something of that kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is one of the difficult cases which the minister says cannot be provided for. If we are going to exempt the taxpayer $200 for each child under sixteen, why not come out and say so flatfootedly? As the Act now stands, the department must obtain proof that the child is dependent on its parents for support.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it is clear enough. I do not think it would be wise to amend the section along the lines suggested by my hon. friend. There may be other cases than the one I cited a moment ago, but I really do not think there will be any difficulty in administering the Act in that respect.

Mr. PARDEE: Will the minister tell me why, under section 27, judges' incomes are not taxable?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would my hon. friend renew his question when we come to that section?

Mr. McMASTER: I notice that by section 2 there is an exemption of $200 for every child under 16. Might I ask the minister whether he has considered the advisability of raising that age to, say, 18? There are a great number of people of moderate means who are doing their best to have their children finish their high school courses and it is rarely that children of 16 have finished with the high school. I would suggest that it would be advisable to raise the age to 18. The minister would still be protected to the extent that the child must be dependent on the parent. The loss of revenue would not be considerable and it would be a great help to people of moderate means who are endeavouring to give the best possible education to their children.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That matter was considered by the Government. A great deal could be said in favour of the suggestion but all exemptions and rates of taxation are arbitrary as a rule and suggestions are easily made in regard to them. The Government were of the opinion that 16 was the proper age to which to apply the exemption.

On section 3—income tax:

Mr. NICKLE: Will the minister be good enough to give me an explanation, because I have not been able to think of one, why it is that the incomes of husband and wife are treated as one. I think that in the working out of this Act, the country is losing considerable money owing to a married couple being entitled to double exemption. If there is any reason for the law being drafted as it is now, I would like to know what it is, and if the reason does not seem to be one that the House should approve, I would like to know if the minister would consider an amendment to the provision so that the exemption given to married people is only applicable to the income of one and not to the income of both.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is a matter that had the consideration of the Government in the preparation of this Bill and they concluded that it was not advisable to amend the Bill in the direction suggested at this present session of Parliament. The chief reason is that a woman is a separate individual, as is a man, and in a country where we propose giving woman the franchise, just as we do a male person, I think the argument is very strongly in favour of treating their incomes as separate. That is the general principle upon which the Government decided not to treat the incomes as one.

Mr. NICKLE: I do not think the philosophy of the minister's statement will stand criticism. He says the reason the exemption is given is because a woman is a separate entity before the law, as is also a man.

Mr. McMASTER: Might I ask the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) to speak a little slower and a little louder because we want to hear what he is saying on this side of the House?

Mr NICKLE: I say that I do not think the philosophy of the minister's statement will stand criticism. If I understood him correctly, he said that the reason that a separate exemption was given to a married man, and also to a married woman, was that the married woman was an entity before the law as was also the man. I cannot dispute that because to dispute it would lead one into a ridiculous position. We all accept that, but if a married woman is an entity before the law, and also a married man, why should the married woman get a married woman's exemption and the married man also get a married man's exemption when the responsibility for the maintenance of the family is on the married man and is not on the married woman? As the law stands at the present time, if a woman is unmarried, and has therefore no family responsibility, she is entitled to an exemption of $1,000, but if she marries and has an income, I think under the present Act, of $1,450, or of less than $1,500, she is entitled to exemption up to $1,500 and her husband is similarly entitled to exemption. I opposed this principle of the Act when it was introduced last session, emphasizing, as best I could, that I thought in exemption given to married people the exemption should only apply up to the aggregate of the two incomes. In other words, if the combined income amounted to $1,500, exemption would be given under the present Act up to that amount. But if the combined income reached $2,000 then an income tax should be paid on the difference between $1,500 and $2,000. My experience during the past summer has convinced me that the contention I raised in the House last year is sound if the object of the Government is to get money.

Suppose there should be a couple, a man who had an income of say $3,500, and whose

wife had an income of something over $2,500. The combined income, we will say, was $6,000, and under the law as it stood last year each was entitled to an exemption of $3,000. That is the woman paid no income tax, and the man only paid income tax on $500. Let us suppose the particular family I mention had no children, the result would be that a married man and woman without children get an exemption of $5,500, whereas these same people if unmarried would only get a small exemption granted to them, under the Act as drawn last year, $1,500 each, and this year, of $1,000 each. I say it is not sound finance and it is bad in principle, if the object is to get money, and I say it for the reason that I believe this income tax has come to stay, and in my judgment if the practice continues of treating as separate the incomes of married men and women, there are going to be a good many incomes in this country divided into two parts to the extent at least of the exemption granted the woman, for the purpose of saving the income tax which she otherwise would have to pay. For instance, let me give an example: Suppose for the sake of my argument, a married man's income was just over $10,000 and suppose that the husband wants to get rid of the surtax, he transfers securities of such a value that it will bring an income to his wife of $1,450, and in that way she is entitled to exemption because being a married woman her income is less than $1,500, and he gets rid of the extra tax because he has $1,500 of the income applied to the wife, and leaves himself under the $10,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. There is a provision in the Act against that.

Mr. NICKLE: There is a provision in the Act against it, a provision in the Act does not amount to very much, because you cannot draw any Act to-day by which a husband cannot give to his wife a certain number of securities as a gift. I admit the principle of the Act says you must not do it, but there is no principle you can put in any Act which is going to prevent a married man, if he wants to do so, transferring certain securities over to his wife. The hon. gentleman says there is a provision in the Act against it. The forms that we had to sign last year certainly had nothing in them requiring one to declare that there had not been a transfer of property for the purpose of escaping the tax. As the practice, and as the law is at present, I submit the whole tendency is to deprive the State of some money that it legitimately should have, and to raise in the minds of the people who have a taxable income, that they should look about in the hope that they may see a way of relieving themselves of some of the taxation. If the minister tells me he will not consider an amendment, nothing would be gained at this late hour of the session, by my moving an amendment, but I would like to urge upon him, as I did unsuccessfully urge upon his predecessor, that he give this matter consideration and impress upon him that I am looking at it from the point of view in a part of the country where incomes are not large, and where people feel that all should bear equitably, the burden that is cast upon them by this war.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be very difficult now to amend the Bill so as to cover the points raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Nickle). But I assure him that during the recess the matter shall have consideration by the Government. Personally, I am disposed to agree with the remarks of my hon. friend, and I think that probably at the next session of Parliament an amendment will be proposed to carry that idea into effect.

Mr. NICKLE: I am satisfied to have bent the line, even if I have not broken it, but I hope that next session I shall succeed in breaking through.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): The tax on corporations is embraced within this clause. Suppose the tax is paid by the corporation, does that give an exemption to the man who holds the stock? To make myself clear I will give an example: Suppose John Smith has $5,000 of capital invested in Canadian Pacific stock, and the Canadian Pacific in the first place pays a tax of six per cent. Now, is any allowance made to Smith by reason of the fact that the corporation owning the stock has already paid that tax?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The income in that case is exempt from the normal tax only, which is four per cent.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is not the tax six per cent?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Four per cent is the normal tax upon incomes, as will be found in subsection a of section 4 of the Bill. The income tax upon corporations is six per cent, and when the corporation pays an income tax, the individual is exempt from the normal tax.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): Before this clause carries I think we should pro-

test against the method prescribed of increasing the tax upon a corporation and not giving credit to the stockholder, which means the imposition of an extra tax on the latter. There can be really no question on that point. A corporation, under this clause, is called upon to pay six per cent upon its total net income. It distributes part, perhaps the larger part, of that income among its stockholders, some of whom are not liable to income tax. The Government gets six per cent from the corporation, and to that no objection can be raised. But is the stockholder, who is liable for income tax, prepared to have a two per cent tax imposed upon his income in addition to whatever tax he may be subject? The man who holds bonds, mortgages, or other securities, is not subject to this disability; it is one peculiar to the holder of stock, and I cannot see the logical justification for such a measure.

Mr. PARENT: Has the Acting Minister of Finance taken any measures so as to protect Americans residing in this country from paying a double tax? I understand that at the present time there are a good many American citizens living temporarily in Canada who are earning wages and paying taxes in this country, and at the same time paying taxes in the United States; so that they are paying a double income tax. Has the Acting Minister of Finance had any communication with the United States Government so as to prevent the imposition of double taxes upon such persons?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That matter was a subject of negotiation between the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) and the officers of the Treasury Board at Washington a few days ago. The Minister of Finance advises me that he anticipates reaching some arrangement with the United States whereby persons might be relieved of the double income tax. And he also had a conference with the same officials in respect of the business profits tax, as there are instances where companies pay the business profits tax in Canada and in the United States as well. There is no provision in the Bill in respect of the matter, and it can only be overcome by arrangements reached by negotiations between the two countries. The matter of the double income tax received consideration at the last Imperial conference, and I understand it was decided to let the matter stand in abeyance until after the conclusion of the war. There is no doubt in the world that it is a great hardship, and should be eliminated in some way or other.

[Mr. Cronyn.]

Mr. CROWE: If I remember aright, the Acting Finance Minister in his Budget told us that the Government received practically $385,000 from the insurance companies. I received the insurance blue book the other day, and looking over the statements of the insurance companies, I figured out that they were doing business to the extent of $110,000,000 annually in Canada, and paid out in losses $43,000,000, leaving about $67,000,000 for expenses of operation. Of this the Government received only $385,000. It seems to me that is a very small amount.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The insurance companies pay one per cent upon their net premiums.

Mr. CROWE: The net premiums for fire, life and other insurance amount, I figure, to $110,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Life insurance is not included.

Mr. CROWE: Why should it not be included as well as fire and other insurance?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I imagine it was deemed to be an unjust and unnecessary tax, and perhaps would do an injustice to people who were insured. The amount of the tax would probably have been added to the premium.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: On the point raised by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), the minister has not yet given a satisfactory explanation. In the income tax of last year, where corporations were taxed at the rate of 4 per cent on all their profits and the balance distributed to shareholders, this 4 per cent was carried forward to the credit of the individual shareholder upon the dividend he had received. The present Bill raises the rate from four to six per cent. But on the two per cent additional the principle introduced into the Bill last year for some unexplained reason is now dropped. If it was good business and fair, even-handed justice to carry forward to the credit of the shareholder of the corporation or company the 4 per cent the argument is absolutely unanswerable, in my judgment, that now that 6 per cent is levied that 6 per cent should be carried forward to the credit of the shareholder, and he should not be subject to this extra 2 per cent, which does not fall on any other class of the community only on corporations and joint stock companies. As the member for London said, if a man's income is invested in bonds, mortgages, or real estate, or anything of that kind, it escapes. But, under this provision, as I understand

it—I may be wrong, but I have not heard anything to the contrary—while the tax is raised from 4 to 6 per cent, the shareholder in these corporations is only credited with 4 per cent instead of 6 per cent, which his stock has already paid before the dividends were distributed. I should like to ask the minister to justify that position if he can, so that I may be clear why the principle involved in the taxation of last year is being deviated from.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The point made by the hon. member for London is very substantial, indeed, and I am much impressed with it. I think probably at some future session of this Parliament some consideration will have to be given to that point. The necessities for revenue will justify the difference between the income tax—

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It does not justify the inequality.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All taxation measures contain inequalities.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like the acting minister to consider the phraseology of section 3, subsection (1), which reads:

> There shall be assessed, levied and paid, upon the income during the preceding year of every person residing or ordinarily resident in Canada or carrying on any business in Canada, and upon the income received by any person from any source within Canada, the following taxes:

I put to the minister the case of a gentleman having an income of $10,000 arising in Scotland and who is living in Canada. I would assume that that income is not taxed a second time. It is taxed 25 per cent, I think, in England. I notice that the minister said a moment ago—but do not know that I clearly grasped his meaning—that at the Imperial Conference it was decided to prevent double taxation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Efforts are being made to evolve some scheme to avoid double income tax, but no scheme or plan has yet been worked out. The purpose of the words "from any source" in the Bill is to make it possible for us to tax persons who earn an income within Canada, but who live outside of Canada. We want to put ourselves in the same position as the United States in this respect.

Mr. MORPHY: If that is the intention, the Bill seems to be unfortunately worded. The section as it reads provides that the income must be obtained from any source within Canada. If it is obtained from a source in Scotland, it is not taxable?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. NESBITT: I was going to ask also if that is the intention of the Act. "From any source within Canada" would mean derived from a source within Canada, or as long as he received it while he is in Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That was intended to impose taxation upon incomes earned in Canada by persons who do not live in Canada.

Mr. PEDLOW: Since the hon. member for Kingston made his point in regard to the working out of this Bill, I have been doing some figuring, and would like to know whether the results are correct or not. Take for instance the income of $10,000 in the case of a married man. There would be an exemption deducted from that of $1,500, leaving $8,500 subject to a 2 per cent assessment, which would be $170. Then the income would be subject to a further tax after another exemption of $3,000 of 4 per cent on $5,500, which would be $220. In addition to that there would be a supertax of 2 per cent on $2,500, the balance of income over $6,000, amounting to $50. Adding these three amounts, $170, $220 and $50, the tax on a married man with an income of $10,000 would be $440.

Suppose a man's estate is in stocks and bonds, half of which he transfers to his wife. Each has then an income of $5,000, and would pay 2 per cent on $3,500 and 4 per cent on $500, or $90 each, a total of $180 as against $440 if the estate had not been divided. The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who is a good lawyer, says that it is possible to drive a wedge into the Act in this respect. Is the argument of the member for Kingston sound, and are my figures correct?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The member for Kingston properly stated the facts, but I was unable to follow the figures given by my hon. friend (Mr. Pedlow); I did not hear them. Section 4 of the Income War Tax Act provides that any person who after the 1st day of August, 1917, reduced his income by transfer or assignment of any property, real or personal, to his wife or to any members of his family shall nevertheless be as liable to the tax as if such transfer or assignment had not been made. The income from any property so transferred is treated as the income of the husband, notwithstanding the transfer.

Mr. McMASTER: In view of the fact that we have to get money, the larger incomes should be more heavily taxed than

they are by this proposed measure. The reply made by the Acting Minister of Finance the other evening when I brought this matter up was that although the British taxes are a great deal heavier than ours—$3,000 on an income of $10,000 in Great Britain as against $400 or $500 on the same income here—we must not forget that the customs tariff imposes a very substantial indirect burden upon the people. In that I agree, but that is not the question. Money has to be found, and after we tax certain yearly incomes more or less lightly, we are in respect of taxation on the higher incomes, really taxing the luxuries and superfluities of life which a few people have but which the great masses of the people have not. To tax more heavily these higher incomes is the proper system of direct taxation to be followed at this time. I urge the Acting Minister of Finance to amend the Act so that the larger incomes will be taxed, perhaps not as heavily as they are in Great Britain, but at least more heavily than they will be taxed if this Act is passed in its present form. The minister will probably say that there is a great deal in my argument and that next year he may have to adopt my suggestion. He is running the risk of becoming known as the minister of good intentions rather than the Acting Minister of Finance. The poor people of this country, who are paying taxes on tobacco and tea, expect the Government to carry out the promise they made at the last election to stand for the conscription of wealth as well as for the conscription of men, and to carry it out as fearlessly with regard to wealth as they seem inclined to carry it out with regard to men. I believe that in this respect I voice, however feebly, the views of the people at large.

Mr. NESBITT: Being one of those who may be classed among the poor men who will help to pay these taxes, in any arguments that I make I shall not be accused of defending the rich man. The Acting Minister of Finance read a statement the other evening showing the amounts paid here by way of income tax compared with those paid in the United States. We must not forget our geographical relation to the United States. England's large incomes have been worked up during a long period of years, while large incomes in this country are of very recent date. If you make the income tax in Canada larger than it is in the United States, those who receive the larger incomes here may go to the United States—it is just as warm there as it is here; it is quite as comfortable a place to live in, and we are accustomed to the habits of their people. Most of the large incomes earned in this country are derived from industrial pursuits. If a man whose income is very large is taxed too heavily, he is induced to put his money into Government bonds, which are not taxed, and to let the wheels of industry stand still. No greater calamity could overtake this country than that these large incomes should be put into Government bonds and the wheels of industry not kept moving after the war is over. Heavy taxes are now imposed under the Business Profits War Tax Act. If we continue to increase that tax we hamper a great many industries which have not yet been able to build up sufficient reserve to carry them through the hard times which will prevail after the war. So with income tax; there is a limit to the tax that we should impose on the income of the so-called rich man.

From the table which the acting minister put on Hansard the other evening, I noticed that the taxation on income up to $1,000,000 is higher in Canada than in the United States. Practically no one in this country is receiving an income of $1,000,000; indeed, there are in this country very few people receiving an income of more than $100,000, and yet our taxation on incomes up to $100,000 is considerably above the tax in the United States. Nearly all the men in Canada who are deriving large incomes are deriving them from the risks they have run and the strenuous exertions they have made to establish industries in this country. The man who is prepared to take chances in investing his money to build up industries in this country deserves what he gets. I would ask any of my hon. friends who are anxious to see how much money they can make in industries, just to invest money in them, and see what happiness they will have after they have been in the business for a while. I give credit to men who have put their money together and started an organization. I do not understand the feeling that exists in this country against corporations. Corporations are only unions of individuals who have had faith enough to put money into one man's hands for investment in an industry which he manages. If he makes a success of it and they begin to make money they deserve it, because they have taken a risk. For one corporation that succeeds in this country three fail to accomplish their purposes, so that there is a big risk in putting your money into industries. It is unwise for us to keep harping against the so-called

large incomes and to keep taxing them out of this country, because it will be a great detriment to Canada to drive men into investing their money in Government bonds or out of the country altogether.

Mr. McMASTER: I have no desire to tax capital out of this country, but I have a desire to see some basis of equality of sacrifice between the people of smaller incomes, whose sons have gone to the front and who remain and are taxed on their simple luxuries at home, and those people of large incomes, whose sons have also gone gallantly forward, but who remain with as many luxuries, as great incomes from a material standpoint as they had before the war, and many of whom find that their fortunes have been enormously increased on account of the war. We ought, as far as possible, to have an equality of sacrifice between the different classes of this country. Suppose I said to you, Mr. Chairman, that we should judge of the sacrifice of men between ourselves and the United States. We would point out that they should send overseas an army of 5,000,000 men to be on an equality with the man-sacrifice demanded in this war. The argument is, therefore, not altogether sound that we should look merely to the United States to see whether our taxes are on an equality with theirs. I think better of the wealthy men of this country than to imagine that they will object to heavy taxation so long as that heavy taxation is distributed justly and evenly, and I do not think, if they are heavily taxed, they will skedaddle to the United States.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend has much greater faith in humanity than I have.

Mr. McMASTER: Perhaps I have.

Mr. NESBITT: So far as the sacrifice of the rich man since this war started is concerned, I venture to say that if my hon. friend picks out man for man in this country, he will find that the so-called rich man has sacrificed just as much, both physically through his family and so far as his means are concerned, as any other class of people. Not only is that the case, but the rich men have been the great subscribers to all the benevolent funds that have been started in this country. Otherwise, those funds could not succeed. Let my hon. friend pick out, if he will, the so-called rich men in this country, and he will see how many of them have sent their sons and brothers to the front just as freely as the poorest man in Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: I said that they had gallantly sent their sons to the front.

Mr. CANNON: The question raised by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is a most interesting one, and I am much surprised that no hon. member from the Western Provinces has so far taken part in the debate. Before the last elections were held, there was a convention, which was forgotten by most people, but which I remember. I refer to the convention held in the city of Winnipeg. I understand that certain members of this Government and certain other hon. members sitting in this House were present at that convention, at which one of the main planks of the platform of the so-called western party was conscription of wealth. Where is conscription of wealth? How has that promise been fulfilled? The Acting Minister of Finance makes the proposition of taxing incomes up to 50 per cent and not above. That is not sufficient. Conditions throughout the world are to-day most extraordinary and exceptional, and a Government that wants the actual condition of things and order to be maintained in this country must see that the burden of taxation is evenly and fairly distributed amongst the different classes of our people. Is that the case to-day? I claim it is not. After this Bill is passed, whenever a poor man who earns a few dollars a day goes to the grocery store at the corner, he will have to pay taxes for all kinds of commodities of which he is in absolute need. He will have to pay taxes on tea, matches, tobacco, playing-cards. This poor man who, by working probably ten or twelve hours a day, is able to earn $2.50 or $3, will be spending practically one-half of his salary in paying taxes. In comparison with that man, let us take a man like Sir Joseph Flavelle. How is he taxed by this Government? How are Mackenzie and Mann taxed by this Government? How are those millionaires who bought and bribed the press of this country during the last election taxed? How is the wealth of our country taxed? How are those people who claim to own this country taxed by the present Government? They are not taxed at all—and why? Because this Government does not dare to do its duty.

The Acting Minister of Finance, whose Liberal principles are well known, who used in this House to profess real Liberalism, who last year got up in this House and said in reply to the Minister of Finance in the then Tory Government, "Taxation is not

equal in this country"—what changes has he brought about? I have listened to all his speeches this year, and from a Liberal speaker he is changing into a speaker more Tory than his predecessor ever was. We do not want any more Tory theories in this country. The Canadian people stand for Liberalism and democracy. The only Tory country left in the universe to-day is the one against which we are directing all our efforts—Germany—and the only Tories left in the world to-day are the Germans. I do not wish to join them. I wish to remain with the real Liberals, the Liberals who say that when people are to be taxed, they shall be taxed according to their means and not according to their power or influence.

5 p.m.

When it comes to the poor man in this country, with little money and no influence, the Minister of Finance goes into his pockets and takes a few pennies he has, taxes his tobacco, his matches, his tea and his other necessities. But when Sir Joseph Flavelle walks along the corridors of this Parliament, his pockets bulging with the profits he has made out of the sweat of the people of this country, the Acting Minister of Finance is only too glad to bow to him. And why? Because Sir Joseph Flavelle represents wealth. Mr. Chairman, I do not represent wealth in this Parliament; I do not represent robbery; I do not represent thievery. I represent democracy and Liberalism and I warn the Government: they can vote us down this year, they can vote us down next year, they can drown our voice and defeat our proposals, but never will they drown the voice of real Liberalism in this country because this country is Liberal to the core. The Government have bought the press of the country, which can no longer express its views freely unless the President of the Privy Council has O.K.'d the articles printed. We in the province of Quebec and other Liberals in other provinces cannot speak freely any more. Why? Because by Order in Council the Government have tried to stifle freedom of speech in this country. Members of Parliament cannot express their views because this Government does not bring measures before the House, but on the third floor of this building, behind locked doors, passes Orders in Council, tears up our constitution, and—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member, I am afraid, is not speaking to the clause before the committee. His arguments concerning the taxation of wealth were, I thought, in order, but I would ask him to confine his remarks to that subject.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: I was just saying that if this Government wishes to meet the views of the country, if the Liberals who have joined this Government wish to maintain their principle, if the members from the West wish to stick to their principles as expressed at the Winnipeg convention, let us have conscription of wealth. Let us see that Mackenzie and Mann, for instance, pay something into the exchequer of this country; let us see that they give back some of the money they have stolen from the Government and people of this country. Let us see that those new-rich we meet on the streets of every large city and on every train in this country, men who have made millions in shells and bullets and rifles made under war contracts—let us see that these people pay not a small tax like the Government imposes, but a real tax, because those people are exactly like the birds of prey seen on the battlefields at night after the strife is over. They swoop down to the ground, and for what? To eat those who have died. If we have birds of prey in this country, if they wish to feed on the Canadian people, the least we can do is to tax them when we find them out.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know whether there is enough water in the Rideau canal to drown the eloquence of the hon. member (Mr. Cannon), who has just taken his seat, but I am quite certain there is not enough in the whole St. Lawrence to drown his voice. He has just given demonstration of the fact that we have in this Victoria Museum to-day a Cannon which can carry three thousand miles, if we are to judge by the volume of sound it emits. If democracy and Liberalism have to depend on the hon. member for Dorchester, then God help democracy and Liberalism. This is the gentleman who speaks of sacrifice, and he dwells on the sacrifice of money. Is that the only sacrifice? The greatest sacrifice which this country has made is not the sacrifice of dollars, but the sacrifice of men, and when he speaks of equality of sacrifice in taxation I should like him to direct his vehement attention to the inequality of taxation in the men of this country. I ask him what he has done in the past to bring about equality of taxation in the men of this country for the purposes of the war? What sacrifices has he induced the people of Dorchester to make in the past? This is the gentleman

who appealed in a picayune, peanut style for the votes of his electors on the ground that the Government was putting a tax on a bottle of patent medicine. This is the high-minded gentleman from Dorchester county who undertakes to read a lecture to the Liberals of the West who have recognized their responsibilities as citizens of this country, and undertaken to carry them out. It is not possible for the hon. member for Dorchester to realize what are the responsibilities of a true Canadian citizen. Far be it from him then, to undertake to read a lecture to men in this House whose shoe latchets he is not worthy to unloose. Sacrifice? Why, when my dear Lucien appealed to the people of Dorchester, did he appeal to them on the ground of the sacrifices they should make? Not at all. His appeal was of the most inflammable nature, just as was his speech this afternoon.

With regard to taxation, I have said before that I think the higher incomes should be more heavily taxed. I have given a reason for that, but, nevertheless, I do not think it would be wise for this Government to impose all at once as high a tax as I think will in time be imposed on wealth in this country. I can see reasons why it would be inadvisable just now. I should like the hon. member for Dorchester, who preaches about sacrifice, and talks about Sir Joseph Flavelle, Mackenzie and Mann, and so on, to tell us some of the sacrifices he has made towards winning this war or towards paying the debt of this war. Let him tell us what he has invited his constituents to do in the way of meeting their obligations, not only in regard to taxation, but in the way of standing on Flanders fields and doing their part. The hon. member is on record in this country. Long before he had a seat in this House he did everything he possibly could to prevent equality of sacrifice in this country on the part of men to take up their responsibilities on the battlefield. It ill becomes him, and it becomes him less than any other hon. member in this House, to get up and read a lecture to men on this side of the House for their political affiliations whether they are Liberals or Conservatives

Mr. CANNON: In my province—and I am sure the hon. gentleman who has spoken before knows nothing about it—history reminds us that long ago the French regime Quebec was attacked and the voice of Frontenac was heard. When I mention the voice of Frontenac in that instance I may tell the hon. gentleman that it would take only a very small river to drown his voice but that after many centuries the voice of Frontenac is heard even to-day. I do not wish to enter into a discussion with the hon. member as to what he might have done to win the war, or as to what I might have done to win the war. When a man really does something he does not boast about it as the hon. member for Frontenac has been doing this afternoon. The hon. gentleman mentioned the by-election in Dorchester. I am sure the information that he has about that by-election comes from the same source as that from which he derives most of his information; that is the Orange Sentinel and papers of the same colour. But I will give this House some real information about Dorchester and I hope it will be broad enough to counteract the effect of the narrow-mindedness of the hon. member. The by-election in Dorchester was brought about by the appointment of Mr. Sevigny as a member of the Borden Cabinet. I am not afraid to say that I ran against him and I did so because I was a Liberal and because Mr. Sevigny was a Nationalist.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CANNON: Some hon. gentlemen are calling me to order. I am simply answering the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac. I have always been in favour of Canada taking part in this war. I fought for that policy. I expounded the same principles during the Dorchester election and if my hon. friend wants to know what the candidate whom he supported, and the candidate of the Government which he supported, was doing, I will tell him that he and his friends were taking the National Service cards, throwing them into the stove and telling the people to pay no attention to them, and that they did not amount to anything. I do not wish to go into these details, but if the hon. gentleman believes for one moment that I belong to his school——

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not.

Mr. CANNON: If he believes for one moment that my mind is of the same gauge as his——

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not.

Mr. CANNON: I am grateful to the hon. member. If the hon. member thinks for one moment that in the province of Quebec we could produce a school of extremists, fanatical, narrow-minded men, and parochial politicians, like the hon. gentleman, he is making a mistake. I understand British principles—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman—

An hon. MEMBER: Take it.

Mr. CANNON: Sit down; I stood it through.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Frontenac is rising to a point of order. I must ask the hon. member for Dorchester to take his seat.

Mr. EDWARDS: I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member was in order in referring to me as a narrow-minded, fanatical, parochial politician?

The CHAIRMAN: Such an expression should not be used with reference to an hon. member in this House, and I must ask the hon. member (Mr. Cannon) to withdraw it.

Mr. CANNON: I regret that my knowledge of English gives me no opportunity of expressing in parliamentary words the same idea. I therefore withdraw the last words if they are not parliamentary. But to continue, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the hon. member for Frontenac that extremists in this country, like the hon. member and his friends, are too numerous even to-day, but, thank God, they are vanishing from the field of our politics, and I could wish that the hon. member would be the last of them.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask the hon. member (Mr. Cannon) to confine his remarks to the clause under discussion. We have had a very interesting little trip into Dorchester county, but it is entirely out of order. I did not call the hon. member for Frontenac to order when he started on that excursion, and therefore I did not think it right to call the hon. member for Dorchester to order when he answered the hon. member for Frontenac, but I must ask both hon. members to return to the item under discussion.

Mr. EDWARDS: I want to express to you, Mr. Chairman, my extreme appreciation of the advice gratuitously offered. I was not aware that I had made any trip to Dorchester in what I said in reply to the hon. member, and, as a matter of fact, I never used the word "Dorchester." I think I might be permitted to refer to the allusion made by the hon. member (Mr. Cannon) to the source of my information. One of the sources of my information, I am proud to say, has been the Orange Sentinel and others have been the Toronto Globe, the Toronto Mail and Empire, and various other newspapers throughout the country, all of which without exception have, in unmitigated terms, condemned the stand taken by the hon. member for Dorchester on more than one occasion. But in so far as his little slur in regard to the Orange Sentinel is concerned, I may say that there are overseas to-day some 60,000 representatives of the Orange order fighting for the good people of Dorchester whom he has time and again told it was their place to stay at home instead of going overseas.

Mr. CANNON: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman I said nothing of the kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would——

The CHAIRMAN: Order; the hon. member for Dorchester has risen to a point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Let him state his point.

Mr. DEVLIN: He did.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member for Dorchester repeat his point of order?

Mr. CANNON: Inasmuch as the hon. member for Frontenac is making a statement as to declarations that he says I made, I wish to state that I never made any such declaration and I wish him to take note of what I am saying now.

Mr. EDWARDS: With regard to the declaration of the hon. member I must respectfully decline to take careful note of anything he has said. I do not think it is worth taking note of.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman is obliged to accept the statement of the hon. member for Dorchester.

Mr. EDWARDS: I beg your pardon; I am not obliged by any rules of this House to accept a false or incorrect statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The rule of order is that the hon. member for Frontenac must accept the statement made by the hon. member for Dorchester concerning his own statements outside this House.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding to state that it ill became the hon. member for Dorchester to cast any reflection upon an order some 60,000 of whose members are overseas fighting for him and people whom his whole course

has led to stay at home and let others do the fighting for them.

We have the records of this House, as a matter of fact, showing that there were only some fifteen soldiers' votes recorded in the county of Dorchester election, so I think I am not very far astray when I say that every man who went overseas is putting up a fight for the member for Dorchester and his constituency. I say further that the whole attitude of the hon. member for Dorchester has been one to discourage his constituents from taking their proper part in this war. If that is not the case, then we must conclude that, notwithstanding the hon. member's own high estimation of himself, he has absolutely no influence in the county he represents, because that county's record bears out my statement that it has done practically nothing in the way of sending men overseas. With regard to the hon. member's opinion of myself, I think I can afford to let that pass. The hon. member for Dorchester's opinion of me will not cause me any worry, and I presume what I think of the hon. member will not cause him any concern as far as that goes. With absolute confidence I place my record, and any sacrifices which I have made in connection with this war, alongside the record of the hon. member. I have not made any boasts in that connection in this House, and I do not intend to do so, but I have made sacrifices, and my people also, that count for something in this war. I am proud also to say this: That there is not one of my blood relatives in this country but has done everything he could do to assist in carrying on the war, even to the extent of risking life overseas. I have not a single blood relative to-day of military age who is not in uniform overseas, or in this country preparing to go over.

Mr. VIEN: I rise to a point of order, and it is this. You, Mr. Chairman, have repeatedly asked hon. members who have taken part in this debate to discuss the question which is at issue. I think that the hon. member for Frontenac has wandered far from the subject, and if discussion is permitted to continue on such lines we shall have to follow him, which would not be in Order

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause be adopted?

Mr. HOCKEN: Would I be in order, Mr. Chairman, in speaking as one having some authority on the question of the veracity of the Sentinel; a point which has been raised by the hon. member for Dorchester?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman would be entirely out of order

Mr. HOCHEN: If I had the opportunity I would tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cannon) that he can not quote anything from The Sentinel which would prove his assertions against it.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MORPHY: Am I too late to say a word or two?

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 3 has been carried.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member can make his observations when we have completed the consideration of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes.

On section 4—Judges' salaries, retiring allowances or annuities exempted:

Mr. McKENZIE: The language in paragraph (k) is rather complicated, does it mean that the salaries of judges are not taxable?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the Judges' Act the incomes of judges are exempt from taxation, and it was desired to state that exemption in the present Bill for the guidance of the officers of the department who will be charged with administering the Act when it goes into force throughout Canada. This provision does not change the law in any respect.

Mr. McKENZIE: The provision has been framed in a rather roundabout and complicated way. All I want is to make it perfectly clear what is regarded as income and what is not regarded as such. In this connection I do not think any definite judicial opinion has been expressed as to whether the indemnity of members of Parliament is regarded as income for the purposes of taxation. It would be well perhaps for members to know whether it is or not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The indemnity of members is subject to the income tax. Section 3 of the Judges' Act, which grants exemption from taxation, is as follows:

> The salaries and retiring allowances, or annuities, shall be payable by monthly instalments, and shall be free and clear of all taxes and deductions whatsoever imposed under any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: Under that I would apprehend the allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick of $5,000 a year for acting as deputy

of the Governor General—that is, he comes down, I believe, once a year and nods his head to a few Bills, for which he gets $5,000—will escape taxation although it is income.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I hardly think that.

Mr. MORPHY: Yes, it is not salary in the real sense of the term. And his allowance of $2,500 will escape taxation also. Why should judges' salaries be exempted from taxation? I am opposed to the whole thing. I do not believe it is democracy at all. Why should a judge's salary escape taxation? Can he not stand on the same plane as anybody else, and pay his share of the burdens imposed by the war. It seems ridiculous to me; I am opposed to it, and will test the sense of the Committee by a vote if I can get the necessary support.

Mr. DUFF: As every member of this House has to pay income tax, there is no reason why the judges should be exempt. The ordinary man has to go out and earn money to help to pay the salaries of judges, and it seems to me they should be made subject to the tax just the same as anybody else. I intend to move that paragraph (k) in clause 4 be struck out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would not help the situation any to strike this paragraph out.

Mr. DUFF: It would show that we are opposed to this exemption.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under a separate Act of Parliament the salaries and retiring allowances or annuities of judges are not subject to any taxation by this Parliament. Paragraph (k) was inserted in the Bill to make all the officers who will be engaged in the administration of the Act cognizant of the fact, and if the paragraph is struck out it does not change the situation at all.

Mr. COPP: Why not have an amendment providing that notwithstanding anything in the Judges' Act, this income tax shall apply?

Mr. NICKLE: Although I sympathize very much with what the hon. member for Perth says, that judges as well as every other citizen shall bear their part in the cost of this war, I would not be disposed on general principles to go the length that he is disposed to go. I have endeavoured since I have been in this House to keep before me that contractual obligations should be respected. Section 27, subsection 3 of the Judges' Act says:

> The salaries and retiring allowances, or annuities, shall be payable by monthly instalments, and shall be free and clear of all taxes and deductions whatsoever imposed under any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Now it seems to me, Sir, that when a judge is appointed, a contractual relationship is established by which that judge is entitled to the remuneration set out in the statute, together with such other emoluments of office, as may have been defined at the time he entered into office. Under those circumstances it seems to me it would be a breach of contract for this House to attempt to deprive a judge of an immunity he enjoyed by statute. I am not saying that I think their lordships should claim this exemption, because the taxes now imposed are very different in character and for a different reason than could have been in the contemplation of Parliament when the Judges' Act was passed. I think we should, although I sympathize with the point of view that we might go this far: make clear that while we feel ourselves estopped by virtue of contractual relationship in so far as salaries of judges now appointed are concerned, it would not be amiss to amend the Judges' Act so that the exemption in reference to war taxes, and particularly this income tax, should be taken from those who are appointed subsequently to the date of the amendment. That would relieve the present judges, if they care to take advantage of the exemption given them of this impost, but would make those subsequently appointed liable for taxes. And if the Government cared delicately to point out to the judges that they were of the opinion that present conditions were peculiar, they might say that the judges would only be entitled to the exemption if specially claimed by judges now exempt; and any judge subsequently appointed should pay in any event.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not quite feel disposed to accept the phraseology too aptly applied by the hon. member for Kingston under the terms of contractual relationship. I do not see that there is any contractual relationship in the matter at all. As I view the situation, considering the period through which we are passing, it is men of that judicial class, enjoying large salaries, that we should reach and not attempt to hide. The Government could find a way for making a pledge to the country

that farmers' sons should not be taken for military service. But they found it necessary in the stress of war to change their mind and break their pledge, for which I give them credit. But the statutory exemption which has been enjoyed by judges almost from time immemorial could easily be withdrawn by this legislation until after the close of the war. And the judges themselves, I think, would be the very first to admit the justice of it. I do not think in war time that we should be bound by any statute ever passed to give a bigger salary to a man no matter how deserving he may be. What I am opposed to is the principle of putting into this Bill something that the minister says is not necessary to put here. If you look at the phraseology of the Bill you will find it very hard to understand. It is not salaries altogether. The phraseology is confusing, and really, I have not been able to determine just what it means. One provision is to save the judges from taxation on their salaries. I want to see the judge stand in the position of any other highly-paid man in the country in regard to taxation. I say that highly paid civil servants should also be subject to this tax, like Professor McCallum, whom I do not mention in any invidious way, who gets $10,000 a year as the head of the Advisory Council of Scientific Research. Judges are patriotic men. I do not believe they will thank hon. gentlemen in this House for appealing to save them from a fair and just taxation. Take the case I put to the minister a few moments ago, of a man who has an income from Scotland of $10,000 a year, and who is taxed about $3,000 on it. He is one of the most philanthropic and splendid citizens I know of in my county. His pockets are always open to charitable and patriotic purposes. He pays about $3,000 in Britain on a $10,000 income. He comes to live in Canada and the acting minister soaks him again, if I may use a vulgar expression, by this Bill. If he is going to be so drastic with a man so liberal and patriotic as this man is, who generously contributes to the Red Cross and other war funds, under what process of reasoning may I ask is it necessary to argue that a judge, who has a sinecure, who has a life appointment, who is provided for by a paternal State in his old age, should not do something now towards paying for this war in the shape of taxation?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was not the purpose or intention of this section to remit taxation. Under the Judges' Act their salary is exempt from taxation under this or any other Act. At any rate I propose asking the committee to permit me to withdraw this paragraph (k) altogether. I propose submitting the matter on an amendments of the Judges' Act to my colleagues.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have often wished that I had studied law. If I ever get time I intend to study it just as a pastime. The Judges' Act has been quoted as a reason why salaries of judges cannot be touched. I do not suppose that the Judges' Act, providing that their salaries should be exempt from taxation, while it had reference to Acts already passed, was intended to apply to Acts that might be passed in all futurity. Surely it never meant that. If you can provide in any Act that a certain thing can be done notwithstanding anything in any other statute, surely you can put the same proviso in this Bill in regard to the salaries of judges, and say that they shall be taxed notwithstanding anything in any other statute. Apart altogether from that, under the War Measures Act, by which it seems we can move the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the Pacific to the Atlantic, the Rocky mountains to the sea, and the plains down to the ocean, there is power enough to put a tax on judges' salaries. Why should not a tax be placed on their salaries? That is a question which every person will ask.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Even on the salary of a Chief Justice.

Mr. EDWARDS: Even a Chief Justice—if I might even mention that title—should be taxed, and a certain five thousand dollars should have a supertax on it. However, I won't talk about that, I may be called to order. Allow me to point out what sacrifices men are making in this country. Take, for instance, a farmer who, with the help of his only son, and of his whole family as well, by working from daylight until dark, is making possibly $1,500 or $1,600 a year. That son has to go to the war as provided by the recent order. That is all right. But that will mean for that farmer and his family a lessened revenue by five or six hundred dollars a year. He is not only sacrificing his flesh and blood, or at least offering it for sacrifice overseas if that may be necessary; but his revenue is being depleted by the absence of his son by five or six hundred dollars, and he is a poor man. While he is making that sacrifice not only on the battlefield but in a monetary way as well, we are told that we must

not touch the salaries of these gentlemen who remain and sit on the Bench. I, for one, say it is not democratic, fair, or reasonable in any sense that if those gentlemen do not voluntarily contribute as other men contribute, then I say by an Act of this House they should be forced to contribute as other men drawing like salaries are forced to do. Their future has been well looked after by Parliament. A certain number of lawyers in the House of Commons are always anxious to look after any of the fraternity. They have provided fair-sized salaries for the judges, and they have made provision for the time when those judges reach old age or think that they should retire—and some of them have retired on good, fat allowances and have taken up much more strenuous work than that which they performed on the bench, and at larger salaries than they formerly received. It is said that men who occupy judicial positions should not pay anything by way of taxation towards the expenses of this war. That view is absolutely indefensible, and, if put to a vote of the people, would not get the support of a corporal's guard outside of those members of the legal fraternity who look forward to the day when they shall occupy a position on the bench.

Mr. McKENZIE: This question is not at all one-sided. For a time I was a judge in a small way, but I am a judge no longer, so I cannot be accused of partiality. It is in the interests of this great, democratic country that judges should be absolutely independent. Judges are paid high salaries so that, as far as money is concerned, they shall be absolutely beyond temptation. That is a good thing for the country. Our judges are splendid men; they give fair decisions and administer the law as they understand it. I know of no case in which money considerations has influenced any of our judges. They get good, fat salaries, and they are absolutely independent. Another thing that is in the interest of democracy is that the judges should not be dragged into political controversies. We have stripped them of the franchise; they may not express their opinion at the polls. It is highly desirable that they should be absolutely independent. Considering them as a class, there are but a few judges in this country, and the few dollars that we would get by imposing a tax on their incomes would not amount to very much. I do not express these views because I believe that the judges should be allowed to keep the few dollars which the imposition of the tax would involve. There is therefore another side to the matter which is of more importance to the country than the small amount of money we would get by assessing their incomes for this tax.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is not a question of the few dollars that we would get; it is a question of the principle that is involved. Why should the man earning a small salary be required to pay taxes while the judge, who is earning a large salary should be exempt? The unfairness of the suggestion will surely impress itself upon the people. The member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) believes that judges are given the large salaries so that they will not be subjected to temptation with regard to money. I recall a case where a judge was required to make restitution of $5,000 that he had taken improperly. Moreover, we have the case referred to recently in this House—that of a gentleman, whose name I am not allowed to mention, who took at least $5,000 to which he had no claim. The payment of large salaries to judges does not change their sense of humanity; so that the argument of the member for North Cape Breton does not hold. The man who draws a Government salary of $10,000 has just as much right to pay taxes as the man who draws $3,000 from an industrial organization. We want to be fair and just. The member for Kingston suggests that we should in a delicate way suggest to the judges that they pay these taxes, although they are not required to do so. I am afraid we would not increase the revenue very largely by that process. If the principle is right, then everybody should be taxed under the law. The amount of revenue we get in this case is not the point at issue, there is an important principle at stake.

Mr. NICKLE: I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Hocken) that a principle is involved; if I did not feel that I should not be on my feet again. If I understand anything about the constitutional position of the judges under our British system, particularly in a democratic country, it is this: judges are supposed to be above and beyond governments and parliaments in so far as either governments or parliaments can in any way indirectly influence them by passing legislation affecting their financial position in relation to their salaries. The very principle upon which the stability of our judicial system is based is this: when you appoint a judge you appoint him for life. You give him reasonable remuneration to prevent the possibility of his de-

siring to secure further financial assistance by improper methods, and you lay down in your statute that he shall not be taxable by the Government by virtue of any legislation passed subsequent to his being appointed to the bench.

Mr. MORPHY: When was that provision adopted—many years ago?

Mr. NICKLE: I am referring to the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

Mr. MORPHY: That section is perhaps twenty-five or fifty years old.

Mr. NICKLE: If we should trace the section in all its history, I should not be surprised to find that it was taken from some British statute perhaps two hundred years ago.

Mr. MORPHY: We are at war now.

Mr. NICKLE: In the working out of our constitution to define the position of the judiciary, of the executive and of the legislature, an effort was made to put the judicial powers far beyond the interference either of the Government or of the legislature and the object sought was to give the judge sufficient remuneration to make him immune from temptation and to put him in such a position that no adverse Government, no body of legislators opposed to the man, could by duress—that is, by threatening to interfere with his salary by a tax—do something to impair his administration of justice. I argue that because by statute we said that the salary of a judge should be exempt, and because men were on that condition appointed to the bench, that that national obligation should be respected—because it is, in my judgment, a national obligation. The member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) says that it is not a contractual obligation. I meet my hon. friend by saying that it is a statutory contractual obligation, and that we should respect that obligation so far as the position of the judges now appointed goes. And the argument of the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) falls to the ground when he says that members of the legal profession always rush to the defence of the judiciary because they hope sometime to reach the woolsack. My position is that I am willing that the Act be amended to provide that this income tax shall apply to the salary of any judge subsequently appointed. But I should be sorry to see this House or this Government lay down the principle that an obligation of the nation to the judges should be interfered with unless the judges were prepared to acquiesce. It is fundamental and a protection to democracy that judges should feel that their tenure of office is secure and that their promised emoluments are not subject to attack either by Government or by Parliament.

Mr. MORPHY: I shall just refer the hon. member to the fact that it is to be deplored that he, as well as the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), is under the impression that judges have to be paid high salaries to be honest. That is the the most startling statement ever made in this Parliament, and it casts a reflection on the county court judges of the country and the district judges of Quebec who are not paid high salaries. I am to be told, forsooth, that, owing to that fact, the judges of the district courts of Quebec and of the county courts of Ontario and other similar judges throughout the rest of the Dominion must be dishonest because they are paid low salaries. That gives the whole case away. There is the other fact that the low salaried judge would have to pay something if it were not for the Judges' Act. It would not hurt them if they paid that tax, and the Supreme Court judge, with ten or twelve thousand dollars a year, can surely afford to pay a little? The fact that this Act, which has been on the statute-books from time immemorial and is a relic of the Middle Ages, has been abused to the extent that judges in England are receiving $50,000 a year and upwards, should not make us want to follow such a custom in this democratic country. In ordinary times of peace a judge in this country can live pretty well on $10,000 a year, and in time of war, a judge, if he is patriotic at all, might reasonably afford to pay a little in taxes. If he does not want to do it, because apparently, as the hon. member for Kingston has said, a judge should be above legislation by Parliament, I do not so conceive the position of a judge. As the hon. member said, this Parliament has frowned on exemption; it has dealt with the man-power and the blood of the nation in the most drastic legislation, and it is humiliating to me to find in the twentieth century men arguing that a judge is too sacred a being for Parliament to lay its hands on him. The minister has, in my opinion, acted wisely in saying he has withdrawn this section. I shall now, in anticipation, thank him for not putting into the Judges' Act any amendment that is going to unduly favour judges in this time of stress.

Mr. EDWARDS: I want to refer to just one point in the argument of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). The hon. member put forward two grounds. One was a statutory ground, namely, that those salaries were granted to those men, and that there was a contractual or statutory obligation in connection therewith. I think that was the legal phraseology used to describe the operation. There was also a contractual or statutory obligation to pay certain members of the Civil Service who went overseas their salaries in addition to their pay of rank as soldiers. Those civil salaries were paid for a time when those men went overseas, but it has recently been thought wise to break that contractual or statutory obligation to those men, who are overseas fighting and risking their lives for the judges who are here in safety and who, God grant, will all live to be one hundred or more years of age. The point was raised by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) that the salaries of the judges were fixed at an amount which would place them above temptation. That point was also mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston. I am glad to hear that given as a reason. It throws a great deal of light on past history and past action in this House, because at various times, the salaries of judges have been increased. I presume at the time the salaries were first fixed, the amount, for instance, $5,000, was considered sufficient to keep them honest; but when in the wisdom of Parliament, that was raised to $7,000, I presume it was thought absolutely necessary to give them another two thousand dollars if we wanted to keep them honest and to remove temptation from them. The simple explanation of any increase in the salaries of judges is: We must keep those judges above temptation; we must remove all temptations from them by raising their salaries so that they will not be tempted to go elsewhere for money. Has that been the result? Not that one would notice particularly. I have in mind a judge whose salary is fixed at a good figure—at least I would consider it a good figure if I was getting it. Of course, I would not say that I was competent to earn any such salary. I do not object to judges getting generous salaries; I would like to see them all getting good salaries. But that was not considered, according to the argument of the hon. member for North Cape Breton, sufficient to keep this judge honest, and, therefore, he was given an additional sum for certain work which did not take him five minutes in the year, for signing his name once or twice for another party who might happen to be away fishing for the time being. Some four or five thousand dollars was given to him in that way to keep him above temptation. One would have thought a salary of $10,000, plus the additional amount to which I have referred, would have been sufficient to lift him clear above any possible temptation; but it did not, and another salary was created for certain duties which he had to perform in a far distant country. He was not to get this salary unless he performed those duties, it should not have been paid to him. There was only one reason why it should be paid to him. I am glad to note that it was not because he was justified in getting it or because he earned it, but it was granted and paid to him for two years in succession in order to keep him above temptation. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from judges.

Mr. HOCKEN: I understood the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) to say, in a very fervent manner, that taxes should be imposed in accordance with the ability of a person to pay. That is a pretty sound Liberal principle; at least, it has been enunicated in that way here to-day, and it is one that I am entirely willing to accept. If we are going to proceed along that line, surely those men who are getting $10,000 a year and who are relieved of many financial responsibilities which other citizens have to bear, should be willing to submit to this form of taxation. An ordinary man, in business or in any profession, has sometimes to pay up to $1,000 or $1,500 a year for life insurance, if he wishes to take care of his family after his decease; but here we have a set of men who drew full salary as a pension, and who are not under the same financial obligation to take care of their families, because they may be expected to live at least until all their children are settled. There is another consideration. Most of the men who are appointed to the judiciary are men who have been eminent in the legal profession. A man, who has had a good practice of the kind that most men have who get to be judges, should be able to put away a large sum of money. Such men are usually able to amass a considerable competence before they are appointed to the bench, so that on the grounds of relief from financial responsibilities that other men must carry, and on the salary they receive, and on the probability that they are fairly

well off to begin with, I do not see why we should exempt every one of them to the extent of $360 a year. My opinion is that any self-respecting man occupying the position of judge in this country would be not only willing but anxious that he and his class should not be taken out of this Act and exempted when all the other people of this country are being taxed in this time of national stress.

Mr. FIELDING: I brought up this matter at an earlier stage when the resolution was under discusion, and I was met by the statement that there was a guarantee in the Judges' Act that the judges should be exempt from taxation. I have a profound respect for vested rights; I have a profound respect for a promise that has been made by a man, a Government or by anybody else, and since we have given the judges, foolishly I think, this exemption, I would not advocate the violation of our pledge. I think the only reason why this exemption has been tolerated in the past is that we never understood it. There was no such tax from which they could be exempt. They were not exempt from customs, they were not exempt from excise, but there was a clause that they were exempt from taxes which had no existence whatever then. That being the case, there was nothing to draw public attention to it. I am content that we should keep faith with the judges. I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not in his seat, for I would have offered the suggestion that he should now at this session introduce a Bill to repeal that exemption clause in the Judges' Act, not as respects the judges of to-day—I would keep faith with them, because a bargain is a bargain, and even if it is a bad bargain or an imprudent bargain we must nevertheless stick to it—but to abolish that exemption as respects any judge who may hereafter be appointed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I beg to move:

That paragraph (k) of section 4 be struck out, and the word "paragraph" be substituted for "paragraphs" in line 24 of said section.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, amendments read the first and second time, and concurred in.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 93 respecting a patent of Jacob David Wolf.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 94, to incorporate l'ordre des Dominicains ou frères prêcheurs au Canada.—Mr. Chabot.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 100 for the relief of David M. Sloss.—Mr. Copp.

Bill No. 101 for the relief of Lillie Mabel Billing.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 102 for the relief of Emily Kathleen Cochrane Lackey.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 103 for the relief of Alfred Frank Scott.—Mr. Harold.

Bill No. 104 for the relief of Alonzo Jesse Chapman.—Mr. Copp.

Bill No. 105 for the relief of Margaret Bell Charlesworth.—Mr. Fripp.

SUPPLY.

ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS ON THE GOVERNMENT RAILWAY SYSTEM.

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

Canadian Government Railways—Construction and betterments, including equipment, $18,000,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the Minister of Railways and Canals intend to make his promised statement on this item?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Chairman, it has been customary for the Minister of Railways and Canals to make a statement in connection with the operations of the Government Railway system from year to year. Following that custom, I desire to present a detailed explanation of those operations to the Committee.

For long the Government Railway system consisted of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Halifax, with branch lines to Fredericton, St. John and Sydney, and the Prince Edward Island railway. In recent years we have taken over the Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Moncton, and have leased from the Grand Trunk Pacific their line between Superior Junction and Fort William. We have also absorbed additional branch lines. So that now there are slightly more than

4,130 miles of railway under the direction and control of the Department of Railways and Canals and comprising the following systems:

	Miles.
The Intercolonial, including branches to St. John and Sydney, and the Canada Eastern	1,518.39
The Prince Edward Island Railway	275.20
The Transcontinental Railway, Moncton to Winnipeg	1,811.28
The Lake Superior Branch	191.75
The International Railway	111.30
The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway	36.05
Dartmouth to Dean's Branch	67.00
St. John and Quebec Railway	119.87
	4,130.84

These figures, of course, do not include the Canadian Northern Railway system to which special reference was made by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) yesterday.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister has mentioned the St. John and Quebec railway. He does not refer to the Quebec and Lake St. John railway which was acquired from the Canadian Northern company?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have just mentioned that this statement does not include any part of the Canadian Northern Railway system. The line I mentioned is in the province of New Brunswick; it runs down the St. John river to the city of St. John. It is commonly called the St. John Valley railway.

The Department of Railways and Canals is directly responsible for the operation of these roads through a general manager of eastern lines (between Montreal and Sydney and Halifax), and a general manager of western lines (between Quebec and Winnipeg). These managers in turn have their general superintendents and other officials responsible for the detailed operation of their respective departments. The principal officials are :

C. A. Hayes, General Manager, Eastern Lines, Moncton, N. B.; F. P. Brady, General Manager, Western Lines, Winnipeg, Man.; C. B. Brown, Assistant General Manager and Chief Engineer, Eastern Lines, Moncton, N. B.; H. H. Melanson, Passenger Traffic Manager, Moncton, N. B.; D. A. Story, Freight Traffic Manager, Moncton, N. B.; L. S. Brown, General Superintendent, Moncton, N. B.; W. A. Cowan, General Superintendent, Cochrane, Ont.; G. E. Smart, Superintendent Car Department, Moncton, N. B.; W. U. Appleton, Superintendent Rolling Stock, Moncton, N. B.

Since the taking over of the Transcontinental on 1st May, 1914, the department has sought to operate the entire system as one railway, and by proper co-operation and co-ordination to economize in the cost of operation and increase efficiency. During the recent year the railways of Canada generally have been working to full capacity, and I am pleased to state that the Government Railway system has received its fair share of business. But the House will observe that even though our earnings during that period reached high-water mark, the actual net results are not such as I would like to report. The reason for this is that the costs of operation and maintenance have so largely increased. Fuel has almost doubled in price; living conditions, owing to the war, have necessitated very large increases in wages to all classes of labour; supplies of all kinds have very greatly advanced; equipment has at least doubled in cost, and in some cases considerably more. But, taking everything into consideration, I believe the results achieved have been equal to those of other railways. I am pleased to be able to state that, in the operation of the Government Railways since the war began, we have had the good will and assistance of employees of all classes and to the greatest possible extent.

I will now give a statement showing the results of operation during the past fiscal year ending March 31 compared with those of the previous year:

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—ALL LINES.
Working Expenses.

Month.	1916-1917.	1917-1918.
April	$ 1,707,384.23	$ 2,071,993.14
May	1,946,267.31	2,304,049.73
June	2,014,967.07	2,114,690.75
July	2,031,315.98	2,647,213.01
August	2,153,435.90	2,654,689.16
September	1,993,351.10	2,761,536.99
October	2,232,079.49	3,127,664.57
November	2,149,125.72	3,084,303.88
December	2,137,306.89	2,608,269.34
January	2,160,271.12	2,924,537.03
February	1,776,470.83	2,845,000.00*
March	2,325,295.74	3,155,000.00*
Total	$24,627,271.48	$32,298,947.60
Average per month	$ 2,052,272.62	$ 2,691,578.66

* Estimated.

It will be noted that the total working expenses for the year 1916-17 were $24,627,271.48, compared with $32,298,947.60 for the year 1917-18. The average per month was $2,052,272.62 in 1916-17 and $2,691,578.66 for the past fiscal year.

The earnings on the Canadian Government railways were $23,468,998.99 for 1916-17, and $27,004,666.61 for 1917-18. The average earnings per month for the fiscal year 1916-17 were $1,955,749.91, and for the fiscal year 1917-18 they were $2,250,388.87. Hon.

members will see that there was an increase in the earnings during the last fiscal year of an average of about $300,000 per month. Although we had an increase in earnings of some $4,000,000, the deficit for the fiscal year was $5,294,280.99. The detailed statement of earnings is as follows:

	Earnings.	
April	$ 1,737,658.90	$ 2,181,474.74
May	2,144,039.81	2,471,189.98
June	2,018,450.66	2,223,000.80
July	1,999,001.87	2,287,789.40
August	1,973,970.77	2,477,074.81
September	2,089,373.02	2,237,839.92
October	2,237,536.88	2,623,927.82
November	2,321,585.48	2,454,306.37
December	2,138,239.03	2,133,672.82
January	1,653,019.47	1,993,389.95
February	1,262,722.05	1,729,000.00*
March	1,894,301.05	2,192,000.00*
Total	$23,468,998.99	$27,004,666.61
Average per month	$ 1,955,749.91	$ 2,250,388.87

* Estimated.

Mr. COPP: Will the hon. minister permit a question? Have the freight rates been increased in the last fiscal year over the preceding year?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, the freight rates were exactly the same. The order of the Board of Railway Commissioners, granting the railways an increase of 15 per cent, became effective on the railways on a certain date, and on the same date a similar increase was made on the Government railway system. That was two months ago. We got no benefit last year from that decision.

Hon. gentlemen are aware that during the past year the several large railway corporations have been pressing the Railway Commission to allow them an increase of rates. From the statement I have presented in connection with the Government railways, it must be apparent to every member of this House that they were justified in asking an increase. The Government railway system increased freight rates equally with other railways. Even though we have increased rates. I am not looking forward to any surplus; we expect to have a loss, and perhaps a very large one, during the coming year.

During the past year we have not undertaken any extensive new work, although we have been endeavouring to complete the works in process of construction. I am pleased to be able to say that we expect that the Halifax ocean terminals will be practically completed during the present fiscal year. I am also glad to say that last year we used those portions of these new terminals which have been made available. Had those works not been undertaken, we would not have been able to handle the traffic that has developed at that port during the present war. I desire to emphasize that fact—it would have been impossible to have handled the freight and passenger traffic at Halifax if we had not had the new terminals now nearing completion. Then again, when the disastrous explosion occurred on December 6, last year, which destroyed the major portion of the other docks, the fact that we had available a large portion of the new terminals saved the situation.

It has been customary to bring down certain statistical information of interest to many hon. members, more especially to those from the Maritime Provinces. I will include now a statement showing the earnings and expenses of the Canadian Government railways for the last fiscal year compared with the two preceding years. With the consent of the committee I shall place this statement on Hansard without reading it:

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—ALL LINES.

Months.	Working Expenses. 1915-16.	1916-17.	1917-18.
April	953,805 43	1,707,384 23	2,071,993 14
May	1,069,036 77	1,946,267 31	2,304,049 73
June	1,198,582 18	2,014,967 07	2,114,690 75
July	1,406,541 10	2,031,315 98	2,647,213 01
August	1,279,678 37	2,153,435 90	2,654,689 16
September	1,419,230 16	1,993,351 10	2,761,536 99
October	1,433,492 73	2,232,079 49	3,127,664 57
November	2,054,739 55	2,149,125 72	3,084,303 88
December	1,578,430 81	2,137,306 89	2,608,269 34
January	1,586,369 96	2,160,271 12	2,924,537 03
February	1,520,210 70	1,776,470 83	2,845,000 00*
March	2,296,943 35	2,325,295 74	3,155,000 00*
Total	17,797,061 11	24,627,271 48	32,298,947 60
Average per month	1,483,088 42	2,052,272 62	2,691,578 66

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—ALL LINES—*Continued*...

		Earnings.	
April	1,005,652 42	1,737,658 90	2,181,474 74
May	1,017,424 81	2,144,039 81	2,471,189 98
June	1,120,924 79	2,018,450 66	2,223,000 80
July	1,400,056 79	1,999,001 87	2,287,789 40
August	1,458,378 06	1,973,970 77	2,477,074 81
September	1,648,064 10	2,089,373 02	2,237,839 92
October	2,089,325 01	2,237,536 88	2,623,927 82
November,	2,190,151 23	2,321,585 48	2,454,306 37
December	2,061,924 42	2,138,239 03	2,133,672 82
January	1,464,772 21	1,653,019 47	1,993,389 95
February	1,413,617 20	1,262,722 05	1,729,000 00*
March	1,502,852 41	1,894,301 05	2,192,000 00*
Total	18,373,143 45	23,468,998 99	27,004,666 61
Average per month	1,502,852 41	1,894,301 05	2,192,000 00*
Surplus	576,082 34		
Deficit		1,158,272 49	5,294,280 99

*Estimated.

I merely point out that the total working expenses for the year 1915-16 were $17,797,061.11 compared with $32,298,947.60 in 1917-18. Hon. gentlemen will note that they have nearly doubled. The earnings were $18,373,143.45 in 1915-16 as compared with $27,004,666.61 in 1917-18.

Early last spring the Department of Railways and Canals ordered the following equipment:—

Cars.	Ordered from	Number ordered.	Contract Price.	Total.
			$ cts.	$
40 ton steel frame Box	Canadian Car & Fdy. Co	1000	2,417 00	2,417,000
	" "	2000	2,647 50	5,295,000
	" "	2000	2,647 50	5,295,000
	Eastern Car Co	1000	2,417 50	2,417,000
	National Steel Car Co	1000	2,647 50	2,647,500
30 ton stock	Canadian Car & Fdy. Co	1000	2,271 00	2,271,000
Locomotives.				
Mikado type	Canada Locomotive Co	50	48,750 00	2,437,500
	Montreal Locomotive Works	30	48,750 00	1,462,500
Pacific type	" " "	10	47,300 00	473,000
Santa Fe type	" " "	10	56,000 00	560,000
				25,275,500
Airbrake equipment and couplings supplied by Government at cost per car of on		3000 cars about	$75.00 each	
		5000 " "	102.50 each	$737,500
	A total Cost of			$26,013,000

In addition to this new equipment we purchased a number of second-hand engines and cars, without which we should not have been able to show such good results. Not only were we able to meet the requirements of the Canadian Government railways, but we were able to come to the assistance of other railways.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Prince Edward Island Railway.

The deficit on this railway during the last year amounts to $488,172, the largest in the history of the road. It has never been possible to make this railway pay, but at the time of Confederation it was taken over and the Government has to operate it for the accommodation of the

public. No doubt the members all know that it was decided to construct and operate a car ferry between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. I am pleased to say that this car ferry is in operation and is doing good work. It has been suggested that the railway on the island be changed from the present narrow gauge to the standard gauge, and I may say that it was the intention of the Government to consider this, in order that commodities shipped to and from the island could go through to their destination without transhipment. But owing to war conditions making the financial situation so serious and so greatly enhancing the cost, it is impossible for the Government to go into the widening of the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway while the war continues. It is not merely a question of change of gauge; it practically means an entirely new railway, the complete replacement of all motive power and equipment, and the revision of curves and gradients so numerous on the island, and which, while suitable for the present light equipment, would never do for the heavier main-line motive power and rolling stock. It would mean an expenditure of at least $2,000,000, which cannot be entertained at this time.

Provident Fund.

The provident fund, which is an employees' pension department, to which the railway contributes $100,000 per year, had on its rolls 1,096 ex-employees, covering a period from 1907 to 28th February, 1918. Of this number 368 have died, and the remaining are receiving pensions which amount to $254,201.50.

Employers' Relief and Insurance Association.

This is a life and accident insurance organization supported by contributions from employees and $10,000 per annum contributed by the railway. During the past year 197 death claims and three total disability claims were paid, amounting to $76,000. Sick benefits to employees, medical and surgical attendance and other expenses in connection with the organization show a gross expenditure on this account of $30,783.51. These amounts are larger than previous years, owing principally to loss of life and injuries to employees in the Halifax disaster.

Canadian Railway Association for National Defence.

It might be well to mention at this point that, in my opinion, the operation of all the railway systems in the Dominion of Canada during the past year was the equal of, if not better than, that of any other railways on the continent; and I believe that the reason of this was the action of the large railway systems—the Canadian Pacific railway, Grand Trunk railway, Grand Trunk Pacific railway, Canadian Northern railway and the Canadian Government railways—in joining together and forming an organization known as the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence. The association's executive committee on war and national defence is composed of the following persons: Lord Shaughnessy, Canadian Pacific railway; Howard G. Kelley, Grand Trunk railway; Sir William Mackenzie, Canadian Northern railway, and Alfred H. Smith, New York Central railway. In turn they organized an administrative committee to deal with the situation, composed of the following: U. E. Gillen, chairman; D. B. Hanna, A. E. Warren, C. A. Hayes, Sir George Bury, F. F. Backus, E. D. Bronner, J. H. Walsh and A. E. Warren, the latter representing the Minister of Railways.

The Prime Minister explained this organization on Wednesday last, and I will not go into further details. We have reports from this organization day by day. During the past year the different railway companies have been working together practically as one organization, and the results have been as stated by the Prime Minister.

Equipment for 1918.

We require a good deal of equipment for the present year. In fact, all the railways are short of equipment. It was necessary for us to order equipment not only for the Canadian Government railways, but also in order to protect some of our other large railway systems. The following equipment purchases have been authorized for 1918:

Cars.	Ordered from.	Number ordered.	Contract price.	Total.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
40 ton steel frame box	Canada Car & Foundry Co.	5000	2,750 00	13,750,000 00
" "	National Steel Car Car Co.	1000	2,750 00	2,750,000 00
41 foot 40 ton flats	Eastern Car Co.	750	2,370 00	1,777,800 00
50 ton coal cars	"	650	3,179 50	2,066,675 00
Hart Otis side dump only	Hart Otis Co.	250	3,040 00	760,000 00
Hart Otis side and centre dump	"	200	3,125 00	625,000 00
General service tanks	Pressed Steel Car Co.	25	5,398 25	139,956 25
Water service tanks	" "	25	5,183 75	129,593 75
Refrigerator cars	Canada Car & Foundry Co.	250	4,097 00	1,024,250 00
Sleeping cars	Pullman Car Co.	14	35,890 00	502,460 00
Dining cars	"	7	34,100 00	238,700 00
Locomotives.				
Consolidation freight	Montreal Locomotive Works and Canada Locomotive Co.	50	58,000 00	2,900,000 00
Switchers	" "	10	40,500 00	405,000 00
Pacific type	" "	30	60,000 00	1,800,000 00
Mikado type	" "	60	62,000 00	3,720,000 00
Switching	Canada Locomotive Co.	6	41,000 00	246,000 00
Narrow gauge superheated	" "	4	34,020 00	136,080 00
Total cost				32,966,515 00

All orders have been given for cars and engines. Before ordering these cars, I conferred with the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Government railway management, and they all agreed that this additional equipment should be ordered and secured at the earliest possible moment.

I shall now refer, very briefly, to other phases of departmental activity.

Halifax Ocean Terminals.

The work on the Halifax ocean terminals has been continued, the present status being as follows. Grading is practically completed; overhead bridges carrying streets across the railway are all practically completed. Sufficient trackage has been installed to serve the two temporary sheds built last year, and two large temporary sheds on pier A, which were rushed to completion after the explosion of December 6 last, and which are now in use, together with a 100-car team track yard for serving the north end of the city. The placing of concrete blocks for quay walls is practically completed, and there remains only a small quantity of concrete work and granite facing in order to finish the quay walls. The filling has been proceeded with, but there still remains over 500,000 yards of filling to be placed behind the quay walls. Arrangements are being made for the erection of a temporary station and the construction of coach yard with coach-cleaning and repair facilities for the handling of the passenger traffic business of the city, as North street station and facilities are not suitable since the explosion for the carrying on of this work.

I may also state that the station was very badly damaged, and that we must get away from it at the earliest possible moment. The contractor claims that the new station will be ready for us about the month of September next, when we shall run all trains into the new terminals.

Halifax Disaster and Restoration.

In the disaster of 6th December, 1917, at Halifax 56 employees and 10 pensioners of the Canadian Government railways were killed, and 2 employees afterwards died from injuries received in the explosion. Thirty employees were killed while on duty. Of the 1,078 employees of the railway living in Halifax and Dartmouth at the time of the explosion, investigation showed that only 157 were comparatively unaffected by the disaster; 107 who owned their own homes, and 165 who were tenants had their property totally destroyed; 432 had properties more or less damaged, requiring at least considerable repairs. Later on, the Rehabilitation Branch of the Relief Committee, in their housing programme, agreed to provide at least 84 temporary houses for employees of the railway. The following railway and 56 freight cars of other lines, valued at $50,000, were destroyed.

Removal of wreckage and clearing tracks and replacing various electrical lines throughout Richmond yard and North street

station will have cost, when complete, roughly, $100,000.

One hundred and three Government railway cars of passenger class, and 9 cars of other lines of the same class were damaged to an estimated extent of $60,000.

Thirty-seven Canadian Government railway and 56 freight cars of other lines valued at $50,000, were destroyed.

One hundred and twenty Canadian Government railway and 222 freight cars of other lines were damaged to approximately $54,000.

Four Canadian Government railway locomotives suffered damages estimated to amount to $6,000.

Canadian Government railway steamer McKee was also damaged and is now under repair.

The Willow Park shops, consisting of roundhouse, machine shop, power plant, planing mill, car repair shop, coaling plant and ash pit, and stores and office building suffered severely. These damages have been estimated at $130,000.

The shipping facilities at piers Nos. 2, 3 and 4 and the adjacent freight shed and other buildings, are all much damaged, but they have been nearly completely repaired. The elevator has been repaired.

The piers at Richmond are all wrecked and some are totally destroyed. Pier No. 9 has been repaired and is in use.

In order to obtain relief as quickly as possible from the effects of the damage to the various shipping facilities, the construction of two large sheds on pier A at the ocean terminals site was rushed to completion at the same time as repairs were being made to the previously used wharves, etc. These sheds are now in operation and the repair work is also practically complete. In addition to the work on the railway properties, the Restoration Organization have carried out the repairs to H.M.C. naval dockyard and to the naval hospital, under arrangement with the Department of the Naval Service. This work will cost about $205,000. The estimated cost of reconstruction on Canadian Government railways' properties is estimated to be about $1,250,000. Of this amount $850,000 will have been spent by March 31. Or in other words, the loss to the country on account of the Halifax disaster, so far as the Canadian Government railway system is concerned, is $1,250,000.

Hudson Bay Railway.

We have expended upon this enterprise up to February 28 of this year, the sum of $20,161,000, of which $13,814,000 was on account of the railway, and $6,347,000 was on account of the harbour and terminals at Port Nelson. The latter sum includes expenditures incurred in the purchase of steamships which are now in general service throughout the year, as well as the valuable plant at Port Nelson. During the past year the construction of the bridge over the Nelson river at Kettle rapids has caused the suspension of tracklaying. The north and south arms of the bridge were connected up in December and tracklaying can be continued this season. The grading between Kettle rapids and Nelson was completed and train-filling and ballasting at various points along the line was continued. At Port Nelson a restricted programme was followed, in which materials and supplies on hand were utilized. Owing to the general shortage of ocean tonnage no further shipments were made to the Bay during the season. The island cribwork was extended and dredging continued.

Prince Edward Island Car Ferry.

The total amount expended upon this work has been about $2,875,000. We are asking for a further appropriation of $65,000 to cover certain minor additions which have been deferred until actual operating conditions could be observed. The main contracts for the construction of terminals were completed during the season of 1917 and the steamer "Prince Edward Island" was placed on the route in the beginning of October. All freight offering has been satisfactorily handled since that time.

Canals, General.

But little new construction work was done on the canals during the past year, and even minor improvements and works of maintenance were restricted to essentials. Our only appropriations on capital account for the year just closed were for the Welland ship canal and the Trent canal. Upon the ship canal the work done during the year was of an emergency repair nature, being occasioned by clay slides, one of which destroyed the temporary crossing provided for the Queenston road, and the other, by its proximity to the existing canal, was considered so menacing as to require immediate attention. Construction work under the several contracts was suspended throughout the year. As there appears to be no possibility of resuming this work for some years, the several contractors have requested that they be relieved of further responsibility with respect thereto. Equitable arrangements have been concluded with several of them for the surrender of their contracts, and it is hoped

that mutually satisfactory arrangements will shortly be completed with the others.

On the Trent system we had a number of contracts nearing completion on the Ontario-Rice lake division, upon which work was continued with some hope of clearing them up during the year. Owing chiefly to labour conditions, slow progress was made, and although we shall be able to open this division for navigation this spring, each of the contractors has a few months' work to do. The Grand Trunk railway are proceeding with their high-level bridge at Campbellford, and the barrier created by their present low-level structure will be removed during the early spring.

On the Severn division, two contracts were in force. As this division cannot be brought into service until another section, not yet under contract, has been completed it was deemed advisable to close down work upon section 3, which connects Lake Couchiching with the Severn river. On section 2, all efforts were concentrated upon the completion of the power house and dam at Swift rapids, with auxiliary works related thereto. This structure was completed with great benefit to the power situation in the surrounding neighbourhood.

I do not think I can add anything to what I have already said, but I shall be very glad, indeed, to give full information on any questions that are asked.

Mr. BOYCE: Was that large tract of land at Rideau junction included in the bargain with the Canadian Northern railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: That land was purchased by the Canadian Northern Railway system; it was deeded to that railway, and is now owned by the Crown.

Mr. BOYCE: I am very glad to hear that, as it is one of the most valuable pieces of land in that section of the country. I trust the Government will not allow it to lie waste as it has done for the last five years. It has been nothing but an eyesore in the past. The buildings that were on it were pulled down, and the land could not have looked worse if the Germans had passed over it. Part of the land has been cultivated this year, but very little, and I trust the Government will see to it that this valuable tract of land, comprising eight or nine hundred acres, will be used not only for railway purposes but cultivated to the very best advantage. I should also like to know whether any improvements will be made through that section.

Mr. J. D. REID: Any improvements along the Canadian Northern will be made through the board of directors which is now operating the Canadian Northern Railway system, and not through the staff of the Railway Department at Ottawa.

Mr. BOYCE: The sooner the improvements are made the better, because that part of the road is in a very bad state.

Mr. J. D. REID: At the present time the Government would have no say in such matters as the hon. member has mentioned. But I would suggest that from now on, as this railway belongs to the people, any hon. member who thinks improvements should be made on the line in any part of his constituency should communicate with the head of the Canadian Northern Railway system. Later on, of course, he should communicate with the head of the reorganized board, which the Prime Minister said would be constituted at a date not far distant.

Mr. BOYCE: I can assure the minister I will cheerfully do anything I can for the benefit of the road.

Mr. MURPHY: What use is being made of the land my hon. friend spoke of just now?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern directors will use it as they think best, but I was suggesting that if any hon. member sees land going to waste belonging to the railway, or the necessity for improvements on the line in his constituency, he should communicate with Mr. Hanna, the general manager of the Canadian Northern Railway system. Of course, if he should write to me as Minister of Railways and Canals I shall be very glad, indeed, to forward the communication, but I wish to emphasize that the management will be by the board, and not by the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. MURPHY: I think my hon. friend mentioned something about buildings at Rideau Junction.

Mr. J. D. REID: No, there are only ties there.

Mr. ARTHURS: I think the statement that has been made by the minister is satisfactory. I should like to know whether the Government railways have charged the same rate for the conveyance of troops as the other roads. In other words, is the deficit on the Intercolonial and other Government roads partly attributable to the fact that Canadian troops have been carried at a lower rate than on the other roads in Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: I understand that the Government railway system charges the same rates as the other roads, with this exception, that ours is the longer haul, and consequently the proportion we get of the through rate is greater. The amount we receive is in proportion to the haul.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is the minister sure of that? The Government haul may or may not be the longer haul. Let us suppose the traffic originates in British Columbia, comes partly over the Government road, and then over the Grand Trunk to Montreal, and is there transferred to the Intercolonial. Will the minister say that that traffic is in the ordinary proportion as between two privately owned roads?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the information I have from my officials.

Mr PEDLOW: I have been informed that a number of cheques were issued by the Department of Railways and Canals during December last in settlement of claims for right of way through Carleton county. Is that information correct, if so, how many of such claims were settled, and had these claims reference to the pieces or sections of land that the hon. member for Carleton referred to?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member must be referring to the Canadian Northern Railway system?

Mr PEDLOW: Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no information in connection with that. I never heard of the matter before.

Mr. COPP: I understood the minister to say there were something like 1,200 participating in the Provident fund.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said there were 1,096. But 398 have died.

Mr. COPP: The Provident fund has been in force since 1906 or 1907. At that time it was an experiment. This fund was arranged by the then Minister of Railways and Canals and quite a large number of employees of the lower-paid classes went into that fund, their participation entitling them to the minimum amount of $20 a month. There are quite a number of these men living in Moncton and I know a number who have absolutely nothing to live upon except this $20 a month. They are in destitute circumstances, after they have given their lives to work on the Intercolonial. We must not forget that the wages paid to these men were very much smaller than those paid to-day and notwithstanding the greatly increased cost of living they have only this small monthly allowance and they have to pay the same for whatever they purchase as the men who are working on the road and receiving higher wages. I wrote a letter to the minister in the early part of the session and I trust that the department will enter into negotiations by which fair treatment may be meted out to this class of retired Intercolonial employees. It is ridiculous to expect men, living in a city and some of them with families and without any other income, to live on the pittance that they receive from the Provident fund.

Mr. J. D. REID: The contribution is made half by the Government and half by the employees and the Provident fund is administered by a committee composed of employees and some of the officials of the Railway Department. The whole matter was brought to my attention by my hon. friend (Mr. Copp) and I think also by one or two of the employees who were superannuated under that fund and who asked me to take the matter up. The Compensation Act has gone through this session, and it is necessary that we should take up this whole matter of the Provident fund in connection with it. It is being looked into, and as soon as the session is over, and I can get an opportunity, I intend to go into the whole matter. The point which the hon. gentleman has mentioned will have to be brought before this committee to see if something cannot be done for the old employees. I realize that their pension is very small and that something should be done. I had a gentleman to-day appealing for a larger retiring allowance. He has a pension of $20 a month, he is 80 years of age and he was on the road for forty years. But, it is not within the power of the minister to deal with the matter; the committee must agree to any changes.

Mr. COPP: The trouble is that the matter has been taken up in a half-hearted way by some members of the Provident fund board, but there has been no one to take hold of it actively, meet the men, consider the case. I would suggest that the minister give it to some particular man in his department as part of his work, and let him look into the matter, visit the diffferent localities and see if some scheme cannot be evolved by which fair treatment can be given both to the railway and to the men.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the minister said that the Government contribute $100,-

000 to the Provident fund and that it has been a fixed sum for a number of years.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is right.

Mr. FIELDING: If the principle of making such a grant is a sound one—and I think, on the whole it is, although I have some reason to believe that there is a difference of opinion on that—it seems to me that the grant should bear some proportion to the number of employees. The idea that there should be a fixed sum given for a smaller number of employees and no larger sum when the number of employees has increased, does not seem to me to be consistent with sound business. There may be room for doubt as to whether or not this is the best form of dealing with the problem, but I think the sum to be contributed ought to bear some proportion to the number of employees and the contributions of the men.

Mr. J. D. REID: When the scheme was started the contributions, by the Government and the employees, were to be on a fifty-fifty basis. The Government's contribution did not start with $100,000 but it was limited to $100,000, and it has reached that amount. Now that the Compensation Act has been passed, the matter will likely be taken up and some change will probably have to be made in the whole organization.

Mr. HENDERS: Will the House be put in possession of the whole history of this Provident fund scheme and will hon. members have an opportunity of studying the question, not only from the viewpoint of those having it in charge but also from the purely business standpoint; and will they have an opportunity of fully discussing it before any definite policy is laid down?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Provident fund required an Act passed by Parliament to legalize it. This Act will require amendment if there is any change proposed and therefore it will come before the House. It can then be thoroughly discussed and hon. members will have an opportunity of expressing their opinions on the matter.

Mr. HENDERS: Will all the information in connection with it be in the department and shall we be able to secure it by making application?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have in the department full information in connection with all those matters, and we submit to the House the annual report of the department, which contains the information the hon. gentleman wishes. We are at all times pleased to give such information as we can. Sometimes, of course, there are matters that perhaps we may consider of minor importance which a member of Parliament or the public may deem to be of greater value. In such a case. if our attention is drawn to the matter, the department will give explanations by letter, or by a statement to the House, or communicate with the public in any way that is asked for.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I want to make a few brief observations concerning the Prince Edward Island railway before the session is too far advanced. I am quite aware that the veteran members of Parliament know the history of that railway, but this is a new Parliament, and the new members may not be quite so well informed. To review the whole history of that railway would be too long a story to relate to-night when we are so anxious to close Parliament and return to our homes. I shall, therefore, not discuss the history of the building of the railroad in Prince Edward Island, which was one of the greatest political conspiracies ever carried out in the civilized world—a conspiracy which cost the province of Prince Edward Island its liberties, and which robbed the people of that province of their birthright for a mess of pottage. I am simply making the present statement as an introduction to the speech which I propose to deliver next year if I live to return, and you will give me the hearing such as you have always accorded. First of all, let me draw the attention of the committee to the fact that Prince Edward Island paid for its own railroad. The Dominion Government does not own the Prince Edward Island railway; it holds it in trust for the benefit of the general public. However, I am not going to enter upon a discussion of this truth to-night, because some of us are in too big a hurry to get away to Europe. All that will come up next year.

Mr. HENDERS: May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nesbitt): Yes, if the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Read) consents.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The hon. gentleman can ask his question.

Mr. HENDERS: I suggest that if Prince Edward Island owns the railway it would be a very proper thing for this House to hand it back to that province.

Mr. MURPHY: That is not a question.

Mr. BUREAU: That's a conclusion.

Mr. READ: The Government would never take it back and pay us what they owe us through Confederation. The present deficit on the Prince Edward Island railway represents the interest on the money that belonged to Prince Edward Island when it entered Confederation. Those of you who have studied the history of Confederation know that when the four original provinces of the Dominion—Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—united, they did so on the principle of funding the whole of their public debt and then crediting it on a per capita basis to be held as part of the funded debt of Canada on which they would pay five per cent per annum for all time to come. When Prince Edward Island entered the union our proportion was one-fortieth. The public debt of the four big provinces was $240,000,000 and one-fortieth of that would be $6,000,000 due to the province of Prince Edward Island, provided it had any public debt. But as a matter of fact it did not have any such obligation except the railway debt. That was imposed upon us by the connivance of the Imperial and Dominion Governments, and the set of politicians that sold, as I have already told you, our birthright for a mess of pottage. I want the House to be seized of the fact that the money which is absorbed by the present deficit on the Prince Edward Island railway really belongs to that province. That deficit amounts this year to about $470,000. Why is that debt so great? There is no part of Canada which yields so much traffic to its railway as Prince Edward Island. In the name of goodness then, why should there be a deficit? I will tell you why. I have received a letter from home to-day, a business letter, and the complaint made in that letter—and the complaint which has been made for the last twelve months by every business man in Prince Edward Island—is that they cannot get their produce carried away, they cannot get sufficient cars for the purpose and the Minister of Railways knows that. However, I am not blaming the Government for it, because, as the minister has pointed out, they intend to widen the gauge, and they do not want to expend a considerable sum of money on a system that is going out of use. But I am still hoping that the minister will bring down Supplementary Estimates before the present session closes that will make provision for widening the gauge between Port Borden, Summerside and Charlottetown, and consequently obviating the present great necessity that exists for cars and locomotives. The Government has had Dr. Robertson in Prince Edward Island telling the people to increase their production, and they are going to produce more. But what are they going to do with the food that is produced if no provision is made for transporting it to the markets of the mainland? That is the condition of things which exists there to-day. Hon. gentlemen who are in the habit of reading the newspapers will have noticed that the Food Controller has been advising the people of Peterborough, Ontario, to sell their potatoes instead of feeding them, giving as the reason that the Prince Edward Island people are feeding their potatoes to hogs because they had not the necessary transportation facilities to move them. The Minister of Railways has pointed out that it will take $2,000,000 to widen the gauge of the whole of the Prince Edward Island railway, with its 275 miles. But we are not asking him to undertake that work this summer. We are only urging him, between now and next September or October, to widen the gauge for a distance of sixty miles, and the bulk of that is over level country, with easy grades and bridges already constructed.

Mr. MURPHY: Between what points does the stretch of railway to which you allude extend?

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Between Port Borden and Summerside and Charlottetown. The name "Port Borden" was bestowed in recognition of the leader of the Government because he was good enough to inaugurate the car ferry system, for which we are much obliged to him and to the Government. There are some 49 miles between Summerside and Charlottetown, and then there is a branch that runs down to the car ferry from Emerald Junction, some 11 miles. If we had the railway in such a shape that between now and next September or October we could use the wide gauge cars over the 60 miles referred to, it would obviate the necessity of purchasing any more narrow gauge cars or engines beyond the three or four that have been already ordered. I am not criticising the Government for the purchase of these narrow-gauge locomotives; it had to be done unless we were to go into the cellar altogether.

Mr. COPP: The Government could not run the new private car on the narrow gauge system.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I hope the Minister of Railways and the Government will consider our position and endeavour to make some provision for meeting our necessities during the coming summer. I ask this House to be fair to our little province, for we have been the "staggering bob" on the Dominion for many years.

Sir Richard Cartwright used to claim that Ontario was Canada's milch cow. We are the " staggering bob," the poor little sister bled white, though not by any intention on the part of the big provinces, who have not understood our situation. When we went into Confederation the Government put in the terms certain statutory promises —or, rather, not promises merely, but statutory contracts. And one of them was that we were to have uninterrupted steam communication, summer and winter, so as to connect the Prince Edward Island railway with the railroad system of the Dominion. After forty-five years of waiting this contract was only fulfilled last October. I am proud to think that the Government has found a way to overcome the difficulties. All governments have made an honest endeavour at one time and another to give us winter communication, and have provided the Stanley, the Minto, the Earl Grey and all those beautiful ships. But they could not do the trick. Now they have a vessel that can. All I am pleading for now is that the Government will take into consideration the situation in our province and appropriate at least $300,000 or $400,000 to widen the gauge on the sections of the line I have referred to. I believe it will cost only $2,000,000 to standardize the gauges on the whole line, and the $400,000 I am asking for is a mere bagatelle in these days when we are talking hundreds of millions.

Mr. McISAAC: I am pleased to notice that the Minister of Railways has an item of $65,000 in his estimates for the completion of the terminals at Port Borden and Cape Tormentine, where the car ferry steamer Prince Edward Island plies between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. I need not say that I deeply regret that the minister has not found it convenient to include an amount in the estimates, at least to commence the standardization of the gauge on the Prince Edward Island railway. I would not suggest to the Government, as my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Read) has done, to standardize the gauge from Port Borden to Summerside and from Port Borden to Charlottetown. That would only be a piece-meal proposal. I would not dictate or suggest to the Government where they should begin. But I sincerely desire that they shall make a beginning as soon as reasonably possible. And when they do begin to standardize, it should be done in such a way that all portions of the province traversed by the railway will be benefited. As I had occasion to say before, in consequence of the dearth of coastal steamships, the removal of the products of Prince Edward Island will be a very difficult problem this very year. Notwithstanding that a great many of our sons, I am proud to say, have gone to fight our battles at the front, I am satisfied that there will be a very considerable increase of agricultural production in Prince Edward Island this year. That being so, we shall have much more to export to provide food for the soldiers fighting our battles. We have scarcely any idea of how productive Prince Edward Island is, for the very fact that we have never had sufficient facilities to ship our products from the Island. The car ferry steamer "Prince Edward Island" is a splendid ship. In my opinion, she is the greatest product of marine architecture of her class. During the past winter, which was unprecedently severe and arduous, she made daily trips across the Straits; several times a day, sometimes. As I said before, the question of winter navigation of the Straits has been solved. The solution of that problem, which had caused so much difficulty, hardship, disappointment and uncertainty to our people, has caused a revolution of feeling, and the matter of winter navigation of the straits is now accepted as beyond any question. Consequently we feel exceedingly grateful to the Government for what they have done in furnishing this magnificent steamer, and solving this difficult problem, and placing us in continuous communication with the Intercolonial and other railway systems of the Dominion, which was written in the bond at the time we entered Confederation. It was the lack of this understanding which prevented Prince Edward Island from going into Confederation with the original four provinces in 1867. In 1873 the Imperial Order in Council contained what the Island asked for, but it is only now that we have succeeded in getting the link across the Straits. As the minister knows, the standardization of the gauge is the complement of the car ferry steamer. I think I can thus speak, though I have no warrant for it: As we all know, the people of Prince Edward Island are not poor, although it is a small place. They have contributed most

generously to the loans that Canada has floated. I feel I am safe in saying that if the Government would issue a special loan of $2,000,000 for the purpose of broadening the gauge on the Prince Edward Island railway, the people of Prince Edward Island have the money; and they would buy the bonds and furnish the necessary funds to complete the work. If the Government take that departure, they will solve at least one difficulty in connection with the problem of standardizing the road. If the Minister of Railways, in his supplementary estimates, provides a sum for the commencement of this work he will do something that will be dear to the hearts of the people of Prince Edward Island, something for which the people of that province will never cease to be thankful, and something which will be a benefit to the whole Dominion as well.

Mr. TURGEON: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the matter of the acquirement by the Government of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway in Gloucester county. I hold no brief for the company which operates that road; my brief is for the people of Gloucester county. Indeed, this is a national as well as a local question; it affects not only the interests of my county, but the larger interests of the Dominion. During the last two months the Minister of Railways has received many petitions on behalf of the people of Gloucester county requesting that the Government take over that road. I do not wish to say anything in disparagement of the company which operates that road, but if I point out that through lack of initiative, of wise administration, or of ability to raise the necessary capital the road is in an embarrassed condition and the people of Gloucester county are thereby suffering inconveniences in the matter of transportation of their products to the markets which are clamouring for them, I do so only in order to put the case as it is before the Government. I wish to read only one of the many petitions which have been sent, as indicating the gravity of the situation to-day in that district—the most potential district in the matter of resources not only in New Brunswick, but, considering its size, in the whole of Canada.

Caraquet, N.-B., March 22, 1918.

O. Turgeon, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

At a public meeting held here last night the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

Whereas petitions pointing out the dilapidated and unsafe condition of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway and its unfitness to satisfactorily perform the public service required of it were signed by a large number of the residents and ratepayers of this county, and forwarded to the Hon. F. B. Carvell, Minister of Public Works, Ottawa, respectfully asking that the Government acquire the railway and operate it as part of the Government railway system in the interest of the people; and, whereas the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway represents the only system of transportation on the south side of bay Chaleur from Bathurst to Shippigan and Tracadie, a distance of more than hundred miles on which is dependent the traffic resulting from the agriculture, lumbering and extensive fishing industries along the coast; and whereas the service performed by the railway, which for some time has been most unsatisfactory and irregular, has become entirely inadequate to handle the increased traffic, notwithstanding the equipment recently obtained from the Government; and whereas the Government has taken no definite action thus far to acquire the railway and operate it in the interests of the people;

Therefore resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting, representative of the industrial, agricultural and fishing interests of the community, the time has now arrived when serious loss and injury will occur to these industries unless the railway is taken over by the Government at as early a date as possible and operated as part of the Government railway system.

Dr. F. X. Comeau,
Chairman.

The minister has received many such petitions from residents of the districts traversed by that railway. Since I first became a member of this House it has been my duty on many occasions, on behalf of my constituents, to request that this road, which for some reason has never been operated as it should have been in the public interest, be taken over by the Government and operated as part of the Canadian Government railways. The main line of the Government road passes through the head of the Gloucester peninsula. Sir Sanford Fleming had a survey made in 1873 and 1874, and it was his plan at that time to construct a branch line in that county as part of the Government road. Had this proposal been accepted, direct communication with Newfoundland would have been afforded and Newfoundland would have undoubtedly entered the Confederation. It was understood by the people of Canada that the construction of branch lines in that county as well as on the other side of Chaleur bay should not be left to private enterprise, because a branch line cannot be expected to pay unless it belongs to the company holding the trunk line. The Government made a great mistake when they allowed this branch line railway in Gloucester county to be constructed by private enterprise. However, a few men were trying to get sufficient capital together in order to build branch lines, and they got

a charter for the construction of this road. As far back as 1882, as an independent candidate I was advocating the construction of that line by the Government. My Conservative opponent, a man of wealth, advocated the construction of the line by a private company under subsidy. He got the subsidy and built the road—and died from worry. Although that line is in a dilapidated condition, if the minister acquires it he will not be getting a road which has no value. If it has not great worth as a road, owing to its condition, it has great value because of the potentialities of the district through which it runs. It is not a line of railway ten or fifteen miles in length, a distance over which traffic might to-day be readily carried on by auto-trucks; it is 88½ miles long, and serves one of the richest districts of northern New Brunswick with its wealth of resources of land and sea. The lumber industry there has grown tremendously in the last year. A few years ago that industry was not of much value to the road, because the price of lumber was low, and the lumber cut along that road could be transported by water. To-day there is no more transportation by water, while there is at present an immense demand for lumber in the American market, and it commands a high price. There is no limit to the thousands of cars of lumber the district along this road can produce. The transportation of this means traffic not only for the road itself but for the Intercolonial railway from Bathurst to Montreal as well as from Tracadie to Bathurst. The Government, therefore, should look after its interests by taking over this road. The fishing industry in this district has doubled and trebled, and even quadrupled, in the last few years on account of the market in the United States and in the Old Country. Transportation has, therefore, been transferred from water service to railroad service, and consequently the hundreds of carloads of fish that the district will provide, from Shippigan and Caraquet to Bathurst, will be freight for the Intercolonial from Bathurst to Halifax or St. John. The road of which I speak has been a feeder for the Intercolonial, although not to such an extent as it can be made to-day. But of late years, notwithstanding the unsafe and dilapidated condition of the road, the freight which it has procured for the Intercolonial has increased from $50,000 in 1905, to $80,000 in 1917. I say, with knowledge, that if the Government take over that road, putting it into safe condition for this year and improving it later on, it will double its productivity as a feeder to the Intercolonial from Bathurst to Montreal as well as from Bathurst to St. John and Halifax. These are the figures as to the length of the road:

	Miles.
From Gloucester Junction to Shippigan..	68
From Pokemouche Junction to Tracadie..	16
Sidings..	3½
	87½

The road was built between 1884 and 1887, and the cost of construction at the time was $1,163,826.12. It will be remembered that in those years railway construction did not cost one-quarter of what it costs to-day. Labour was worth 90 cents or $1 a day, and lumber and everything else was very cheap. I have had a statement prepared by a man who knows the products of the country and who has interviewed men engaged in the lumber business and men engaged in the fishing industry as well as the leading fishermen, and this is the result at which he has arrived as to the traffic that will be forthcoming. From the Bathurst company's mills the output is 20,000,000 feet of lumber, or a thousand cars—to be transported to Gloucester Junction, a distance of five miles. The minister is aware of the big interests which, during the last six or seven years, have developed at Bathurst by the erection of immense pulp and lumber mills, which have increased the amount of freight from Bathurst to Montreal and also to St. John. This industry has increased the revenue of the customs at that port by thousands of dollars. Bathurst is to-day a station which, outside of the great cities, produces one of the greatest revenues along the Intercolonial. This is the statement:

Large Saw Mills at.	Export Lumber. Output.	Railway Transportation.
Bathurst	20,000,000 feet.	1,000 cars.
Burnsville	5,000,000 "	300 "
Inkerman	3,000,000 "	150 "
Tracadie	5,000,000 "	300 "
	Total..	1,750 "
	Pulp Wood.. ..	1,000 cars
	Stone	100 "
	Potatoes..	300 "
	General merchandise..	50 "
	Grand total ..	3,200 "

In Tracadie a large sawmill was closed down this spring, operations being stopped during the winter, just because they had lumber ahead, due to the fact that they could not ship last fall, and could not under existing conditions rely upon having

their goods transported. In addition to the traffic which I have already enumerated, 750 carloads of hay, flour and other goods could be got. I wish to call the minister's attention to the figures which I have given, in order that he may see the necessity of taking over that road. For the last ten days or so I have had a question on the Order Paper, which the minister has not yet answered. If he had answered it, he as well as the committee would have been spared this address to-night. As, however, he has not made up his mind upon this subject, I wish to impress him with the good results which will ensue to the Government from taking over this road. The Prime Minister, in his statement on Wednesday, said that, although the acquisition of the Canadian Northern will for the moment impose a terrible burden upon the people of Canada, that road will eventually prove to be a benefit, because, in the course of some years, it will yield a profit. I will admit that railroads in their inception do not pay, no matter where they are built. I believe that this Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, when the Government operates it properly so that the various industries will have confidence that their products will get adequate transportation, will prove a paying proposition. It will produce more traffic year by year for the Intercolonial.

I understand the department claim they cannot pay much for the road on account of its dilapidated condition, and that they have not agreed on a price with the owners. If they cannot agree, why not submit the matter to arbitration, as is usually done in cases of this kind. If either party could be said to have the advantage in an arbitration it would be the Government, because public opinion in New Brunswick is against the company operating the road. The cry all over New Brunswick is that the company have allowed the road to get into a very dilapidated condition. I hope the minister, therefore, will take steps immediately to acquire the road and let me know to-night what has been decided on.

Mr. KEEFER: Before the minister answers my hon. friend I should like to ask whether he has received a petition from the inhabitants of the town of Sioux Lookout requesting that the name of the railway station be changed to the name of their town. The matter might have the appearance of having politics in it, but I can assure the minister that there are none. The name of Sioux Lookout is an old name that was given to the place long before the railway went through. It is the junction point of the waters by which the Indians from lake Superior used to travel westwards, and the Sioux on a high hill could see them coming a long way off, and so the town got its name, just as Medicine Hat got its name. When the railway was built, the place began to grow and eventually became a divisional point. The station was then called Graham. But the town name is still Sioux Lookout; the post office is Sioux Lookout; the registry office plan is under the name of Sioux Lookout, and if you wish to write a letter to a person there you have to address it Sioux Lookout; but if you want to send a telegram it has to be addressed to Graham, and it is exceedingly confusing. It would be a pity to see the name of Graham disappear from the Transcontinental, but one of the other divisional points east or west, Armstrong or Redditt, for instance, might take that name, or if it was desired to give the name to a junction point, why not call Superior Junction, where the railway comes down to lake Superior, Graham? But to continue the name of Graham for the railway station and Sioux Lookout for the post office is certainly confusing to business life. The people will not give up their name of Sioux Lookout, all their deeds and conveyances being under that name in the registry office plan, and that being also the name of the post office. I should like to know whether they have asked the minister to change the name, and whether he can see his way clear to do so, giving the name of Graham to some other divisional point.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have received petitions and numerous requests to change the name of the station. The petitioners if I remember rightly, stated that Sioux Lookout was the name of the town, an incorporated town, I believe, and the post office and registry office was also in that name. Every reason appeared in the petition why the name of the railway station should be changed to Sioux Lookout, but I will frankly admit that I have hesitated to change the name of the station because it was named after the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He had a great deal to do with the building of this railway. He lives within a few miles of me, and we have always been friends, and I have hesitated, and hesitate now, to change the name for that reason, because it might be thought that since I had become Minister of Railways I had some other object in changing the name.

Mr. KEEFER: Why not name one of the other divisional points Graham?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is a good suggestion that never occurred to me before, and perhaps it could be arranged in that way. I will look into the matter. In reply to my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), if I understood him aright, he is urging the Government to take over the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway. Perhaps I might briefly review the situation in connection with branch lines in New Brunswick. Members who have been in this House for some years will remember that every session the question has been brought up of taking over branch lines in the province of New Brunswick. These branch lines, as they are commonly called, or feeders of the Intercolonial, certainly run through well-settled districts in New Brunswick and serve a great many people in the localities through which they run. There are seven of them in all, but none of them is very long, the Caraquet and Gulf Shore being the longest. The owners of these roads have managed to keep them running for many years, but I do not think any of them have ever paid dividends to the shareholders; in fact, they have not even paid the interest on the bonds, and since the war began some of these railways have got into a condition where they cannot possibly operate, and the Government had to come to their rescue last winter and assist them financially and with rolling stock. Unless we continue to do that, the roads must cease operation. Something has to be done, and that has been urged on me by members representing all the constituencies through which these lines run. The hon. member for Gloucester not only in the House to-night, but on previous occasions, has urged me to negotiate for the taking over of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway. The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. McLeod) has also urged that we take over a small road of ten miles in his constituency. The hon. member for St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert (Mr. Elkin) and Mr. Wigmore have also urged me to take over the Salisbury and Albert railway. Besides the representations made by the members for all these constituencies, we have had deputations from the province of New Brunswick to see if something could not be done to put these roads in good condition or to bring them under Government operation. I have entered into negotiations with the owners of these roads. The owners of the York and Carleton railway, some ten miles long, and the Government have agreed on an amount which will appear in the Supplementary Estimates for the consideration of the House. We have also negotiated with the owners of the Elgin and Havelock railway, thirty miles long, and they have submitted a price at which I think every member of the House will agree we ought to take over the road. The owners of the Salisbury and Albert road, some forty-seven miles long, and the owners of the St. Martin's road, some thirty miles long, have also submitted a price which I think the House will approve. If the House agrees to taking over these four roads at the prices submitted, we will make them part of the Intercolonial railway system, and we will operate them so that the people will have a continuous service during the year. Last winter these railways were not able to operate. They had not the power, they could not keep their roads open, and had we not assisted in their operation there would have been no service during a great part of the winter. There are three roads, the Moncton and Buctouche, the Kent Northern and the Caraquet and Gulf Shore. The hon. member (Mr. Turgeon) has had a question on the Order Paper, and I must frankly admit the reason I did not answer. They have been pressing us to take that road. The reports I have are that it is in such a very bad condition that it can hardly be operated. After consultation with some of my colleagues, with members and with prominent men from New Brunswick, I have offered them a price that I would be willing to submit for consideration to this House and that I do not believe any man in New Brunswick would say is not a fair and reasonable price. To go above the price offered I cannot see my way clear, and it will not be in the estimates when I do bring them down unless they accept the amount I have offered. I would feel very sorry if we should not clear up the whole situation, get these railways in under the Intercolonial and then give the people the service they want. I believe that if I were to discuss the matter with the hon. member he would admit that I have been fair in any negotiations that have taken place. I am willing to take any of these roads on the same terms as the others have been taken over. I went further with the Caraquet and Gulf Shore and offered more per mile than for any of the other four that I have mentioned. The same thing applies to the Kent Northern and the Moncton and Buctouche. If these companies were will-

ing to hand over their roads to the Government railway system on the same terms, or even at a little advance, we might close out the whole transaction at once. But I am not coming to this House with an offer for the Caraquet and Gulf Shore that would be unreasonable. Therefore, if the hon. member does not see the Caraquet and Gulf Shore in the estimates I want him, and the people along that line, to understand that I have been negotiating with the owners and that I was willing to take it over and was hoping to take it over at a price per mile proportionate to what has been agreed upon for these other roads. The information I have is that it will take quite a large amount of money to put it in good repair. But if we take it over I can say to the hon. member that I shall do my best to put it in such a condition that the people along the line shall have a continuous service and better than they have had in the past. I would also like to say to the hon. members from New Brunswick, who have been urging this matter on my attention, that none of them can be blamed if these roads are not taken over because they have all done their part in urging the Government to take them over.

Mr. TURGEON: I believe that if the minister takes over any of these branch lines he will find that the Caraquet and Gulf Shore traverses a district having the greatest potentialities and from which he will in future get a more profitable traffic than from any other part of the country. None of these roads travels through a wealthier district than that traversed by the Caraquet and Gulf Shore. If he once gets possession of that line he will find its operation profitable. It is for that reason that we are so anxious to have it transferred from the company to the Government. The minister tells me that he has made an offer equal to that which he has made to the other companies in New Brunswick and that while the others have accepted offers made to them, this company has not accepted. I do not wish to say that the minister has not offered enough. I am not an engineer and I will not put my estimate upon the railway itself. I can indicate the value of the road better by estimating the traffic that is to come to it in the future than I can by putting any value on the road itself. Meanwhile I would say that perhaps if he were to put in his Estimates the price which he offers the owners of the road might be disposed, or induced, to accept it.

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not do that.

Mr. TURGEON: Then why not leave it to arbitration?

Mr. J. D. REID: No; if they do not take it now I will not put it in.

Mr. TURGEON: The minister is willing to pay the price that he says he has offered the company. The company ask for a little more.

Mr. J. D. REID: The company ask double what I offered them.

Mr. TURGEON: Even if it is double, let it be referred to arbitration and it is most likely that the decision will be on the side of the Government. If the minister is willing to spend so much for bridges, repairs and so on to put it in good condition, is it worth while, for the sake of a few thousand dollars, separating the county of Gloucester from the rest of the Dominion?

Mr. J. D. REID: They are not anxious to sell and I am not anxious to buy.

Mr. TURGEON: The minister may not be anxious to buy but in the exercise of his duty he should consider the interests of the north shore of New Brunswick as well as the interests of any other portion of the country. It is well known that in 1911 the Government of that day, at my insistent request and at the request of other members from New Brunswick, gave some attention to this question. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) coming into the House and I am very glad. I missed him during my first remarks. I will ask him to corroborate the statements I have made in his absence. I was asking if it was worth while, for the sake of a few thousand dollars, to differentiate from the rest of the country the county of Gloucester or the northern part of New Brunswick whose advantages, from the railway point of view, will, in the future, exceed those of any other district. I stated that the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway traversed an immense district in the eastern portion of Gloucester which is the wealthiest district in New Brunswick to-day. Railway traffic is assured in the abundance of those products which are the most profitable in the operation of a railway, more particularly the lumber traffic. The lumber traffic is certainly one out of which the railways can make more money than they can out of any other kind of business.

This railway traverses a district, as I have already said, where there is as yet virgin

forest, and where the great industry of agriculture has been progressing rapidly, more particularly for the last few years. As the Minister of Public Works knows, that railway, starting from Bathurst runs for a distance of 20 or 25 miles through a long-settled agricultural district inhabited by an active and enterprising population who have progressed in agriculture for the last forty years. The salmon fishing industry needs prompt railway transportation in order that its yield may be placed on the market as rapidly as possible. It is now separated from the main station at Bathurst by distances extending anywhere from ten, fifteen, twenty and thirty-five miles. The Minister of Public Works knows of the operations that are going on at Stone Haven where there is a quarry with one hundred carloads of stone ready to be transported to the province of Ontario, and which could easily double and treble its output if there was only certainty of getting those transportation facilities which have been lacking. At Caraquet there is the great fishing industry requiring the services of 256 schooners daily, and with a catch of fish easily estimated at $1,000,000 a year. No one can over-estimate the importance of this industry in helping to feed our soldiers at the front. Then there is the great lumbering industry, between Caraquet, Burnsville and Tracadie, which also is in need of proper transportation facilities. The Minister of Public Works knows that there are vast forest areas which are capable of supplying millions of tons of pulpwood to the industry at Bathurst, which has furnished a large amount of traffic for the last five or six years in that district. He knows the increased prices which the pulp company has had to pay owing to the condition of the railway, and that it has thousands of cords of pulpwood lying alongside the line which cannot at present be transported because the freight charges are too high. He knows that every statement that I am making on this subject to-night is correct, and he knows the potentialities of that district just as well as I do. He cannot say that I am exaggerating at all the possibilities of the district of which I am speaking. If, in the Prairie Provinces there was a stretch of eighty-eight miles in which a good railroad service had been lacking during the last twenty or thirty years, so that the development of the district was retarded, the farmers would long ago have insisted on the Government taking over that line and giving them a proper service for the carriage of their wheat.

If to-day the branch lines in New Brunswick are in a dilapidated condition, successive Governments of Canada in the past which allowed these companies to build the small branch lines are responsible for it, and during the past few years the people living in the districts through which they pass have been encouraged to hope that the Government would take these roads over. In 1911 the late Government introduced a Bill which passed its first reading and was awaiting the return of Parliament to undergo its second reading, providing for taking over the road of which I have been speaking, together with others. During that election the present Prime Minister, at the request of his supporters in New Brunswick, wired to Mr. Fowler, now a member of the Upper Chamber, who was at that time a candidate in Kings county, declaring that if his party were returned to power he would not depart from the Liberal policy in regard to the acquisition of branch lines in New Brunswick, but that his administration would also take over these branch lines.

An hon. MEMBER: That was an election promise.

Mr. TURGEON: That was an election promise, and it has not been carried out. During the last two or three years I have constantly urged this matter on the Minister of Railways, and have received the reply that owing to war conditions it was impossible to get the necessary money to take over these lines. I would like to say that the advent of the present Government preceded the outbreak of war. There was a period of three years before the war during which opportunity was afforded of carrying out its promise. Let me say that the conditions last winter on these branch lines were almost intolerable. It is hard enough in the case of passengers, but where freight is concerned it is almost impossible to secure any transportation. I would urge the Government, in view of the fact that it has decided to take over branch lines elsewhere, to see whether it cannot do something for New Brunswick, even if it involves some sacrifice.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not know that this item was under discussion, having been very busy in another part of the building, otherwise I would have made my appearance earlier. However, I am very glad to have listened to the remarks of my hon. friend from Gloucester (M. Turgeon) and I want to assure the committee that he is absolutely sincere in every word he has

stated. With his statement of facts that the condition of affairs which has existed with respect to the branch lines in the province of New Brunswick has become almost unbearable, I have very little quarrel indeed. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, when railway construction in Eastern Canada was fairly in its infancy, when railway communication was beginning to be called for, and the Government of the day refused to build branch lines, the people organized small companies and built them themselves.

The Intercolonial through New Brunswick, as you will observe by looking at the map, does not follow the seacoast where the settlements are, but runs some twenty-five or thirty miles away. Unfortunately, a very great portion of the central part of New Brunswick on the eastern side is not very valuable land. But along the seacoast it is valuable land, and there is a very dense population, the descendants of the old French settlers who came there a hundred and fifty years ago or more. It became necessary then to build branch lines from the main line running down to the seaboard and the Bay of Fundy, as well as on Northumberland strait and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. There were six of these roads altogether. There is another small road, built from Cross Creek, on what is now a portion of the Government railways, to the town of Stanley, in the county of York, but it is not of the same class as the six roads I have referred to. These roads all received small subsidies, probably $6,000 a mile would be the maximum amount of assistance, and in many cases much less than that. In some cases they got a Dominion subsidy of $3,200 a mile and $2,500 a mile from the province of New Brunswick. For a number of years after their construction they got along very well, until the time of replacement arrived. They had no reserves, and were not in a position to charge sufficient rates; in fact, there was not sufficient traffic to justify them in keeping the roads up to standard and they commenced to deteriorate. The result was that about ten or fifteen years ago, or a little before that period, practically all these roads went under the hammer; they were foreclosed by the bondholders and bid in by certain parties. Many of the owners of these roads have fairly large amounts of money invested in them—I know—as my hon. friend (Mr. Turgeon) says regarding the road in his constituency, that the Caraquet railway has cost the present owners quite a large amount of money; I don't know how much. We had several representatives before us a few days ago, who said they could not tell us what it did cost. However, there is no doubt that the roads cost a great deal more money than the Government is offering for them. When the late Hon. Mr. Emmerson was Minister of Railways and canals a very strong agitation sprang up to have these roads taken over by the Intercolonial, as it was then called. I have always supported that proposition, and I am on record a great many times in this House during the last fifteen years as advocating the acquisition of all branch lines by the trunk line, for the simple reason that under modern conditions it is impossible to operate branch lines successfully. I do not believe there is a place in Canada in which a branch line could be economically operated. It must become part of the main trunk line. That policy has been laid down by the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern, and by the Government railways to quite an extent. Unfortunately, however, the acquisition of these roads from the very beginning of the agitation down to a few months ago was simply used as a political football. Not an election, either provincial or federal, has been run in the province of New Brunswick in the last ten or twelve years, I am safe in saying in which the question of the acquisition of these lines has not been an issue, and both parties have used it as a football for political benefit. I do not think I am going too far when I say that some of the gentlemen who purchased these roads did so with the idea of selling them to the Government. I do know that when an attempt was made within the last five years to take over some of these roads, there was always the inevitable grafter who had to have his thirty-three and a third per cent. But the Government would not pay that and I give them all credit for not doing so.

When I became Minister of Public Works, last October, the representative of practically every one of these roads came to me to exact a promise that these roads would be taken over, and I absolutely refused to have anything to do with it or to make any promise whatever. I told them I would not be a party to holding out the purchase of these lines as an election promise, but that I would see that they were operated during the coming winter, because I believed that was necessary. I discussed the matter with my colleague the Minister of Railways, and an Order in Council was passed giving the Govern-

ment railways the right to operate these roads and supply whatever was necessary in the way of equipment, men, and even money, on the principle that the roads must be kept open. Probably it was the worst winter for railroading we have had in the Maritime Provinces for the past twenty years. But, through the activities of the railroads themselves, assisted by the Government railways, they were kept open with very few intervals. There may have been a week or two when one or another was closed down. After the election was over I asked my colleagues to adopt the policy of purchasing these branch lines, and I do not think I am revealing any confidence when I say that it took a great deal of persuasion on my part to bring them to consent to it. However, they agreed, and the Minister of Railways and myself were appointed a committee to purchase them under certain restrictions. Now, Mr. Chairman, we were bound to approach the question of the purchase of these lines, not from the standpoint of what the people had put into them, not to consider any set of men who were losing or making money, but on the principle of what the Government could afford to give. I have no hesitation in saying that they did not put back into these roads anything like what would be required by ordinary railroad management in the way of replacement. The roads had gone down in their physical condition until they were the veritable "one hoss shay"; they were ready to fall to pieces. Yet the people who owned these roads, or their predecessors, had put into them very large amounts of money. We were obliged to approach the purchase of these roads more from the standpoint of necessary accommodation to the people who lived in the locality, and anything which we offer to the owners of these roads is more in the way of a bonus for the purpose of giving accommodation to the people than as a purchase price for the railways themselves. I hope there will not be any misunderstanding as to the principle on which we approached the purchase of these roads. I admit that the amount of $2,000 a mile, which is probably the average price offered, is ridiculous when you consider what the roads have cost. I admit that every one of these companies could tear up their rails and sell them for two or three times what we are willing to pay for the roads as they stand. I believe my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) is right. However, it is a fact that they could take up the rails at the present price of steel and get—

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. TURGEON: Double.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. But we admit at once that we are not purchasing these roads from the standpoint of what they cost at all. If men in the United States and Canada have been unfortunate enough to put their money into an unprofitable venture, that is their misfortune and not ours, and we cannot under any consideration whatever attempt to reimburse these people because of their unbusinesslike venture.

We have offered these companies virtually $2,000 a mile—really only a bonus to get rid of them, and to provide that the people living along these lines may have the necessary accommodation. I think I am safe in saying that within the next two years the Government will have to spend another $2,000 a mile to make these roads passable. But the Government can operate them very much better than local companies can, because large quantities of second-hand and light equipment, both motive power and cars, which are not fit for use on the main lines, can be used on these branch lines. These small roads have practically no rolling stock. They have engines of an obsolete character, but they have practically no cars. Shippers along these lines cannot get the accommodation to which they are entitled because they cannot get cars. Naturally, the Canadian Government Railway authorities supply their own shippers with cars before they devote their attention to outsiders, and the result is that the industrial life of the northern and eastern portions of New Brunswick have been absolutely stagnant for the last ten years because of the lack of railway facilities. I make no apology, even under present financial conditions, for the policy which I have asked my colleagues to adopt in connection with these roads. We have entered into agreement to purchase four of these roads, and the matter will be submitted to the House for consideration in the form of supplementary estimates. The prices vary, but they average $2,000 a mile. The price offered for some is a little less than that; in one case, because the road was in very much worse physical condition than the others. In two cases, I think, the price slightly exceeds $2,000 a mile; in one of these cases the road is very much better equipped with rolling stock and motive power than the others. One has 67-pound rails, practically new, which will last for the next fifty years; the others have 52 and 56-pound rails. We took these things into consideration to some extent, but not wholly, because if we had regard to the value of the rails as they are to-day for

junk, we should have to pay twice as much as we are offering. We have bought three of the roads running from the main line of the Intercolonial to the sea. We have bought a fourth running from Cross Creek to Stanley in the county of York, which is not in the same category as the others; it is simply a small branch line. Then there are three others, two in Kent—the Moncton and Buctouche and the Kent Northern,—and the Caraquet Railway referred to by the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). I admit, that we have offered to the owners of the Caraquet Railway an amount which is probably less than the road cost them. But the difficulty is that the Caraquet Railway to-day is practically impossible of operation; at least $2,000 or $3,000 a mile will have to be expended on the road in order to make possible the running of a freight train over it, let alone a passenger train. We are therefore compelled to approach this subject from the standpoint not of what the road cost, but of what is the lowest amount of money which will give the 25,000 or 30,000 people in that portion of New Brunswick the railway communication to which they are entitled. Although the amount which we have offered is practically in the form of a bonus, it is really more than the Government ought to offer, from a strict business standpoint. The member for Gloucester has given this matter more consideration, probably, than any member of the House, during the last ten or twelve years, and he is entitled to my views on the subject. I have certainly been very frank with him. I hope that the owners of the road running through his good county will see their way clear to accept our terms. Not one of these roads has made a dollar during the last ten years, if you take into consideration the amount necessary for replacements. They have made a little money—from $1,000 to $5,000 a year—but they have made it only by starving the roads and putting them in such a condition that they are now practically impassable. The question for these gentlemen to consider is whether they will hang on to a venture in which they have put a good deal of money and from which they get no revenue, or whether they will transfer them to the Government for a very small amount of cash from which they can get a revenue. Of course, if they will not take what we offer them, we will not buy. But we shall have to adopt some measure to keep these roads going. As long as I remain in this Government, those roads are going to run, in order that the people in that part of the province may get proper railway communication. If we cannot deal with these gentlemen in one way, we will deal with them in another. In any case, we are not going to make them a present of a large amount of money.

Mr. McKENZIE: How can the minister keep the roads going unless he gets money from the companies to operate them? He cannot take the people's money to run private roads.

Mr. CARVELL: Very strong powers are conferred under the War Measures Act. Anyway, I repeat, these roads shall run, and we will not pay the fancy prices they want for them, either.

Mr. TURGEON: I thank the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) for the frank statement which he has made and for his corroboration of what I have said concerning the wealth of the district through which the Caraquet railway runs and the necessities of the people in that part of New Brunswick. He says that these roads must be operated. I submit that the county of Gloucester has as much right to consideration at the hands of the Government in this respect as any other portion of the province. I shall not repeat what I have said on this subject. The minister knows the needs of the district, he knows the conditions, and I can only hope that this matter will receive his consideration, his attention and his sympathy. But if the Government cannot come to terms with the company, expropriation proceedings should be commenced and a board of arbitration appointed to determine the value. Then, if the company are to be the losers, let them be the losers.

Mr. CARVELL: We have offered the Caraquet Railway Company more money per mile for their road than we have offered the owners of any other branch line in New Brunswick. My hon. friend, therefore, may feel assured that no discrimination has been exercised against the railway in his county. I can go further and say that none of the seven roads is in as deplorable a state physically as the Caraquet railway.

Mr. TURGEON: I understand that the minister does not desire to discriminate. The Prime Minister pointed out only yesterday that when it came to acquiring and determining the value of large railway systems in which enormous amounts of money have been invested, arbitration was the best solution. This principle applies to small

lines as well as the big ones, to a matter of $1,000 as well as to a matter of $1,000,000. The Department of Railways, in the interest of the people, should expropriate the road. The company have charters by which they are bound to operate the road, and they have received subsidies in order that they may be able to construct and equip the road so as to give satisfactory transportation facilities to that district. If the Government expropriate the road, the company will have to accept whatever sum is decided upon under the expropriation proceedings. If the Government should put the matter into the hands of Judge Cassels or Judge Audette, of the Exchequer Court—I care not which—or anyone else, the result will be satisfactory to the people and to the Government.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I was surprised to hear the Minister of Public Works speaking about acquiring branch lines. We have as a feeder for the Intercolonial the Témiscouata railway which, as the minister knows very well, is a paying road connecting River du Loup with Connors, New Brunswick. I remember a commission was some years ago sent down to the Maritime Provinces to investigate which lines should be acquired as feeders for the Intercolonial as being paying concerns for the road. If I am not mistaken, the Témiscouata railway was one of the best paying roads, and it should have been acquired at the time. I do not know why it has not been purchased. The farmers along that road are at present obliged to pay very high rates for transportation, and if the road was acquired by the Intercolonial, the people along the road would be benefited as well as the Intercolonial itself. I want to ask the Minister of Railways why that road was not acquired. He has in contemplation the purchase of branch lines which are not paying propositions. It is true the acquisition of those roads will be of benefit for the people, but they will mean an expense to the Intercolonial. On the other hand, the acquisition of the Témiscouata railway will be a paying concern as a feeder for the Intercolonial.

I wish to draw the minister's attention to a little matter in connection with the Intercolonial which is causing annoyance. This particular case will give him an instance of what is going on along the Intercolonial in my constituency. A fire started at Isle Verte on the Intercolonial some three years ago, and fences were burned. During those three years I have asked and written and done everything possible, but while the posts have been put up, the wire is rusting on the ground and the fence is not yet completed.

Mr. J. D. REID: Is that on the Intercolonial?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Yes. Last fall I took the trouble to go to the station, and I asked the roadmaster to put up the fence for the protection of the cattle, because the farmers did not dare to put their cattle there, as they might be killed by passing trains. The roadmaster said: We have no orders for that work; we have men for work on the tracks, but we have not labourers to do that work. Surely the Intercolonial can find labourers to fix a little piece of work like that. Although it is a small matter, it is annoying to the farmers and to the member, and we are, therefore, obliged to annoy the minister.

Mr. J. D. REID: What station is that at?

Mr. GAUVREAU: At Isle Verte, the chief place in the county of Temiscouata. I hope, when I get home on the 22nd day of May, after prorogation, I shall find that orders have been given to procure labourers to complete that small piece of work.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know whether the hon. member brought this matter to my attention before.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I would not bother the minister in regard to such a small matter as that.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am glad my hon. friend has brought the matter to my attention now. I shall take it up with the management and ascertain the facts and see why the work has not been done. I do not agree with the hon. member that he should not bring it to my attention. After three years there must be some good reason why they have not gone on with this work, and I agree with the hon. member that within that period there surely must have been a time when they could have got some one to do the work.

With reference to the purchase of the Témiscouata Railway, the hon. member says that that railway is kept in good condition and operated successfully, and that the people in that locality are well served by the road. I am not going around trying to buy railways. The trouble is that these railways that we are taking over are in such a condition that they cannot operate, they must close down unless assistance is given. We were compelled, therefore, as I stated a few minutes ago, to pass an Order in Council authorizing the Canadian Government Railways to operate them on their behalf.

Those railways are really going to close down unless something is done, and that is the reason why we are compelled to take them over. As the Témiscouata Railway is being operated successfully in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, we are quite satisfied that the company should continue to operate the road and make money out of it. If it is a paying road, the shareholders will not want to part with it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: What about the farmers?

Mr. J. D. REID: The farmers, as the hon. member states, are well served by the road, and so far as the rates are concerned, I suppose the Témiscouata railway is under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and, therefore, no exorbitant rates can be charged. My hon. friend probably feels that rates are lower on the Intercolonial. I think the rates are about the same on the Intercolonial as on other roads. If not, they should be, and so far as rates and protection from fire service on the Intercolonial are concerned, we are in about the same position as the other railways, and during this war we do not want to buy the Témiscouata Railway or any other road if they can operate without assistance from the Government.

Mr. COPP: I did not notice in the statement made by the minister any reference to the number of accidents and collisions on the Government railways, and the loss of life and the damage to property thereby occasioned, during the last year's operations.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not those figures with me, but I could have them here when the Supplementary Estimates are up.

Mr. COPP: I think it would be well to have statistical information in regard to those matters. Referring to the minister's statement, I presume that in "construction betterments" includes improvements to station houses, railway yards, and things of that kind. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, replying to the hon. member for Gloucester, told us that he made a promise to the electors of New Brunswick during the last election that the branch lines would be operated last winter. I do not know how fully he has implemented that promise, but I do know that a number of the branch lines were not in operation throughout the winter, and I presume my hon. friend the member for St. John, who during the election campaign was forced to drive from Moncton to the county of Albert, will agree that the line running into part of his constituency was not very much in operation during that period. I am not blaming the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Railways, but I should like to have the minister assure us that the main line of the Intercolonial at least will be kept in operation next winter. It certainly was not kept in operation last winter, and I presume the Minister of Railways will say that that was because they were short of motive power.

Mr. J. D. REID: We had all the motive power we wanted.

Mr. COPP: If that is so, the minister did not make a very great success of the operation of the road last winter. Of course it may have been impossible to do any better. I am not a railway expert, but I know that the conditions in our part of the province of New Brunswick were very unsatisfactory indeed. So much by way of general criticism.

Now I wish to call the minister's attention to what is going on at Sackville, which is the junction point of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway that was recently taken over by the Government. That road was in bad condition when it was taken over, to connect up with Cap Tormentine and the car ferry running to Prince Edward Island, but improvements, which were very much needed, have since been made in order to handle the freight between Sackville and Cap Tormentine over this thirty-six miles of road. When communication was established last fall, the Railway Department was not in a position to handle the traffic. I suppose it did not realize how great the volume of that traffic was going to be. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said, it perhaps little knew the great productivity of the province at the other end of the car ferry. At all events, the road was simply overwhelmed with traffic, and there was no place to put the freight cars. Passenger trains were held up for an hour at a time because the main line was blocked with freight cars. I am not complaining, because as I have said, no doubt the officials of the railway did not realize the amount of traffic that would come over the line. What I do complain of is that now, when preparations are being made for that traffic, when new sidings and roundhouses are being constructed, exactly the same thing is being done in the town of Sackville as occurred in the city of Moncton. The terminal facilities that are being provided are

not one-quarter the size they should be to handle the traffic that will develop in a very short time. To-day, shunting engines and trains are holding up traffic in the principal streets of the town of Sackville. It is a nuisance already, and the Board of trade and the town council of Sackville are taking steps to remove the nuisance. The work that is being done there now will have to be thrown away in a few years, and new arrangements made for the traffic to go overhead or by subway. I tell the minister that his officials are only half doing the job, because the traffic, instead of decreasing, will increase year by year. I would urge the minister to have this matter investigated, because I can assure him that before the snow flies next winter delegations will be waiting on him to insist that something be done to overcome this nuisance of the trains crossing the main streets of the town of Sackville, and now is the time, before the Government has spent a large sum of money, to make adequate preparations for the traffic that will develop down there in the next two or three years.

There is another matter I wish to refer to, and I am sure the minister does not know anything about it. I was very much surprised, when I went home last week for a day or two, to find contractors already on the ground at Sackville excavating for an extension to the station house. Some seven or eight years ago the old station house was burnt down and a splendid stone building was erected in its place. Imagine my surprise the other day when I found that to provide additional accommodation the Government were excavating for a common wooden building as an extension to the beautiful stone station at Sackville. The stone building was practically fireproof, but now the Government are going to put up a wooden building and run the risk of it burning down the whole station. That seems to me most unbusinesslike. I am told—I cannot vouch for this, but I have no doubt it is true—that the Sackville Board of Trade went to the city of Moncton and interviewed the railway authorities there, and what do you think that delegation was told? I hate to repeat it, because I cannot realize how a member of any board of trade would listen to such a thing. The railway officials told them they were going to put up a wooden building now, and build stone around it at some other time. When I was leaving the station the other day I said to the man who was doing the excavating, "I suppose you are putting in a very solid foundation." He said, "No, it does not require a heavy foundation, because it is only for a small building." I said: "They are going to build stone around this?" He said, "Are they? That is all you know about it." That is what is going on. It is a small matter and the minister does not know about it probably, but it does seem a ridiculous proposition to build a wooden extension to a stone building. It destroys the beauty of the surroundings and I doubt if it will not cost more to build it with wood than to continue it with stone.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know nothing about the situation. I have never been in Sackville.

Mr. COPP: Come down with me when I go home.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall make inquiries as to what they are doing there. I have not had an opportunity of going over the Intercolonial system, but as soon as the House prorogues, or within a few days afterwards, it is my intention to take a trip over the road and this is one of the things I will look into.

Mr. LEGER: I am not here to represent the speculators or the branch-line owners, but I am here to represent the people who are served by these branch lines. The answers given to the questions put before the Government were not altogether satisfactory to me, with the exception of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) that these branch lines would be operated. I understood the Government had power to force these companies to run these roads to the satisfaction of the people and of the Government. If that is the case it will be satisfactory. The people who live from twenty-five to one hundred miles away from the Intercolonial are certainly entitled to some consideration on the part of the Government. I am not here to discuss politics, but I am here to discuss the interests of the people whom I represent, and who contributed their share to the building of the Intercolonial, which serves those living within a certain distance of each side of the road. But those living at a distance from the road and on the shores, farmers and fishermen who are trying to make a living out of their industry, should have the advantage of railway transportation in order to be able to market their products to the best advantage. They have to sell their products at a lower price because of the high freight rates. If it is left in the hands of the owners of these roads, and if nothing is

done to better the situation, I cannot see how it is going to end. I would suggest that the Government take charge of these roads, as they have the power to take over any property that in the public interest it may be necessary for them to acquire. If they cannot agree upon the price they have a way of taking over these roads by expropriation. Let them, then, expropriate the roads. Whether people are engaged in fishing or agriculture, we are anxious to give them every encouragement. I believe it is the duty of the Government to take steps to serve the people throughout the country as best they can and in such a way as to promote their interest and the public welfare generally.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to criticise the Minister of Railways for his generosity towards the branch lines in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—

Mr. McKENZIE: He has not touched Nova Scotia yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have heard discussions during every session I have been in Parliament about acquiring branch lines in New Brunswick. But my hon. friend does not move very fast. He remains in the Maritime provinces and does not seem to reach Quebec.

Mr. J. D. REID: I started at the eastern end.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You are not coming on the flyer. I happen to represent, concurrently with the county of Maisonneuve, the county of Gaspé, and I consider Gaspé as one of the Maritime Provinces. In the beginning of the last century, Gaspé was a province by itself. It was only by the Act of 1791, if I mistake not, that Gaspé was annexed to the province of Quebec, and for a certain length of time I think it was a part of New Brunswick. We had a governor in Gaspé at one time. It is a very large and a most beautiful peninsula. We have the Baie de Chaleur, another Mediterranean sea with the Alps in the background. If my hon. friend goes there next summer we will prepare a fine reception for him. Unfortunately we have no Monte Carlo for his enjoyment.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have been at Gaspé.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Government, at the time of Confederation, promised the Intercolonial railway to the Maritime provinces. They built the Intercolonial with the understanding that a branch line should be extended from Matapedia to Gaspé basin, a distance of 200 miles. In 1877 or 1878 the Government of Sir John Macdonald started a branch line from Matapedia towards Gaspé, built about 20 miles and then left it. The Government handed over that branch to a private company that was incorporated under the name of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, and which had quite a history. That company built as far as New Carlisle and Paspebiac, a distance of 100 miles. The road was very poorly built, and the company left behind it, on both sides of the road, lots of debts. These are partly paid to-day, but there are many people rather dissatisfied with the fact that the company which has acquired the old road has not found it possible to pay the remaining balances. In 1899-1900 I induced another company to take over the charter and to build as far as Gaspé Basin. As in the old Northwest, where the Hudson's Bay Company was not too pleased to see the advent of white men and the progress of civilization, so in the peninsula of Gaspé, the firm of Robin Collas and company was not pleased to view the construction of the railway. For many years, indeed since 1867, they had prevented the Government from building a road, and had made all sorts of trouble for the company which finally undertook its construction. This firm did not want the local fishermen to have access to the other centres of the Dominion; in fact, it kept in bondage the fishermen of Gaspé and Bonaventure counties for over a century. That firm came to Canada before the British domination; it has prospered greatly and has accomplished a great deal in that section of the country, and all over the north shore, but it was opposed, for reasons of its own, to railway construction. In 1900, as I said a moment ago, I induced an English syndicate to construct the remaining one hundred miles, and that syndicate built a very excellent road in the English fashion—they had English engineers and they did not spare money. The syndicate spent about $3,000,000 on that one hundred miles of railway, which compares most favourably with the first one hundred miles. Unfortunately they had some financial troubles, and the bondholders took over the property, and leased the other road running from Matapedia to Paspebiac. I am pleased to say that the road has been well administered under Mr. Gordon, the present manager, who has succeeded in making both ends meet. However, the people feel that this road should be acquired by the Intercolonial, of which it is a feeder. As I said a moment ago, the road is admirably ad-

ministered, the trains are running regularly, and under the present management the line is paying its own expenses, but the first 100 miles would have to be practically rebuilt, and this work ought to be done by the Government. While the present war conditions prevail, I do not wish to impose on my hon. friend's shoulders an additional burden, and I do not ask the Government to take over that road now, but there is on the statute book legislation which would enable that to be done. I hope that when the war is over and financial conditions have improved the Government will accord that section of the country what is due to it. There are a number of thriving industries in that district. First of all, we have the fisheries, then there is the pulp industry—which is developed to a considerable degree—and of late a group of Montreal financiers, I think it is the Lyall syndicate, have been exploiting a copper mine which was discovered some few years ago between Newport and New Carlisle, and which promises to create in that locality a very prosperous mining enterprise. If the Government intends to follow up the policy of acquiring branch lines— and I do not begrudge what is being done for New Brunswick and for the western prairies—it should not lose sight of the fact that the peninsula of Gaspé is entitled to consideration. For, let it be remembered, it is the oldest section in the country. When Jacques Cartier ascended the river St. Lawrence he planted a cross at Gaspé at a spot which I have visited several times. So it seems to me that if we are to consider the proprieties, the oldest spot in the country should be best served. But we are not so ambitious as to press that point. We realize that in view of the present war conditions we should not be unduly insistent, and we are willing to wait until the present great struggle is ended. But I would like my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to inspect that road some time this summer, and judge for himself of the conditions of that section of the country. It is the most interesting section of Canada, and I am quite sure that whenever the policy of acquiring branch lines is brought to a head, my hon. friend will make up his mind that the peninsula of Gaspé should receive his attention.

Another point and I shall have concluded. Some years ago an old gentleman, a friend of the Minister of Railways, named Paradis, was the owner of a sawmill in the vicinity of St. Joseph of Lévis, in front of Quebec. This old gentleman was very well off and very enterprising, and was engaged, as is the French Canadian custom, in raising a large family. He was mayor of his parish, warden of the county, and had once or twice been offered the Conservative nomination, but had declined because of business reasons.

One night a train passed his property and some sparks were emitted from the engine which destroyed the property, razing it completely. Between the evening and the morning this old patriot was completely ruined. He came to Ottawa and a commissioner was appointed to investigate the cause of the fire. Mr. Justice Audette, who was not then, I believe, in the Exchequer Court, was appointed commissioner. He made a report which I read two or three years ago, and he found that the fire had been caused by the sparks from a locomotive belonging to the Intercolonial Railway; indeed, he specified the hour of the night and gave the number of the locomotive. It was proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the department was responsible. Now this old gentleman is very persistent I must say; he belongs to the Norman race.

Mr. J. D. REID: No doubt about that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He would not yield very easily. He is now eighty years old. The fire occurred eight or ten years ago. My hon. friend, I must say in good faith, after having listened to him, after having read the evidence and the report, offered him, I believe, $10,000. First, he was offered nothing, as usual, not by my hon. friend, but by his predecessor in office. Then he was offered, I think, $5,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The old gentleman refused it. And this year, I am informed, my hon. friend, honest as he is, offered the old gentleman $20,000. The old man has again refused; he is more persistent than I am, because I think I would have accepted the $20,000. But his persistency shows the good faith and honesty of this old gentleman. He has been waiting all these years. It seems to me that my hon. friend should not wait until this venerable man goes down to his grave before a settlement is arrived at. And I hope that the Minister of Railways and Canals will see to it that a fair settlement is made and that the old man can return to Levis and live happy until the Lord calls him to his bosom. I leave it at that, expecting my hon. friend to settle this case as soon as possible.

Mr. J. D. REID: With reference to the first matter the hon. member mentioned.

Of course, the Gaspé railroad is operating and has not asked us for any assistance. I agree that after the war, when the proper times comes, we should look into the question of acquiring that road. I have been at Gaspé and know the locality. It is certainly an industrious place. I will take up the question when the opportune time arrives. With reference to the case of Mr. Paradis, as the hon. member has stated, this gentleman is very persistent. When I first had to do with this case, my predecessor had offered him $10,000. Mr. Paradis came along and I raised it to $12,500. Last year, when he was at me again, I raised it to $15,000. This year he came to Ottawa within the last two or three weeks, and I was willing to submit $17,000 or $17,500.

Mr. CARVELL: The cost of living is going up.

Mr. J. D. REID: However, I feel that it is a claim—

Mr. LEMIEUX: An equitable claim.

Mr. J. D. REID:—and it should be dealt with. But really the amount asked for by the old gentleman every time is so high that it is almost an impossibility to come down to any reasonable amount.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is his last offer?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think that $76,000 was what he asked me the other day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course, he had a splendid property.

Mr. J. D. REID: I admit that he had a good property. I proposed to him the other day that I would submit this matter to a subcommittee of council, and consider it with some of my colleagues when we had time to go into the whole matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What does he say to that?

Mr. J. D. REID: He went away perfectly satisfied. It was an impossibility to deal with it before the session closed, so I told him that I would bring it before a committee of council and go thoroughly into the matter so that I could explain it to council, and then we would come to a conclusion as to what we thought was fair and just.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will you let me select the subcommittee?

Mr. MORPHY: How many acres is the old gentleman working, and what buildings were burned?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was in the lumber business.

Mr. J. D. REID: The claim is for a very large sawmill, and a very, very large quantity of lumber. He claims that $45,000 represents the loss, and he has added interest at compound rates during the ten years or so. There is no doubt at all that Mr. Paradis lost at that time equal to about $45,000.

Mr. MORPHY: Why did the previous Government not adjust it?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think according to the law he could hardly claim it. It is hard to prove that the fire originated from a spark from an engine which passed at the time. A train passed through his property half an hour before the fire, and he could not prove that the fire was caused by a spark from the engine.

Mr. MORPHY: What did the commissioner find?

Mr. J. D. REID: He found that the fire was caused by a spark from the engine.

Mr. MORPHY: What did he find the loss was?

Mr. J. D. REID: He was not asked to bring in a statement as to the amount. If I remember correctly the commissioner was simply asked to report whether the fire was caused by a spark from the engine and it was to be left to the department to decide what amount they should pay. That is the way the case has remained ever since.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps I might explain. As the law stood at the time of the fire, under the Government Railways Act, the Intercolonial was not responsible unless the fire originated on the right of way and extended to the property destroyed. About two months, I believe, after this loss occurred, the law was changed to bring it into conformity with the general law of Canada. My hon. friend will probably remember that there was a case in Ontario between the Grand Trunk and another party whose name I have forgotten, which went through the courts, and in which it was held that the railway company was responsible. About two months afterwards, following out the decision in that case, the law was changed so far as the Government railways were concerned. Had that fire taken place two or three months later than it did, there would have been no question whatever about the old man's right to recover.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: In looking over the items for public works and improvements, I find that no amount has been provided for the works in Quebec city, although we are asked to provide many millions for works in different parts of the country. It has been said that the works in Quebec as well as other works throughout the country should not be proceeded with during the war. But surely some of the important works in Quebec city should be proceeded with. An agreement was made between the Federal Government and the city of Quebec in August, 1910, under which the city of Quebec handed over to the Government a property valued at over $2,000,000 in connection with the works in that city. I submit that these works are urgent and essential, in the interest not only of the city and the province of Quebec but of the whole of Canada as well. Large sums of money have already been spent on the terminals in Quebec for equipment of the Transcontinental and for the building of the Transcontinental shops. These shops have now been finished nearly two years, but are lying idle. Some time ago I learned with pleasure that the Government had decided to give contracts for the supplying of 7,500 cars for the Transcontinental railway. I hoped at that time that some of these cars would be built in the Transcontinental shops at Quebec, which were designed for the purpose of doing such work. But all the contracts were given outside; nothing was provided for Quebec. The citizens of Quebec and the board of trade of that city have sent many requests to the Government in this matter during the last few years, but nothing has been done. We had the pleasure of having in our city in October, 1913, the Prime Minister and his colleagues, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Hazen, who all conceded that these works were of great importance and should be proceeded with at once. On that occasion the Prime Minister laid the cornerstone of the St. Malo shops and of the works on the St. Charles river, and visited other important works. But all these works have been stopped and nothing is provided in the Estimates for their continuation. The city of Quebec is not asking for any favour. We are simply asking the Government to give that portion of the country its rights and to carry out the agreement made. At least a reasonable amount should be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to carry out some of the works, to provide equipment for the Transcontinental Railway at Quebec, to proceed with the terminal works, in order that the Transcontinental may take care of the great traffic from the West which should pass through Quebec. It is well known that two-thirds of the grain from the West is now shipped through United States ports instead of through Quebec or other Canadian ports, because of lack of proper terminal and other Canadian ports, because of lack of proper terminal and other accommodation. I ask the Minister of Railways to look into this matter and see that justice is done to the city of Quebec.

Mr. J. D. REID: I realize that the St. Malo shops would be much better if we had them working, but I could not see my way clear, under present war conditions, to spend a lot of money on these shops at this time when the work could be satisfactorily done in many other places. Matters in connection with railways at Quebec will have to be taken up and dealt with now that we have taken over the Canadian Northern Railway system. I have not had an opportunity yet of looking over the matter, but I shall be in Quebec within the next four weeks and will look into the whole situation there with a view to seeing what should be done in the interests of the railways as a whole.

Mr. PARENT: I congratulate the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Lavigueur) for having directed the attention of the committee to the needs of the city of Quebec, especially so far as the Transcontinental railway is concerned. It is stated in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the fiscal year 1916-7 that part of the line between Moncton and Winnipeg has been productive of good results.

The only thing for which I am sorry is that this report does not indicate which part of the line has the best showing. It does not show what that part of the line between Moncton and Quebec has been earning, or what the part of the line between Quebec and Winnipeg has been earning. The report says that the working expenses amounted to $7,206,922.20, and the gross earnings to $5,916,550.99, leaving a deficit of $1,290,371.21. If we take into consideration the remarks which have recently been made by the Prime Minister to the effect that most of the railways in Canada have been working under very unfavourable circumstances, due to war conditions, material and equipment of railways having doubled in price, the result obtained by that part of the Transcontinental is, after

all, a pretty fair one. Fortunately, what the report does not contain has been obtained from the minister in answer to a question put to him by the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Lavigueur), and I find that the revenue on the line from Quebec to Moncton is $1,538,764, and the revenue on the line from Quebec to Winnipeg is $4,226,018.

Mr. J. D. REID: It cost about twice as much as that to operate it. There is a big loss.

Mr. PARENT: Some years ago I had a seat in this House when the question of the Transcontinental was very much debated, and there was a good deal of opposition to that part of the line from hon. gentlemen who were, at that time, sitting on the opposition side of the House. Remarks were made in particular to this effect, that the line running through the northern part of the province from Quebec to Cochrane would never prove a paying proposition. Since that line has been built it has opened up a very wealthy part of the province of Quebec, where thousands and thousands of settlers have already established themselves and where immense wealth in the way of pulpwood lies ready for the market. If this line has not brought better results, I think the minister will probably find that the reason is that the equipment is not sufficient to take care of all the traffic coming from that part of the country. The settlers of the Abitibi region have complained over and over again that it is impossible for them to ship their pulpwood. All along the line from La Reine, Amos, and the different settlements in that district, thousands and thousands of cords of wood are lying, unable to be shipped. If we had had a little more equipment, much more revenue could have been derived from that road. The revenue obtained by the road has been obtained without the railway having had an opportunity to meet either of the two purposes for which it was built. These purposes were, first, to decrease the cost of freight on wheat from the West, and secondly, to ensure ocean freight for our Canadian ports. Has this been obtained? I say without the slightest hesitation, no. The figures in regard to exports have not been given by my hon. friend from Quebec county, but I have a few here which I want to place upon Hansard. The exports of grain from Fort William and Port Arthur are as follows:

	To Canadian Ports. Bushels.	To United States Ports. Bushels.
For the twelve months ending December 31, 1914..	91,000,000	138,000,000
For the twelve months ending December 31, 1915..	88,000,000	117,000,000
For the twelve months ending 1st September, 1916.. 138,000,000		193,000,000

How is it that the line in question has not been equipped so that the grain of the West could have been shipped through Canadian ports? In my opinion, the Government which came into power in 1911 deliberately conducted matters so as to discredit this line against which they have always had a grudge, and they did not take steps to equip properly this part of the road, in order that the grain might be diverted to United States ports to the detriment of Canadian ports. Of the ports of Halifax, St. John and Quebec, the one that has most reason to complain is Quebec. We have year after year had promises from different Governments, and every time that the matter seemed to be about to come to a head, a change of Government occurred, and the new Administration immediately upset all the doings of the previous Administration. In 1911, the whole situation in Quebec was very clear and well prepared for the future of the city, when suddenly the Liberal Government went out of power and the new Government that took office afterwards changed the whole situation. We have that instanced especially in the case of the Transcontinental terminals at Quebec. As my hon. friend (Mr. Lavigueur), who is the mayor of Quebec, stated a few minutes ago, the city of Quebec in 1911 entered into a contract with the Government of Canada by which a beautiful property situated on the St. Lawrence front, a property which was valued at least $2,000,000, was handed over to the Transcontinental Commission for the very modest sum of $100,000, on the condition that the Government would spend in the city of Quebec a sum of not less than $2,000,000 in the way of repair shops and other equipment. The engineers of the Government and the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, which was vitally interested in the project, had given their consent to all those proposed improvements. They had decided that the shops of the Transcontinental would be on the heights of St. Foy. The

land had already been prepared; a roundhouse had already been constructed; everything was settled; when suddenly in 1911 the Liberal Government went out of power and the Conservatives took office. At once the agreement entered into between the city of Quebec and the Transcontinental Commission was thrown aside. The whole project was changed and the shops were diverted from St. Foy to St. Malo, six miles from the main line. I am not complaining about the shops being at St. Malo, although the wisdom of that is disputed, but as they have been built there, the least we can expect from the Government is that the shops shall not remain idle. The shops were erected two years ago, yet they have no machinery in them yet. I say the shops should be working for the benefit of the Transcontinental Railway. The Prime Minister stated in a speech delivered in the city of Quebec in 1913—at which time the present Minister of Railways was in the Cabinet—that the shops would be of benefit to the Transcontinental and the city of Quebec. The only thing that was required to be done, he said, was to build a tunnel from the St. Lawrence water front through the mountain in order to reach the St. Malo shops. In order that there may be no doubt as to what the Prime Minister said at that time, I quote his actual words:

> The site originally selected at St. Foy will nevertheless be utilized in the first instance for a large through freight yard which is necessary at that point in order to provide for the distribution of cars on different roads. Moreover, a large handsome station has been completed at St. Foy as well as an eighteen stall engine house and every building necessary for the efficient operation of the railway. Between the Quebec Bridge and the Champlain Market a double track has practically been completed. There is also a connection with the Canadian Northern Railway at Cap Rouge, which permits entrance to the St. Charles side of the city, and which can be utilized for this purpose pending the completion of the tunnel that will connect the St. Lawrence waterfront with the new Union Station on the Palais site. While that tunnel is essential to the National Transcontinental railway for effective access to the Union Station and to the St. Charles side, it will be equally necessary to other great railway systems which will naturally require access to the great frontage terminal of the St. Lawrence.

The Prime Minister in those words pledged himself to the construction of a tunnel with a view to giving access to the St. Malo shops. I would ask any member who wishes to satisfy himself whether the pledge of the Prime Minister in this respect was carried out, to come to the city of Quebec and see conditions for himself. No tunnel has been built, and I venture to say that no tunnel ever will be built. I would urge the Minister of Railways to take a special interest in that matter, for there is no other city in Canada that would tolerate the situation that exists in Quebec at the present time. The shops are there without machinery and with no work for them to do; it is an intolerable situation. The minister can do what he likes with the shops. If he prefers to hand them over to the Canadian Pacific railway, which was apparently the intention in connection with all railway improvements in the city of Quebec, let him do so, and then we shall not have to complain, because the Canadian Pacific railway will use the shops.

Mr. CAHILL: I should like to ask a question as to the policy of the Government with regard to guarantees by the provinces. There was nothing in the Prime Minister's statement to indicate what action would be taken as between the provinces and the Dominion when the liabilities of the Canadian Northern railway were taken over. The province of Quebec comprises about one-quarter of the population of this country, and they have very little of the Canadian Northern liabilities either directly or indirectly, until the Government takes over the obligations of that road, and then, on a per capita basis, the province of Quebec would be liable to a quarter of the total obligations. The county I have the honour to represent built a road some years ago and gave a bonus, and is still paying a bonus, with something like $100,000 yet to run. They have now been saddled with an additional 15 per cent rate on their traffic; they are paying the bonus, and they will assume their part of the deficits when the obligations of the Canadian Northern are taken over. Now I think the Government should go into this whole question and determine what position the towns or counties or portions of a province that have bonused or are bonusing railroads will be in, what their relationship will be to the whole railway proposition, and in what relationship the provinces which have guaranteed bonds will stand to the Dominion as a whole. I hope it will not be adopted as the policy of the Government that they will assume all the liabilities of the different provinces that have been on a sort of spree in railroad building, to the detriment of other provinces that have not so many railroads. The province of Quebec, for instance, has only one mile of railway to every four hundred people. The Dominion as a whole has a mile to every two hundred people, and some of

the western provinces have less than one hundred people to the mile. It would hardly be fair that the provinces should be relieved of all their obligations by way of guarantees unless it is the policy of the Government that when Quebec, for instance, or some other province, wishes to build a road they may guarantee bonds on the understanding that the Dominion Government will relieve them of the responsibility of their guarantee. Otherwise you will have, perhaps not the province of Quebec, but some other province, guaranteeing bonds in the future as in the past in the expectation that the Dominion Government will relieve them of the responsibility when it gets too heavy. I think that is a suggestion which should receive the serious consideration of the Government before developing in any way their railway policy.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Dominion Government must, of course, protect any securities that are against the Canadian Northern. As to the general policy of the Government the hon. gentleman cannot expect any announcement from me at the present time. When we sit down to consider the whole situation, questions of this kind will naturally arise, and during the recess we shall have time to consider them, and then at another session we shall be able to give more information on the whole situation. I would like to emphasize this point: When the Government takes over the stock it takes over the whole road and must assume any obligations that are against the Canadian Northern railway, and it will do that. If there are any claims against the Canadian Northern of any kind, they will have to be dealt with either by the courts, by negotiation, or by settlement if the accounts are fair and just. I do not think I could add anything to what the Prime Minister has said as to the general railway policy. We want to get a good board of directors, of able men, and lay the facts before them, and then the questions can be dealt with as they arise.

Mr. McKENZIE: I regret that the discussions we have on this side of the House seem to be regarded by hon. gentlemen on the other side only with Christian toleration. I see a somewhat amused and contemptuous smile on their faces when we talked about the Intercolonial and railway matters in the far East. I want to remind my hon. friends from Ontario and the West that they have no better customers in the world than the miners and steel workers of Cape Breton and the lumbermen of Nova Scotia, that their pork, beef, bacon, flour, farm implements and everything they manufacture goes down to these very excellent customers from whom they get their money and to whom they get their products by means of these railways. When we are discussing railways hon. gentlemen from the West and from Ontario must not suppose that we are discussing a matter in which they have no concern. We hear uneasy "hear, hears" about passing these items because they do not understand exactly the importance of the subjects that we are discussing. I congratulate the province of New Brunswick upon having a minister who looks after the interests of that province. I hope he will have some success in railway matters. I am sorry that in Nova Scotia it is left to an Opposition member like myself to say anything in the interest of that province. We have the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) but he is too busy, of course, to give any attention to such small details as the railway affairs of that province. We have the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) whose world affairs also are of such a character as to remove him from being concerned about such trifling matters as the accommodation of the people in the way of railway facilities. It, therefore, falls inevitably upon such men as the Opposition members, who have no very great power with the present Government, to get such votes and such considerations as are necessary for railway development in Nova Scotia.

We are now developing largely as railway owners in our country and the management and working of railways is a matter that every member should know something about. It is getting to be important. The minister tells us that we have something like 4,000 miles of road apart from the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is right.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is important for the people that we should have some conception of what we are doing. If this were a meeting of directors it would not be a very cheerful one. The directors and shareholders would have discovered that we were spending away up in the millions in the development and working of the road but that we have made no money. We are in debt. If we were ordinary directors and shareholders of a road we would have to put our hands down in our pockets to find money in order to make betterments and to run the road, and that would not be a cheerful prospect. However we are new beginners in this enterprise. I was never in favour of

Government ownership; I am not in favour of it now; as I think private enterprise will do better in these matters. Particularly in colonization and development, will private enterprise and private energy do much better than Government ownership. But, by the force of circumstances, we are in this net and we must stay in it and make the most of it—that is the way I view it. While a great railway like the Canadian Pacific is being conducted privately we have something to compare our works with. It would be interesting for myself as a citizen of Canada and a member of this House to know how our expenses per mile of operation, for merely running the road, compare with the expenses of the Canadian Pacific. It would be interesting to know how our expenses for betterments, for keeping the road in repair, for rolling stock and all other requirements, compare with those of the Canadian Pacific. Everybody admits that their road is well managed and that it is well equipped. It is making money. It is in the same country side by side with ours, and there is no reason why we should not have just as brainy and as capable men to run our road as they have. I would expect the Minister of Railways to come to this House and make a favourable comparison between his railway and the privately owned line and to be able to show that he is making money. There is no reason why the Canadian people should not "make one hand wash the other," or should keep in debt to the extent we are in debt this year. Of course, we are new beginners and we have to pay for our experience. I do not wish to say anything disagreeable to the minister about the operations of this year. But I must say, in justice to the county and to the part of the province I represent, that we are not treated properly in railway development. We have heard about bad railways, poor railways, narrow gauges and roads which are not properly equipped. That is bad enough and it is to be hoped that something will be done to better that condition. But I come from an old county, the county in which the famous discoverer landed some three or four hundred years ago—Cabot is supposed to have landed in Victoria. We have had settlers in that county since then, but we have never had a mile of railway. My settlers and my people are 100 to 120 miles away from any railway. That is the condition—not a bad railway, which is bad enough, but no railway at all, which is worse. We thought that in 1911 we had the whole thing in our fist, that we were all ready to start building the road: The very first item that the minister mentioned to-night in connection with Nova Scotia reminded me of our old conditions. In 1911, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government and myself were pulling in the same boat, happy friends. I had my railway and he had his. I helped him. He was then in Opposition. He got money for his railway and I got money for mine. The change of Government took place. The Prime Minister went on and built his railway, but he threw me to the wolves—myself and my railway. I do not think that was very fair comradeship or companionship. I have often chaffed him about it since, but he does not answer, and there is no answer for it at all. The money was voted for my railroad in the county of Victoria, just as it has been for the Dartmouth and Dean branch. But I was not prime minister, and the road in Victoria county was not built. The Prime Minister had the power to secure money for a very much poorer section of the country than is to be found in the county of Victoria. I was told at the time by the then Minister of Railways that something would be done. I moved a resolution in the House that the time had arrived when the non-railway counties in Eastern Canada should be provided with railways. That resolution was accepted, and is to be found embodied in the records. I have been keeping quiet since, but nothing has been done, and, to my surprise and consternation, a couple of years ago six or seven millions of money was invested in a new railway enterprise altogether—in the Quebec and Saguenay railway—and in a new part of the country. What justification was there to pass over Victoria county, where the enterprise was right in hand, and to undertake a project in a new county as to which nothing had been said about the need of railways at all, and spend this money as it has been spent, more especially in view of the fact that in the district referred to a railway is not needed half as badly as it is in my constituency? I think I have reason to complain that we have not been properly treated. We have a magnificent country in North Victoria, where there is the finest of fishing, and splendid agricultural land—in fact, everything that is necessary to make of it a great and prosperous district—but we have no railway accommodation, although every other part of Canada seems to be getting what it requires for development and receiving proper attention. While I do not hope for very much from anything I say to-night, I

would not be doing my duty to my county if I did not once more impress upon the minister that we have been neglected. The minister remembers well that I am not talking of something which occurred since our party has been in opposition. He remembers well that I kept pounding away at the former Government, of which I was a supporter, until I got them to agree to the building of this railway, and also that I assisted in getting them to agree to build the Guysborough road and the Dean Settlement road. But the present Prime Minister got his own railway built, and threw the hon. member for Guysborough and myself, as I said before, to the wolves. I do not wish to pursue the subject any further, except to say that when we from Nova Scotia occupy time in talking about the Intercolonial and railway matters we have nothing to apologize for. There is one constituent of mine who pays $350,000 to $400,000 to the Government railways. If the minister will look into the freight accounts of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, he will find that one concern pays something like half a million of money into the coffers of this railway, in addition to the large sums paid by other very excellent customers of the railway in that part of the country.

Now, there are a few other local matters that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. Last year I spoke about our station at North Sydney. That is where the Newfoundland traffic is handled, as the minister knows. The trade with Newfoundland during the summer time, when the steamships on that route are able to run, is simply enormous. An immense number of passengers travel by that route, and there is a large amount of freight carried, and the money that goes into the coffers of the Government railway from the terminus at North Sydney must be very large indeed. Unfortunately, the station at North Sydney is a very small one, containing only one small room, and is not at all fit to accommodate the traffic of which I have spoken. I wish to impress upon the minister—and he will remember that I spoke to him last year upon the same subject—the necessity of providing better accommodation for the public. The existing traffic will amply justify whatever expenditure may be involved in making the accommodation more adequate. The minister will find, if he makes inquiry, that there are no modern facilities at the station for the needs of the public. The station is but a little bit of a place for a town of the size of North Sydney, and especially in view of the immense traffic which passes through it. As the member for that constituency, I have often felt ashamed that we did not have better accommodation.

The minister will also recall the fact that I have brought to his attention two or three times the need for better facilities at a place called McInnes' Harbour. In spite of the poor accommodation the man in charge has to stay there all the time, and I am sure that if the minister could see the place he would realize that it is not at all suitable. Accommodation for passengers is also lacking, and yet this is one of the places in the district which pays the road well.

I also spoke to the minister last year about the need of proper facilities for handling freight at a place called Christmas Island. At that point there is a large amount of freight, but no person to handle it, and no proper station house, and yet the traffic is one that pays well. I sincerely hope that the minister will give some attention to these matters to which I have drawn his attention. I am talking at a rather unseemly hour, owing to giving way to other hon. gentlemen who had representations to make, but I can assure the minister that I am very much in earnest in urging upon him the imperative necessity of meeting the needs of the people whom I represent. The fact of this being war time compels me to be brief, otherwise I would assure the minister that it would take him three weeks or more to get his estimates through the House.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member has acted rightly in bringing these matters to the attention of the committee, because they are now on record, and it will afford me an opportunity of looking into them thoroughly. I want to assure the hon. gentleman that since I have been administering this department I have been anxious to take the necessary time to make a trip over the Intercolonial railway and look into all such matters as he has spoken of from one end of the road to the other. Perhaps it was hardly fair on my part not to have carried out that intention before, but owing to Parliament being in session, it has so far been an impossibility. However, I have made my plans to take a trip over the Intercolonial, which will include a visit to Sydney. I wish to go to Sydney to see the works there, and also to visit other parts of Nova Scotia, which, as yet, I have not had an opportunity of seeing. When I go to Sydney I will discuss matters with

the hon. gentleman and come to some conclusion with respect to some of the things he has mentioned, as well as any other points which need to be dealt with. If there are things that are really necessary, notwithstanding the fact, that this is war time, I will take them up and give them my best consideration. It is only the prevailing war conditions which prevent the Government from doing many things that we would like to do. However, the hon. member knows the situation as well as I do, and the difficulties which confront us. Nevertheless I am glad that the hon. member has ventilated these matters this evening, and I repeat that when I am in Sydney I will look into the whole situation. I shall be very glad then to discuss each and every matter that he may bring forward, and endeavour to determine exactly what we should do under the existing conditions.

Mr. PARENT: Does the item of $1,600,000 for the Quebec bridge include the amount of $1,000,000 supposed to be paid as a bonus to the St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is only the amount to be paid to the contractor, the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, for building the bridge. No bonuses, other than building the bridge.

Mr. PARENT: I suppose my hon. friend remembers that there was a bonus of $1,000,000 to be paid to the contractor if the bridge stood up. Has that $1,000,000 been paid?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. This is simply to return the deposit and any little bills the Bridge Company has.

Progress reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1917-18.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1918, was presented by Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) read by Mr. Deputy Speaker to the House and referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are these all the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are the Supplementaries for the past fiscal year. The Supplementary Estimates for the current year will be submitted possibly tomorrow.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 12.32 a.m., Saturday.

Saturday, May 18, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

THE YUKON ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the original order of the result of the recount for the Electoral District of the Yukon Territory.

THE ALLIED FORCES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): I wish to draw the attention of the Government to this article which was published in the Montreal Star of yesterday, and which is entitled: "America will not agree to replace released troops":

> The War Department has declined to accede to French proposals whereby some of the French army would be released for agriculture or industries and be replaced at the front by United States troops. This was learned to-day to be the outcome of recent discussions of man-power.
>
> The Government feels that both France and Britain should increase, rather than diminish, their military forces and that they should not expect the United States to furnish soldiers to release Allied soldiers for industry.
>
> The recent revelations in the Maurice-Lloyd George controversy spell to Government authorities the significant fact that Britain had not radically increased her army in the past year. They believe she should have done so, and they think she and France should prepare to make further increases while the United States proceeds with its increase in overseas shipments.
>
> War Department plans contemplate getting 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 men overseas this year. But it is pointed out that in time the American shipments are likely not to exceed replacement needs.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to summarize the article instead of reading it in its entirety, and then put his question.

Mr. VIEN: Just two lines more and I have finished.

> Hence, when the United States army reaches 2,000,000, it is likely not to go beyond that figure for some time, unless shipping facilities are much extended.

I wish to ask the Government whether they have any information as to the accuracy of this statement.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no official information on the subject, except, of course, we have official information that the various classes in Great Britain have been combed and recombed over and over again in the desire to put into the fighting line every available man. We have been

informed that that has been done to the extent of most seriously interfering with a great many highly important industries of Great Britain.

CORRECTION.—MR. RICHARDSON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): I should like to call the attention of the House to an extract from an article published in the Daily Ontarion, Belleville, under date of Thursday, May 16. The article quotes an extract from Hansard in connection with the Bill respecting the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, to which my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) called attention. The article which is under the heading, "Who supplied the misinformation," contains the following extract from Hansard:

> Mr. Lemieux: Was Mr. Parliament, the local member for Prince Edward, a party to the arrangement?
> Mr. Richardson: He was a party to it.
> Mr. Lemieux: Did he accept the tolls agreed upon, and also the price?
> Mr. Richardson: He did.
> Mr. Lemieux: And the new conditions?
> Mr. Richardson: He accepted the price and the tolls. The ex-reeve of the municipality was also present and also agreed that the tolls were reasonable.
> Mr. Lemieux: Then the objecting parties were satisfied?
> Mr. Richardson: Yes.

The mistake that happened was this. There was some noise in the House, and when my hon. friend from Maisonneuve asked the question whether Mr. Parliament was a party to the matter, I thought he said "Mr. Porter," the hon. member for West Hastings, who asked me to take charge of the Bill during his absence while attending the assizes in his county. I regret to confess my ignorance, but I did not know that such a gentleman as Mr. Parliament existed, and thinking that my hon. friend said "Mr. Porter," I said, "yes." I do not know Mr. Parliament at all, and I wish to make this explanation in justice to him.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I am very glad for the explanation given by my hon. friend from Springfield, because the day before yesterday I received a telegram from Mr. Parliament denying the statement made by the hon. gentleman, but I knew that a misunderstanding had occurred.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I see, according to the newspapers, he does deny it. There was another little inaccuracy. I stated that the matter had been submitted to the "Ontario" Government and that the Ontario Government had agreed to give assistance, but I find that the Hansard report says the "Imperial Government." It is easily understood that is an error.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is an obvious misprint.

CONNAUGHT RIFLE RANGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): A few days ago I placed a question on the Order Paper, and I thought that the answer I received was rather peculiar. Am I in order in saying a few words with regard to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may ask a question, but it is not in order to enter into a discussion. If the hon. member will put a question, he will be in order.

Mr. BOYCE: There were several questions. The first question was:

> What are the names of the parties who have Connaught Rifle Range rented for pasturing cattle?

The answer was:

> Robert Richardson.

The reason I asked the question was because I thought it was beneath the dignity of this country to turn this rifle range into a cattle ranch. The next question was:

> What is the amount paid for rent?

And the answer was:

> $925 per annum.

In answer to my question as to the duty of Mr. Holbrook, who lives on the range, I was told that he is caretaker and receives $90 per month, with free house and grounds. What struck me as very curious was that it should take $1,080 to collect $925. There must surely be something wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is now proceeding to enter into an argument, and he is, therefore, not in order.

Mr. BOYCE: Am I called to order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may put a supplemental question on the Order Paper and get his answer in that way.

Mr. BOYCE: There will not be time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should proceed in the usual way and put a supplemental question on the Order Paper.

Mr. BOYCE: I do not want to be called to order, because I have not spoken very often.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member will have various opportunities, on going into Supply, or in Supply, to go into the matter at length. He is not in order in proceeding as he is doing now.

Mr. BOYCE: I shall just make one reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

FARMERS' DELEGATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Has the Prime Minister been handed a certain communication which was addressed to His Excellency the Governor General regarding the last convention of farmers held at Ottawa?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understood it was to be referred to me, but it has not yet arrived so far as I am aware.

Mr. VIEN: Will the Prime Minister lay it on the Table when he receives it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will make any necessary announcement in that regard at a later date.

HALIFAX RELIEF COMMISSION.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister), Bill No. 97, respecting the Halifax Relief Commission, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Act of Nova Scotia ratified:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The purpose of this Bill is merely to confirm an Act of the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia conferring certain powers on the Halifax Relief Commission, and also to provide that the accounts of the commission shall be audited by such persons as the Governor in Council may appoint on the recommendation of the Auditor General of Canada. The provincial Act conferred upon the Halifax Relief Commission power to make certain alterations in the streets of the city. My right hon. friend, who knows the city fairly well, will recollect that in the north end the streets run directly up a very steep hill from the water. It is proposed that as that district has been completely devastated, the commission shall have power to run certain of the main arteries of the city diagonally along the hill so as to secure a much better grade, and that for that purpose they shall have power to acquire or expropriate the land that is necessary for making these alterations. Those are the principal features of the Bill. The provincial Act confers upon the Halifax Relief Commission certain powers which could not properly, in the first instance at least, be conferred by this Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As I understand the explanation of the Prime Minister, this Bill is simply to confirm, so far as our confirmation may be necessary, an Act passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And to provide that the accounts of the commission shall be audited.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When a decision has been reached by the Commission, which I do not at all criticise, will it be submitted to the Council?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see by the newspapers that the Commission intend to do some modern town planning in Halifax, something which very generally occurs after a big fire in a large city. For instance, some years ago a fire destroyed the city of Trois Rivières, which is possibly one of the oldest cities in Canada. After the fire the city authorities decided to remodel the town plan and to have modern improvements, which have been of great benefit to the city itself. I suppose the Halifax Relief Commission will do something of the same kind. If so, a large expenditure will be involved, and I should like to know whether the Commission, which we can trust to act honestly and intelligently, will submit the proposed expenditure to the Governor in Council. Will Council have the final say before the expenditure is made?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Commission have always reported to the Governor in Council before taking any step that involves a considerable expenditure. One of their reports, which has been confirmed by Order in Council, was laid on the table of the House early in the session. Before proceeding further along the line which I have just indicated, the Chairman of the Commission came to Ottawa and made an oral statement to Council, in which he outlined certain proposals, and this will be followed later by a written report. As to expropriating the land, the opinion of the Commission is that very little expenditure will be occasioned; that is to say, the land acquired will pretty nearly, if not alto-

gether, compensate for the land that requires to be expropriated. As far as town planning is concerned, if it is carried out under the direction of the Commission so that buildings and the material and labour for buildings can be contracted for on a large scale, it is believed the work can be done with much less expenditure than if it were undertaken by individuals. Furthermore, the improvement in the appearance of the town and the comfort of the people will be very decidedly enhanced.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If I might touch on a subject which is germane to the matter under discussion, I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his department, after the revelations that were made at the investigation into the Halifax disaster, has taken drastic measures to prevent similar accidents in the future. I am told that the Halifax Pilotage Commission managed its business very badly, and that the minister has received reports tending to show that only by a miracle have similar accidents been averted before. As we are going to spend a very large sum of money to repair the damage that was done, and Canada will willingly bear this expenditure, yet, may we expect that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will exercise proper supervision over the pilotage system in the harbour of Halifax?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Naval Service): I am very glad to give that information. The commission appointed some months ago made a very thorough investigation into the pilotage system at the port of Halifax, and I thought hon. members were all aware that after the report of that commission which I promptly laid on the table of the House, the pilotage system of Halifax was taken directly under the control of my department, bringing Halifax into exactly the same position in that respect, as the ports of Montreal and Quebec. I have appointed a very capable man as superintendent of the Halifax pilotage system in the person of Captain Lindsay, who has had very many years of seafaring experience and holds a master mariner's certificate. For a great number of years he had charge of some of the largest ocean-going steamers of the White Star line, and is most competent in every way. He has direct charge of the pilots of the port of Halifax, and he reports to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The commission which is investigating the pilotage systems in this country is now on its way to the Pacific coast, where it will thoroughly investigate the system in vogue at Vancouver, Victoria and Nanaimo harbours, and if the commission reports in favour of placing the pilotage systems at these ports under a superintendent of pilots, as is now the case in Montreal, Quebec and Halifax, I can assure my hon. friend I shall see that that is done.

In regard to the handling of high explosives in the port of Montreal, I informed the hon. member some months ago that I had taken immediate steps to see that all high explosives were loaded many miles east of Montreal. Special sheds have already been constructed at that point and high explosives will be safeguarded in every possible way so as to avoid the recurrence of such a terrible catastrophe as occurred in Halifax. I have had drawn up stringent regulations, governing not only the handling of these high explosives at Pointe aux Trembles east of Montreal, but also the movement of munitions ships coming in and going out of the port of Montreal and while in the channel between Montreal to Quebec. These regulations are now in force and I can assure the hon. member that every precaution is being taken.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very well satisfied with the explanation given by my hon. friend with the rider that he has ingeniously shifted the explosives from Montreal, where he resides and which he represents, partly to my own constituency of Maisonneuve. I do not know why these explosives should be shifted to Maisonneuve. At all events, I have full confidence in my hon. friend's regulations and I hope that extra precautions will be taken to safeguard the Pointe aux Trembles and Longue Pointe people against any possible accident. Since the castastrophe at Halifax I have heard any number of people in Montreal expressing their fear that a similar accident might happen on the island of Montreal, but I am satisfied that the regulations enacted by my hon. friend will prevent that.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend knows the location of the port of Montreal very well. I would not want him or any citizen of Maisonneuve to think that any high explosives are going to be loaded there. They are going to be loaded four or five miles below.

Bill reported.

On the motion for the third reading.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I forgot to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister if any limit

was put on the amount to be expended at Halifax.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. So far as this Government is concerned, there is a limit fixed by Order in Council. The sum amounts altogether to $12,000,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was received from the various provinces and states? I understand there were large subscriptions made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Speaking from recollection—I will not be sure of this—the total amount is in the neighbourhood of $20,000,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And these moneys are administered by this commission?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By this commission.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT.

AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE.

On the motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 20, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Hay and Straw Inspection), be concurred in:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What are the amendments, please?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The first amendment made was in section 340, adding two standards for dyke hay. That was particularly for the Maritime Provinces. There was no such standard provided for in the Bill as it passed this House. On representations which were made from the growers of dyke and marsh hay in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, two standards for dyke hay were established, as follows:

(h) No. 1 Dyke shall be timothy and couch with not more than one-eighth of clover or other tame grasses mixed;

(i) No. 2 Dyke shall be timothy and couch with not more than one-third of clover or other tame grasses mixed, of fair colour, sound and well cured.

In the same section, in paragraph (i), the word "or" has been placed between the words "grassy" and "stained," so as to make it read "grassy or stained." In consequence of the addition of (h) and (i) in reference to dyke hay, there is a change in the lettering of the different subsections. After section 340E there has been added section 340F, which provides that:

"340F. Every seller of baled hay or straw in Canada shall affix to every bale of hay or straw

[Mr. Lemieux.]

sold or offered for sale, a tag having thereon plainly written and ligible, his name and business address, and the weight of the bale. Such tag shall be securely fastened to the bale and shall be of not less than one and one-half inches in width and three inches in length.

A penalty of $5 for each violation of this provision is attached.

Amendments concurred in.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of the Hon. C. J. Doherty, (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 99, to amend the Act of the present session intituled: an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, was read a second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister explain the purpose of this Bill?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The Committee will recollect that during the present session we passed an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, and one of the provisions of that Act made applicable to the other provinces the restrictions upon the right of appeal contained in the Supreme Court Act with regard to the province of Ontario. After the Act had been passed, the suggestion came from some of the judiciary in the province of Nova Scotia, that it would deprive the parties in certain pending cases of the right of appeal; and the purpose of the present Bill is to add to the Act which recently passed, a provision that the particular section in question shall not apply to pending cases. I rather think that the weight of authority in jurisprudence leads to the belief that this provision is not necessary, and that the Act would not apply to pending cases in any event, but there can be no harm done in making quite clear that such is the intention of Parliament. I think it would be obviously unfair to deprive the man, whose action has already been instituted under a particular condition of the law, of a recourse to which he was entitled before he instituted his suit.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Since the appointment of ad hoc judges has been authorized by recent legislation, have any such judges sat in the Supreme Court?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: I must admit that I have not followed the sittings of the court, and I am not in a position to answer the question at present, but I will make inquiry and acquaint the hon. gentleman with the result.

Bill reported and read the third time.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty, Bill No. 98 (Letter V of the Senate) to amend the Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1—Objects of the corporation:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the Minister of Justice explain the change made by this provision.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The change consists simply in making it clear that the "residence" required, is residence on the part of the beneficiaries. Personally I have no doubt that the section as it stood meant residence on the part of beneficiaries, but from the way in which the phrase was constructed it was possible to suggest that the relatives residing anywhere, of a man who happened to be resident in Canada when he joined the forces, were entitled to the benefit of this fund. That is not what was intended, and that is not what was carried out, but as recently there has been a suggestion that that was what ought to have been done, it has been deemed desirable to make it perfectly clear that the fund is to be for the benefit of relatives of soldiers —wives, children, and so forth—resident in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not see the Acting Minister of Finance in his seat or my friend from St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) who is the chairman of the Patriotic Fund. I may say that the Canadian Patriotic Fund has accomplished wonders since the beginning of the war. To my own personal knowledge, the fund has extended its bounty, not only to the families in Canada, of our own soldiers, but also to the families of Belgian and French reservists. With these latter I am more especially concerned, because in Montreal I have had several interviews with members of such families, and the Patriotic Fund has always responded generously to the request for assistance made by them. The other day a question was mooted during the Budget debate by the hon. member for St. Antoine, and since then I have received a letter asking for my views as one of the incorporators of the Patriotic Fund—which possibly was sent all the other incorporators in Canada—regarding the future policy as to the Patriotic Fund. In other words, should the Patriotic Fund moneys be collected in future from the public, or should the Government inaugurate the imposition of a special tax upon the whole of the people of the Dominion for the purpose of maintaining this fund. I have answered unhesitatingly that after four years' experience of individual subscriptions, gathered from all parts of Canada, though it might be an excellent incentive to future generosity to depend upon the public, the Canadian Patriotic Fund was an organization which, in my opinion, should be supported by a special tax levied by the Canadian Government. It seems to me that it is only fair that the responsibility of caring for the families of our soldiers should be borne by the state.

It is not fair that a few individuals be specially singled out to subscribe and others ignored. Summing up my argument, I think that the levy of a special tax of one mill on the dollar for instance would be received with pleasure by the whole people of Canada. I know that many people in very ordinary circumstances have hesitated to subscribe because they thought their subscription was too modest, whilst the names of large subscribers were being paraded before the public. Every year a whirlwind campaign is organized in our large cities, and the names of the same large subscribers, with the amount of their contributions, are published. I do not say that our well-to-do people subscribe for the pleasure of parading their names before the public. Far be it from my mind to suggest such a thing. My contention is that it is not fair that only one class of the public should be publicly assessed for the maintenance of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. I hope the Government next session will accept as its policy the recommendation made this year by our colleague from St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), the able chairman of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, and impose a special tax, small though it may be, to enable the whole of our people to share in the benevolent work accomplished by that fund. I do not make a special plea for the well-to-do classes or for the middle classes. But I cannot help stating that the people who are specially reached by the income tax and the business tax, and the various municipal and provincial taxes, are the same people who generally speaking, are providing funds for the Canadian Patriotic Fund. I must say too that the poorer classes have been very generous. They have subscribed anonymously and, after all, the anonymous subscription is perhaps the most worthy. I believe the country would be pleased to

see a new policy inaugurated by which the fund would be maintained through a small taxation on the whole of the people. I was present in August, 1914, at the special meeting called by the then Governor General, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, when the Canadian Patriotic Fund was organized, and I have often thought of the remark made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when his views were asked by His Royal Highness as to the method to be pursued in raising the moneys for that fund. Though the right hon. gentleman favoured the incorporation and organization of the Patriotic Fund, and though he said that the public, generally speaking, would respond magnificently to the requests made to replenish its coffers, yet he stated that before long there would be an urgent request on the part of the public that the assessments be levied generally by the state. The families of the soldiers are the care of the state, and it is its duty to see that they are maintained in proper comfort. I throw out these few remarks in the hope that the Government next session will adopt the views expressed by the chairman of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, and will adopt the wise policy of making the state responsible for the maintenance of the families of our soldiers who are in need.

Mr. MORPHY: May I have a word about this section? I quite agree with the principle enunciated by the last speaker, that the country at large should now take over the fund and provide for it. Looking at the meaning of this section, I am somewhat alarmed about it. I would like to ask the minister if I am to understand that the section means that the Patriotic Fund in future shall apply to the wife or family of every French reservist, every Italian reservist—

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, as it always has in the past.

Mr. MORPHY: —every Portuguese reservist—

Mr. DOHERTY: It will apply to the wife of every man who is fighting in the Allied armies—

Mr. MORPHY: —every Russian reservist—

Mr. DOHERTY: —if that wife is resident in Canada. And I may say it always has so applied.

Mr. MORPHY: I was not aware that it always had so applied. It seems to me that the Government should hesitate a little. This country will have enormous burdens to bear both through the Patriotic Fund and in every other way. I think Canada is pledging itself now quite prematurely, at least until we know the kind of immigration we will have. Are we to provide for every indigent of Europe, simply because of the fact that a soldier's wife happens to come here, probably sent here by the country in which she lives, to get rid of her, she probably not being the most desirable individual? The proposition staggers me. I do not think that legislation of this kind should go too fast. I would wait a bit. This matter can afford to wait. If the wife of every Italian soldier must be provided for by Canada, it will be an incentive to Italy to get rid of them and send them here and put them upon our fund. The same applies to those of every Allied force, including Russia. I speak full of patriotism, and in favour of this country doing what it can for our friends the allied nations.

This section might well stand until next session, when the future policy of the Government will be laid down and when Canada's needs in the matter of pensions will be better known. If the principle is laid down that the Patriotic Fund shall be paid to relatives of soldiers in any of the allied armies, how long will it be before pensions are paid on the same basis?

Mr. DOHERTY: The section that is being amended describes the objects of the association: to distribute among the wives, relatives and dependents resident in Canada of soldiers actually serving in the armies of the Allies. I do not pretend to give the exact wording, but there is no doubt that provision has reference to wives and relatives resident in Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: The amendment says, "who may become resident in Canada."

Mr. DOHERTY: "Resident in Canada" in the section as it stood was considered to apply to those resident in Canada not merely at the time the soldier went away, but also at the time the assistance was extended. This amendment is not creating an obligation on the part of the Patriotic Fund to pay money to every relative resident in Canada; it is simply conferring a power. It is true that if we created an obligation on the part of the fund to distribute its moneys among all relatives of soldiers in the allied forces who might come here, a flood of people might come to this country in order to obtain a share of that fund. But we are only defining the classes

of persons to whom it is permissible to distribute the money of the Patriotic Fund. The hon. member suggested that some of those to whom money might be distributed might be most unworthy. I have no doubt that the administrators of the Patriotic Fund will not distribute their money to people of that kind. This amendment is sought by the administrators of the Patriotic Fund, and it is only to satisfy them that their understanding of the law is correct, and that it is permissible for them to give money to relatives resident in Canada of soldiers who themselves might not have been actually resident here when they enlisted.

12 noon. I do not think that we are exposed to the consequences which the hon. member suggests merely because we make quite clear what are the classes of persons to whom this money may be distributed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Another provision in the Act of incorporation makes optional the giving of aid by the Patriotic Fund to any family. The organization is most elaborate. When a request is made by a family for aid, the Patriotic Fund at once sends a committee of two or three ladies to inquire into the circumstances of that family, and in many cases, for good reasons, aid is refused or delayed. Great care is taken to ensure that no aid is granted if it is not needed. The fund has been admirably administered in the district of Montreal. I said that some of the families of French and Belgian reservists had been helped by the fund. The consuls and their wives, together with members of the Patriotic Fund in Montreal, saw that such families of reservists who needed protection received it. Certainly no abuse was permitted in the administration of the fund.

Mr. TURRIFF: The point raised by the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) is well taken, particularly if we have regard to the suggestion made by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) a little while ago that the Patriotic Fund should be raised by taxation. That has always been my own view. I do not agree with the member for Maisonneuve that the wealthy are providing the great bulk of the money. The poor people of Canada have given much more largely in proportion to what they have than the wealthy people.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I said that the poor people had subscribed, but anonymously, and that it was not fair that only certain names should appear before the public. This taxation should be equalized, and it follows from this argument that the State should provide for the families of our soldiers.

Mr. TURRIFF: I agree with that. In all probability steps may be taken next session in that direction. If that is done, why should we tell the officers of the Patriotic Fund that they may pay out this money to relatives of soldiers of the allied armies who never lived in Canada? Why should such persons draw from the moneys raised either by voluntary subscription or by taxation from the Canadian people? Surely our obligations are piling up quickly enough and largely enough to suggest that if we attend to the relatives of our own soldiers through the patriotic and other funds, we shall be doing our full duty. I agree that the relatives of French or Belgian reservists resident in Canada who go to fight for the Allies should be looked after. But why should we burden ourselves with the responsibility of looking after relatives of Italians who join their army in their own country, and whose wives or families subsequently come to Canada?

The Minister of Justice says that this provision is not compulsory; that we are simply saying that the officers who handle the Patriotic Fund may assist those people. Why should we give directions at all in the matter? Why not leave the Act as it is at present? The Patriotic Fund is now, if necessary, assisting relatives resident in Canada of soldiers in the different Allied armies. Surely that is sufficient; but for us to give directions that such assistance may be given to a soldier's relatives who may come into this country in the future after he had enlisted in the Allied forces, is, to my mind, absolutely outside of our duty altogether, and we shall be making a great mistake if we pass this amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should like to endeavour to make this matter clear. As the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has pointed out, there is in the existing Act a subsequent provision which says that there is no right vested in anybody to get the money, and this section simply defines those to whom it may be permissible to pay the money. The principal object of this section is not to include, but to exclude, people. If the interpretation which the hon. member would like to see continued possible, remains possible, our Patriotic Fund will be liable, so far as there can be liability, or, at least, subject to claims being made—and such claims have been made,—that we should give aid

and assistance to women and children and other dependent relatives living in all parts of the habitable globe, because the man at the time he enlisted was in Canada. Do hon. gentlemen think that is a more desirable situation, even if there were a question of obligation? As I said before, it is beyond possibility of doubt that whoever may be benefited, nobody is being given an absolute right to be benefited. Do hon. gentlemen think it is desirable that there should be in this country, for instance, dependent relatives of a British soldier, or a French soldier, or a soldier of any other Allied country which is taking part in this war, who are destitute, starving, and that this fund should have to say: We cannot give you anything; we have no power to give you anything? It is not a question of saying, what the hon. gentleman apprehended, namely, that any soldier's relatives who may flock in here will have the right to demand such assistance?

Mr. MORPHY: I never said anything of the kind. The minister is wrong. The minister knows that.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is what I understood to be the apprenension.

Mr. MORPHY: I think the minister is endeavouring to becloud the issue.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall leave that to the appreciation of the committee. If I am making that endeavour, I hope I shall not be successful. What I was endeavouring to point out, in order to pierce through the clouds—

Mr. MORPHY: The matter is quite clear.

Mr. DOHERTY: —that have been caused to circulate in the atmosphere, was that all that we are trying to do is to remove the suggestion that it may be impossible for the Patriotic Fund to assist dependents, actually resident in Canada, of our own soldiers, if it happened that such soldiers were not in Canada when they enlisted. You may have the case of a Canadian absent from Canada, because there are known cases of Canadian men who have enlisted on the other side and whose dependents are here, and it would not be impossible for it to be contended, if the other interpretation is necessarily right, that such relatives would not be entitled to relief. I hope to make the matter clear, notwithstanding the motive that is attributed to me, that there is no question of creating an obligation of any kind, nor of creating an absolute right of any kind. All that is sought to be made clear is that the Patriotic Fund is not precluded from assisting, is not in a position where it is impossible for it to do anything for the wives and children or other dependents residing in Canada of a man who is in the Allied fighting forces engaged in the present war.

Mr. MORPHY: The minister has sought to convey the impression that hon. members opposing the amendment have pretended to argue that a right is given. No one has argued that, and I think the minister might as well get that out of his head at once and get down to the proper meaning of the section.

Mr. McMASTER: The right is inferred.

Mr. MORPHY: It is, of course, inferred. It may or may not be exercised. The section reads:

> The objects of the Corporation shall be to collect, administer and distribute the fund hereinbefore mentioned for the assistance in case of need of such wives, children and dependent relatives as are or may become resident in Canada, of officers and men who, during the present war, may be on active service with the naval and military forces of the British Empire and Great Britain's allies."

That covers the whole gamut. It takes in the Japanese. A subject of Japan in the naval or military service of that country comes under the scope of this section. Will the minister tell me what Japan has done for Canada in the way of establishing a patriotic fund to take care of Canadians stranded in that country? The Italian is taken care of under this section. Has corresponding legislation been passed in Italy to take care of Canadians who may be forcibly detained there, unable to get home and compelled to seek a living in that country? Have the authorities in the loyal parts of Russia made a reciprocal provision to provide for stranded Canadians? Whence springs this unbounded generosity of the Canadian people that, in this time of stress, we must, for all time to come, put upon the statute books a provision which is heralded to the world that we, of Canada, are so affluent, and rolling in wealth, so unburdened by the stress of war, that we can say to the world: Send all your dependents here; we do not promise to take care of them, but we have a provision which says: If you are worthy, we shall take care of you? If it does not say that, it does not say anything. I object to the principle of the Bill being put forward at the present. This is no time for us to hold out these invitations to come here and get under the wing of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. Let me put this argument to the minister: The

minister has argued that this section gives no right. Will he deny that, if there are 150,000 soldiers' wives and children, relatives and dependents, coming into Canada, and if they are deserving, this section means that they shall be helped? I submit it does. It would be cruel to argue in any other way. That being the meaning of the section, what I object to is the probable, and prospective burden Canada is assuming at a time which, far from being in affluent circumstances and untouched by the stress of war, we are straining every effort to assist our own dependent people.

At a time when our soldiers say they are not getting big enough pensions, when their widows say they are not being properly taken care of, when the dependents of our soldiers are none too well taken care of, I object to the principle of this Bill, which would launch us out on a scheme of indiscriminately taking care of every Italian soldier, every Portuguese soldier, every Japanese soldier, every French soldier, the soldiers, in fact, of all the Allied armies and their wives and dependent children. The principle is too altruistic, too premature. Let us wait a little. Let us see how our balance sheet stands and provide for those for whom it is our bounden duty to provide, before extending the scheme to others.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The hon. member for Perth and the hon. member for Assiniboia object to the principle of this Bill. May I remind them that they have already agreed during this session to the principle of a Bill which goes a great deal further than this Bill? The Bill before us empowers the Patriotic Fund to assist the wives, children and dependent relatives of officers and men who during the present war may be on active service with the naval and military forces of the British Empire and Great Britain's allies. Earlier in the session we passed a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment, which created a department and set up machinery for the purpose not only of assisting the dependents of the allied soldiers during the war but of looking after the comfort and welfare of the soldiers of all allied countries, and their dependents, who have fought during the war, whether now resident in Canada or whether they come to Canada after the war. Section 5 of that Bill reads:

> The Minister shall have the management and control of all matters relating to the re-establishment in civil life and activities of all persons who have served in the naval or military forces of His Majesty or any of His Majesty's allies during the present war, and the dependents of such persons, and the administration of any statutes or of any regulations or orders enacted or made by the Governor in Council for such purpose.

When that Bill was before the House I took the liberty of drawing attention of hon. members to the fact that we were consecrating ourselves to a very serious principle indeed. I said we were entering into a very large contract in undertaking such a scheme, but the views I then expressed were not supported by any other member of the House, and everybody seemed to agree that this country should look after the welfare of all soldiers who have fought in the Allied armies during the war, whether they came to this country after the war or not. Surely there is a great deal less objection on our part to helping the dependents in this country of any of the soldiers of the Allied armies than to helping the dependents of soldiers who may not become residents of this country until after the war, and as I have already pointed out, this House unanimously agreed to do the latter when the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Bill was passed.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It seems to me the objection taken to this Bill arises either from a misapprehension of the whole scheme of the Patriotic Fund, or from the fact that the gentlemen who raise these objections have not had very much experience with the practical administration of the Act. If the apprehensions of the hon. member for North Perth were justified, it would mean that the intention of the Act was that people should be assisted from the Patriotic Fund year after year, on and on and on, or as the hon. member expressed it, forever without limitation. The Patriotic Fund has as its expressed object the giving of assistance to relatives and dependents of soldiers only while they are on active service, and not beyond the duration of the war. As the Act has nothing whatever to do with assisting the dependents of soldiers or the soldiers themselves after the war is over that seems to cut away the ground on which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morphy) built up his argument that we were assuming an obligation for which we would be responsible year after year without limitation. My understanding of the Patriotic Fund is that our implied obligation ceases, even in the case of our own soldiers, as soon as they are discharged from the army. Let me say, as one who has had something to do with the practical administration of the fund in Northern Ontario, that the very thing this clause seems to me to be designed to over-

come has been a very great source of confusion in the past. Misunderstandings have frequently arisen as to whether we had the right under the Act to take care of the families and dependents of French or Italian reservists, for instance, who happened to be resident in this country, and I have always taken the ground that it mattered not whether the soldier was Belgian, French, Italian, or Japanese, if you wish, so long as he was fighting for the Allies in one of the the theatres of war and his dependents were domiciled in Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: We do not object to that.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The amendment to this Act cannot override the principle of the Patriotic Fund itself. It is simply interpreting what may be done under the Act. The operation of the Act at the present time, as I understand it, is confined to the relatives and dependents of men who are actually at war and does not go beyond the duration of the war, but if the hon. member for North Perth were correct and the operation of the Act was to continue indefinitely year after year I would certainly say that we must stop and consider, because in that case we could not undertake to pay suitable pensions to our soldiers and their dependents and help them from the Patriotic Fund as well and as a matter of fact we are not doing that now. I have had to deal with many cases myself where the contribution from the Patriotic Fund ceased immediately the soldier who was discharged from the army had his pension fixed.

Mr. DUFF: During the last four years I have had a good deal to do with the local committee of the Patriotic Fund in my county. It seems to me the section we are considering is not as clear as it should be. The Minister of Justice is a lawyer, and of course can interpret it correctly, but I am afraid the members of the local committees throughout the country, many of whom are not lawyers, will get into a great deal of discussion and then not know exactly what the clause means. I would suggest that the section read as follows:

> The objects of the corporation shall be to collect, administer and distribute the funds hereinbefore mentioned for the assistance in case of need of such wives, children and dependent relatives as are or may become resident in Canada, of officers and men who, during the present war, have enlisted in the Canadian military or naval forces and may be on active service with the naval or military forces of Great Britain or her Allies.

I think we should deal only with those who have enlisted in our own forces.

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

Mr. McMASTER: I am thoroughly out of accord with what the hon. member for Lunenburg has just said, because his proposal would cut out the French and Belgian reservists.

Mr. DOHERTY: It would also cut out the British soldier.

Mr. McMASTER: In my county there was a French reservist, a man over forty, with a wife and a number of children, who was called to the colours. His family have been helped by the Patriotic Fund, and everybody is delighted to help them because they should be helped. I believe I express the feeling of the House when I say that we are all willing to take care of the families of the soldiers of our Allies who were resident in Canada at the time they left to join the colours. But this law goes a little further. It is true it does not oblige us to help the families of soldiers who have come in since the war, the heads of whose families may never have lived in Canada. To illustrate that, let me take the special case in my county. Suppose the wife of that French reservist had a sister living in France, and it is left to the generosity of the Patriotic Fund in Canada to take care of that sister and her children. She says: "I will move out to Canada and establish myself there." If they come they will be welcome, and any persons who want to help them should be free to do so, but the country should not assume, or infer, an obligation of that kind. The Minister of Justice is an old law professor of mine, and I would not set up my legal opinion against his for one moment.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not?

Mr. McMASTER: Because I am a modest man. There is no obligation stipulated, but there is an obligation inferred. If we create a corporation for the express purpose of distributing money among people who may become resident in Canada, although their fathers or brothers have never lived in Canada, we certainly invite people to come to Canada in the expectation of receiving some benefit from this fund. If the hypothetical woman, whom I have mentioned for the purpose of illustration, comes to Canada and establishes herself next door to her sister, in my county of Brome, would she not feel that under this law the Patriotic Fund should give her something? She would be quite reasonable in taking that view. It is a mistake to hold out any illusory hopes of that sort. I want to support the suggestion made by the hon. member from Saskatchewan (Mr. Turriff), whose

constituency I have forgotten, but whose constituency I should have known because he was on our side of the House last year. He says that the Patriotic Fund should not depend on private subscription but on taxation. He is quite right. So long as the country raised its armed forces by the voluntary system, there was no reason why we should not raise money to help the relatives of soldiers through the voluntary system, but once we adopted the system of compulsory military service, surely it is only right that the same principle should be followed for the purpose of raising a fund to support and help the relatives of soldiers. As a matter of fact what is often urged is that conscription is a matter of taxation. You would never think of raising money for public purpose by private subscription. That was an argument used by the conscriptionist. This is a conscriptionist Government and it should be logical and consistent with itself. If we raise an army by compulsion, and if we raise money to look after the wives and children of the soldiers who are in that army, I would consider that to be an obligation of the state just the same as the soldier's pay is an obligation of the state. You should be consistent in this and raise the money required for looking after the wives and relatives of soldiers by taxation. The way the Patriotic Fund is raised now is largely a matter of certain people, representing no one but themselves, assessing their fellow-citizens. When a patriotic committee of rich and powerful people, many of them rich bankers, go out among the business people of a large city and collect subscriptions for the Patriotic Fund, they are not appealing to the spirit of benevolence. They are practically, in many cases, assessing their fellow-citizens and telling them, if you will allow a vulgar expression, to come across with a certain amount of money. I do not like that way of raising money by ordinary voluntary procedure. I think it best that money for State purposes should be raised by the State itself.

Mr. NESBITT: I am sorry I was not in when this Bill was introduced in order that I might have found out why this amendment was proposed. As far as I have heard, the Patriotic Fund has been well administered and has been working out very satisfactorily. This clause may be construed to mean that the Patriotic Fund may be continued after the man has returned. My hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) pointed out that that was not the intention. My experience is the same as his. When the men return, get their three months' pay with their discharge, and get their pension, the Patriotic Fund no longer supplies them. I would like to say a word in reference to what the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McMaster) has said as to the method of collecting the Patriotic Fund. I have long thought that voluntary subscriptions were largely a matter of coercion. In the section of the country from which I come we only once took up an ordinary voluntary subscription. After that we adopted the plan of raising the fund by municipal taxation. That plan has been very satisfactory, and it has been most satisfactory in so far as the administration is concerned. I absolutely agree with the suggestion that the fund should be raised by taxation. If the Dominion Government are in a position to collect a tax for it, they are surely the ones to do it. I do not think it should be called any longer a Patriotic Fund. I think the money should be given in the form of extra separation allowance in accordance with the number of children in a family as they do on the other side of the line. If there is a danger of this clause being misconstrued, as the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) says and the money paid to people who moved into the country after the war started, for the purpose of getting some benefit from this fund, or for any other purpose, or if there is a danger that it will be continued after the soldier gets his discharge, I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that he strike out the words "or may become" in the eleventh line.

That would clear the ground in so far as those who may afterwards become settlers in Canada are concerned. Then on the last line but one of the section, the words are used: "who during the present war may be on active service." I would suggest that we should strike out the two words "may be" and insert the word "are." The phrase would then read: "who are on active service." These are my suggestions, and in my judgment, they would overcome entirely the objection that I have heard made to the clause this morning. I think we are all proud of the way in which the Patriotic Fund has been administered, and the very small expense that has been incurred in connection with it. Altogether the work of the local committees who distribute the funds throughout the country has been excellent, as far as I have heard.

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose the soldier is not on active service, but is dead?

Mr. NESBITT: If the soldier is dead his dependents are awarded a pension by the Government. It is not the intention of the Patriotic Fund to provide for dependents of that class. When the soldier returns from active service and is discharged, he receives three months' pay, and that, to a certain extent, makes good the amount formerly contributed out of the Patriotic Fund, until the man is able to settle down to regular employment.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is one other reason why we should not pass this clause as suggested. I agree very largely with the remarks made by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that the provision under discussion might probably be further amended to make it more clear. We notice in the Press that sometime in the future there will probably be as many as three million American soldiers overseas. Under the proposed amendment the dependent relatives of such men who come to Canada, may be paid out of the Patriotic Fund. As is well known, people are crossing from the United States into Canada by the tens of thousands every year, even at the present time. Why should we direct payments to be made from the Canadian Patriotic Fund to the relatives of American soldiers who are overseas fighting the battles of that country as well as our own? They are our allies, it is true, and we are glad to have them and see them in the battle line, but the United States is just as well able to take care of the wives and children of its soldiers, as we are to take care of the wives and children of our own soldiers, and even better.

Mr. McMASTER: I beg leave to propose that the words "may become" in the eleventh line be struck out and the following words substituted therefor:

Were on the 22nd day of August, 1914.

If my amendment is adopted the section will read:

The objects of the corporation shall be to collect, administer and distribute the fund hereinbefore mentioned for the assistance in case of need of such wives, children and dependent relatives, as were on the 22nd day of August, 1914, residents in Canada, of officers and men who during the present war may be on active service with the naval and military forces of the British Empire and Great Britain's allies.

The adoption of this amendment would dispense with the necessity of the second clause of the Bill, which should be struck out.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. DOHERTY: I would like to ask my hon. friend exactly what it is that he proposes? Does he intend that if the wives and children and dependent relatives were resident in Canada when the war broke out, but are now resident in the United States, they are to receive a payment from the fund? I think that the amendment which he proposes would have that result. Perhaps we might arrive at a better wording that would meet what I think is in the mind of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Morphy). I do not want to misunderstand the hon. gentleman, and may I, without offence, state the impression that was created in my mind?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: When there are clouds in the mind of the hon. member for Perth, it is because, in his opinion, I am trying to raise them. When there are clouds in my mind, it is my own fault—they do not come from anything the hon. member for Perth says. What I understood to be apprehended by the hon. gentleman was, that this provision might open the door to an influx of people—relatives of the soldiers of the different armies—with regard to whom there would exist—I understand he does not contend a right—a position as the result of which they might come forward and say: "I am within that description, therefore, you ought fairly to do something for me." Now I think that is quite likely, and I also want to avoid that as far as I can. On the other hand the Patriotic Fund administrators themselves—because I may say this is their Bill, and I was asked by them to have this legislation passed—wanted this one thing made clear: They wanted to be in apposition to say, for example, to a soldier's wife who has been living in the United States, "Our fund is not for distribution outside of Canada, but is for the benefit of those resident in Canada who are relatives of soldiers at the front, without distinction as to which of the Allied forces they are serving under. The people we want to take care of are the dependent relatives in Canada of those soldiers." and the reason we want to do that is that the people of Canada feel that when they have in their midst the dependent relative of a soldier, and that dependent relative is a resident in this country, after all, it is not becoming that we should leave that dependent relative to starve on the streets. That is the general idea of the matter. I am quite prepared to adopt any wording that will guard against an influx of people

coming only for the purpose of getting upon the Patriotic Fund or creating a situation where they may claim it. I have endeavoured to find a wording that I might exclude, at all events, the idea of any invitation to people to come in for that purpose, and at the same time create a situation where the hands of the Patriotic Fund would not be tied—say, with regard to a woman, who, sometime since the beginning of the war, came bona fide into this country and who, perhaps, at the time she came in, was not in want, but has since come into want, and is the dependent relative of a soldier—and that the officials of the Fund should not be bound to say: "Because you only came here after the passing of the Act, or after the outbreak of the war, we can do nothing for you." That I concede might properly exclude the idea or intention to deal with anybody and everybody who chooses to become later on a resident of Canada. I am prepared to concede that the wording in that regard is a little objectionable. If we struck out the words "or may become" and substituted therefor the words "at the time of the giving of such assistance" resident in Canada, that might meet the case. I do not want to dispute that under that wording even it may be possible, it will be possible, for somebody who came in later to rank on this Fund if the circumstances are considered to justify it. But I think it best to exclude the idea of a general invitation to come in for that purpose. Now as regards the situation concerning the words "who, during the present war, may be on active service" to which exception is taken, I think we would meet any possible ambiguity in those words, and make it also perfectly clear that this assistance is to be while the active service continues, if instead of the words "during the present war may be" we substituted the words "actually on active service during the present war." I do not know how far that meets the case.

Mr. McMASTER: It does not—

The CHAIRMAN: The committee is getting out of order. Mr. McMaster has moved an amendment which is before the committee, which cannot be further amended until it is either disposed of or withdrawn. I would like to ask the hon. member for Brome if in order to permit of discussion he will withdraw his amendment?

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, I will withdraw it and move this amendment—

Mr. PARDEE: Might I suggest to the hon. member if the time should not be stated as from the time of enlistment instead of from a specific date? Why make it specifically the 22nd day of August?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. Is it the pleasure of the committee that Mr. McMaster have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Amendment withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Justice moves that section 1 be amended by striking out in the eleventh line the words "or may become" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the time of the giving of such assistance." Also by striking out in the twelfth line the words "during the present war, may be" and inserting in lieu thereofthe words "actually are."

Mr. DOHERTY: The modification suggested is not "actually are." I thought I said "actually on active service." I do not want to say only the men who are today on active service, because we hope to have some soldiers in the future, and their relatives should be dealt with too.

Mr. NICKLE: Perhaps I might clear up this point by reading from the original Act of incorporation, so that the House will see the object of the amendment. Section 3 of Chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1914 reads:

> The objects of the corporation shall be to collect, administer and distribute the Fund hereinbefore mentioned for the assistance in case of need of the wives, children and dependent relatives of officers and men, residents of Canada, who, during the present war, may be on active service with the naval and military forces of the British Empire and Great Britain's allies.

When this section recently came up for careful consideration and construction, a doubt was raised as to what construction should be put on the words "residents of Canada." The question was: do the words "residents of Canada" qualify the words "officers and men," so that this meaning should be taken from the statute that "assistance in case of need" may be given to all those wives, children and dependent relatives of officers and men where the men have been residents of Canada at the time the war broke out, and thereafter. Or whether the construction was that this aid might be given to the wives, children and dependent relatives, residents of Canada, of officers and men who were actually engaged in warfare. The practical condition that had arisen was this: at the outbreak of the war and thereafter there were within Canada certain wives, children and dependent relatives of men, these wives, children and dependent relatives having been for some time residents of Canada, but the

men never were residents of Canada. If we put the narrow construction on the section that the men must have been residents of Canada any time since 1914, the relief given to these female relatives would be illegally given, because the men never had been residents. It was to clear up an ambiguity.

Mr. McMASTER: How would it happen that the women were here and the men were not?

Mr. NICKLE: They were of the families of many men called to the British and the French colours. The families were here, and it just happened that the men did not come. The Patriotic Fund subsequently found themselves confronted with this difficulty: the pay of the French soldier is very trifling; the pay of the British soldier is not great. These women and children were in Canada, and they either had to be kept or they had to starve.

If the Patriotic Fund did not assume the obligation, the municipality in which they lived would have to do it, or these people would be left to starve. Those responsible for the Patriotic Fund did just what you or I would have done. They said: an unexpected condition has arisen; Canada is not going to let women and children want for food in this country when their male relatives are fighting for the cause in another army of the Allies. As I said when the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) interrupted me, in my judgment the section as it now stands, in law, is incomplete. As the words "residents of Canada" should qualify the words "wives, children and dependent relatives," it seems to me that a simple amendment would make clear all that has up to the present time been obscure. In section 3 the words "residents of Canada" might be made to follow the word "relatives," so that the section would read:

The object of the corporation shall be to collect, administer and distribute the Fund hereinbefore mentioned for the assistance in case of need of the wives, children and dependent relatives, residents of Canada, of officers and men who, during the present war, may be on active service with the naval and military forces of the British Empire and Great Britain's allies.

That would simplify the Act and make it as it is desired to be. I admit that the amendment which I suggest would not, on principle, meet the objection raised by the member for North Perth; that the right to claim aid might still be vested in a family who subsequently came to Canada. The difficulty that the draftsman of the Act now before the committee found himself in arose from the fact that by section 2 of the Act he endeavoured to make the law retroactive; and to make the statute speak from the second day of August, 1914, so he had to put in the words "or may become"; otherwise it would not be retroactive in the sense that he desired it to be.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. member believe that unless the draftsman put in those words, he could not make the law retroactive?

Mr. NICKLE: It was because it was to be retroactive that he had to put them in.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not think so.

Mr. NICKLE: When lawyers differ, the only way to get a decision is to leave the question to the court. As it is now one o'clock, I suggest that the minister, during recess, take into consideration the suggestion which I have made and see whether it will obviate the difficulty which confronts the committee.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doherty has asked for leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move:

That section 1 be amended by striking out the word "such" in the tenth line thereof and substituting therefor the word "the," also by striking out in the eleventh line the words "as are or may become."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, and amendments concurred in.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty for the third reading of the Bill:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: A number of prominent members of the House have urged the advisability of raising this fund by way of taxation. As my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has pointed out there is a further reason at the present time why the Government should take that suggestion into consideration, and that is because we are sending men by compulsion to the front. Would the minister say what is the opinion of the Government as to raising this fund by taxation?

Mr. SPEAKER: As the minister has moved the third reading, he is not entitled to speak to his motion again, but I take it that it is the unanimous wish of the House that he may reply to the hon. member.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to announce any settled policy on this subject, but we do recognize that there is very much to commend the views expressed the other evening by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) whose views have added weight from his relation to the Patriotic Fund; and after what has been said to-day in support of his views, hon. members may rest assured that so far as I am concerned the suggestion shall have earnest consideration with a view to settling on a course of action.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

THE YUKON ELECTION.

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House reverted to the Order "Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees."

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor-General) presented the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to which was referred the special return of the General Returning Officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory, with power to consider the same and report their conclusions thereon, and to which was referred their second report for further consideration, presented with respect thereto the following as their third report:

Your committee have, pursuant to the resolution of the House of the 16th day of May, 1918, reconsidered their conclusions concerning the matters referred to in the order of reference of the 15th day of April, 1918, and at a meeting of your committee held this 17th day of May, 1918, the following resolution was adopted which the committee respectfully submit and recommend:—

Resolved, that the votes purporting to have been cast, counted and applied under Part IV of the Dominion Elections Act as shown in the special return of the General Returning Officer are properly applicable to the respective candidates to whom they have been applied, and that said special return be recommitted to said General Returning Officer with a direction that he do forthwith openly proclaim and return as duly elected a candidate to represent the electoral district of the Yukon Territory pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of said Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

H. Guthrie,
Chairman.

On motion of Mr. Guthrie, it was ordered that the report be taken into consideration on Tuesday next.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House proceeded to the consideration of Government Orders.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. T. A. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture, the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution—Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend Part IX of the Inspection and Sale Act, chapter eighty-five of the Revised Statutes, 1906, relating to Fruit and Fruit Marks, and to provide more effectively for the marking and inspection and packing and repacking of fruit, and for the materials, dimensions and content of barrels, crates, boxes, baskets, and wood veener baskets, packed in Canada, or manufactured and offered for sale in Canada, on and after the first day of June, 1919, but authorizing permits to be issued allowing the use of packages of other sizes than those specified; and to prevent false representation as to the contents of any package; and, further, to provide that no person shall sell, offer, expose, or have in his possession for sale, any fruit unless such fruit conforms with the requirements, is properly packed, and the package is marked as prescribed, and such fruit is not diseased wormy or otherwise depreciated so as to be unfit for consumption; and that any person who carelessly handles, wilfully destroys or pilfers any fruit packed in any of the prescribed packages shall be liable to prosecution; and also to amend Part X of the said Inspection and Sale Act, relating to certain Staple Commodities, by providing that no person shall sell or offer for sale any potatoes, represented to be of Number 1 quality or Number 2 quality, unless such potatoes conform to requirements to be enacted and are of prescribed size, but subject to allowance for variations incident to commercial grading.—The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. ROBB: What are the requirements to be enacted governing the sale of potatoes?

Mr. CRERAR: This does not mean the establishment, for potatoes, of any particular grades that shall be compulsory in their character. At the present time, there are no obvious grades or standards for potatoes in Canada. There are, however, dealers who, in selling their potatoes, describe them as No. 1 potatoes, and include under that designation any class of potatoes that they may care to include. The amendments proposed here merely provide that if a dealer does represent his potatoes to be of No. 1 character, they must conform with the description set out in the Bill to be founded on this resolution. It is not obligatory for him to have his potatoes conform with any standard, but we seek to make it obligatory that if he does represent his potatoes as No. 1 potatoes, they shall conform with the standard set out in the Bill.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and concurred in.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 108, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act relating to fruit and fruit marks and potatoes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

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

Trade and Commerce—mail subsidies and steamship subventions—steam service between Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand, $70,000:

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this service being performed at the present time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This line has been subsidized for a series of years, but during the last year the service has been very much interrupted, the company not being able to get ships owing to requisitions made by the British Admiralty. We have, therefore, had to satisfy ourselves as far as possible with occasional sailings. During the last three or four months we have not been able to get any ships at all. The total subsidy for the preceding year was $140,000. I have cut that amount down to one-half, keeping this $70,000 in the Estimates, so that if circumstances prove a little more favourable, we may perhaps be able to get one-half the service if we cannot get the whole.

Ocean and mail service between Canada and Great Britain, $400,000:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same remarks apply to this appropriation. The committee will see that, instead of $1,000,000 which was voted last year for that service, I have cut the amount down to $400,000, and it is problematical whether that amount will be spent or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What companies are in the service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Chiefly the Canadian Pacific and the White Star, but there are one or two others.

Steam service or services between Canada and Newfoundland, $70,000:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is the usual subsidy and the same appropriation as last year. The service is between Sydney and Port aux Basques.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is the service between St. John's, Newfoundland, and Summerside and Charlottetown included in this appropriation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, that is a separate appropriation. This is an appropriation for service between the terminus of the Government railways at Sydney and the terminus of the Newfoundland railway at Port aux Basques.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A few weeks ago I noticed that there was a case before the court in St. John's, Newfoundland, in which the names of the right hon. the leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden), and even that of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) were prominently mentioned. This is a case which arose out of a dispute—or shall I say a quarrel?—between Sir Robert Reid and one of the ministers in Newfoundland.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Might I ask my hon. friend whether that dispute had anything to do with the service between North Sydney and Pointe au Basque?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Absolutely.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would ask my hon. friend if he does not think, that, in these warm and dying hours of the session, it would be better for us to go on with our business and leave these other little things, which cannot affect this vote in any way, until a more convenient day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not intend to be long and there is a breeze coming into the House this afternoon.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is always a breeze when my hon. friend gets up.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not breezy generally. The name of the right hon. gentleman was mentioned very prominently in connection with that case. It was stated that offers had been made to Sir Robert Reid by the Prime Minister and my right hon. friend to annex Newfoundland to Canada. The question of a subsidy was mentioned in connection with that policy. I do not know what happened with the case before the court but I noticed at the time that the name of my right hon. friend had been mentioned. Was he a party to such pourparlers between Newfoundland and Canada as regards this annexation scheme and, if he was, could he give the committee a statement concerning these pourparlers and also say what policy the Government intends to pursue as regards the annexation of Newfoundland?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is a lawyer and has been a member of a

government. As a lawyer he knows that when a case is sub judice, information concerning it is not a proper thing for public discussion, particularly in the House. As a former member of the Government he knows that certain things are better not discussed in public even if there be any foundation for them until they shall have become settled in some way by a conclusion, positive or negative. With these two premises I may say I have no recollection of having been caught in flagrante delicto, or in any other way, in reference to any such negotiations.

Steam service betwen Canada and the West Indies or South America or both, $250,666.66:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The committee will see that this vote has been diminished. The service is under contract, the contract was to run for five years, and it has not ended yet. Two of the vessels have been commandeered for war purposes. That leaves two on that route. It is not improbable that we will be able to get another vessel to go on that route sooner or later. I have made a certain cut in the amount, as we shall certainly not be able to use the whole amount, but I have provided what I think may be sufficient for the two vessels now running, as it is problemetical whether we shall be successful in getting another.

Steam service between Canada and South Africa, $73,000:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same remark applies in part to this service. It has been interrupted. The Elder-Dempster line, which has been carrying it on, has had probably eighty per cent at least of its whole tonnage taken by the British Government for war purposes, and, beside, it has suffered many severe losses through ships being torpedoed and otherwise destroyed. We are, therefore, reduced to an occasional service. There is now in Canada a large amount of material ordered by South African merchants, which is awaiting transportation. But it has been impossible to get even sailing vessels to take that route. I have pressed the matter as strongly as possible upon the Admiralty, but, of course, the necessities of the war must have precedence. I have been able, however, to get the allocation of one vessel which will sail in June, and I may be able to get one a month or every other month. I have therefore kept $73,000 of the $146,000 as usable for the possible service this year.

Steamship service between Canada and Australia or New Zealand, or both, on Pacific Ocean, $180,509:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The service which we have been able to maintain up to the present time has been partly subsidized by New Zealand more largely by ourselves. Whether we will be able to keep on the whole service or not is very problematical; in fact, two of the vessels are under imminent commandeering prospects by the Admiralty. This is a very valuable service, and I have kept the vote on the supposition that we will be able certainly to keep part of the service and to secure the services of two ships.

Mr. NESBITT: Are any ships plying now between the Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand, and how are the subsidies paid? I suppose the appropriation for this service has been passed, but I could not hear the explanations that were made.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Payment is according to the trips made. With respect to the Australian service, there have not been any trips now for four or five months, the service has been intermittent. On the West Coast there has been a steamship service—that is, the steamships have made their trips regularly—which has been entirely satisfactory.

Steam service between Canada, China and Japan, $253,334.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Since this item was put in the Estimates of the four vessels which have been on this service the two Empresses, and they were the largest ones, have been commandeered by the British Government. There seems to be an immediate prospect of having those replaced. In order to keep the estimate as low as possible, and yet to provide for what may be necessary, I propose to take $53,333.34 from that vote and make it $200,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I read in a New York paper that the Canadian Government had made some proposals for a large number of Chinese to settle in western Canada? What truth is there in that statement?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no truth in that statement. I beg to move:

That item No. 129 be reduced to the extent of $53,333,34 so that the item will read: "Steam service between Canada, China and Japan, $200,000."

Motion agreed to.

Steam service between Halifax, Canso and Guysborough, $5,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the contract been made for the present year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, the "Scotia," the same vessel as before, is making the trips.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1918 between the mainland and Magdalen Islands, $18,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the contract been signed, and is the vessel now on the route?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A boat is now on the route. The contract has been signed with Farquhar and Company, and the "Enterprise" is performing the service. She is the best, in fact the only boat, we could get. She is not as large as we would like, nor does she probably come up to the old standard of vessels that we had on this service. The contract, however, is in the hands of an excellent firm, and I think the service will be carried out as satisfactorily as it possibly can be under the circumstances.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was there not an arrangement made with Captain Farquhar that the "Enterprise," being too small a craft for the service, would not be put on the route this year, but that a larger vessel would be built and put into commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have not made any contract, or entered into any arrangement for the building of another vessel. Shipbuilding at the present time is a pretty expensive operation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood from Captain Farquhar when he came here some weeks ago that he was ready to build a vessel if the department would give him a contract for a certain number of years.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think that is true if we could have agreed upon the price of the vessel, and given a long contract, but we are not doing that in any of these services. We have to feel our way and do the best we can.

Mr. McISAAC: Is there any steamer plying where the "Enterprise" operated last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. The only thing that has been done so far is that I have communicated with the "Enterprise," and the "Enterprise" will be able and willing to call at a number of these ports, and might possibly be able to give a very good service at these ports. I am in communication with the company in that respect.

Steam service between Mulgrave and Guysboro, calling at intermediate points, $5,500.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The service on this line has been performed for several years by the "Robert Cann," which was a very good boat. She was withdrawn last year, and a much smaller boat was put on, the "Percy Cann." This boat is not suitable for the service; she is too small. I am not certain that the minister can find a better one at the present time. But it occurred to me that we will never be able to improve if we do not give notice prior to the expiration of the contract. Would it not be well if, three months before these yearly contracts expire, tenders were asked for, so that owners of boats might have a chance to come in? The matter drifts along until the 30th March, or whatever date these contracts run out, and then the contract is renewed with the old company, and no one knows anything about it. The department might perhaps be able to improve the service here and there by allowing others to tender, giving them ample time to do so, say three months prior to expiration of the existing contract. I ask the minister to consider that point.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In normal times I think that would be the proper course to pursue. In fact, we did pursue it before the war and asked for tenders. But during these times the route and the people on it may be thankful to get any sort of an old tub. There is not much chance for choice.

Steam service between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports, $8,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister explain the situation there?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The old boats, as my hon. friend knows, passed off from the service last year in the latter part of the season, and although every effort was made to get a suitable boat for this service, in the end we had to take Hobson's choice. We did get a vessel which would undertake the service between Quebec and Gaspé Basin. The owner is Captain Tremblay, I think, and the boat is a fairly good boat, and will probably carry out the demands of the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you had an inspection made of the boat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, and she is passed for the service.

Mr. PELLETIER: Was a contract signed for that boat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Between Quebec and Gaspé Basin?

Mr. PELLETIER: Between the Government and Captain Tremblay?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. PELLETIER: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that you did not call item 175 for steam service between Quebec and Harrington and along the north shore.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall have two boats on that service which will carry out the service on the schedule of last year, going down to the extremist point and giving the usual and customary service. We have been able to get a second boat on that line. It is rather a superior boat, a better one than I had expected to get.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the "Elaine"?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The "Savoy" and "Elaine" will perform the service along that coast. I am very glad to have got two such satisfactory boats as the department has been able to obtain.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But you have taken the "Elaine" from the Gaspé route between Campbellton and Gaspé?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is true.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why did my hon. friend come to that decision? There is quite a traffic on the Baie des Chaleurs. It is true that there is a railway on the coast, but the fishery business requires a boat in this section of the Bay, as there is a large traffic between New Brunswick and that part of Quebec. I understand that Mr. Evans, the proprietor of the Elaine, would have preferred to remain on the old route between Campbellton and Gaspé.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Several considerations come in there. In the first place, I was faced with the necessity of cutting down the total vote for steamship subventions and subsidies, and I have cut the vote down by nearly one half. The principles that I tried to base the deduction on were these: First, that the most important routes should be kept, and if it came up a question between a more important route and a less important, I should have to make the choice in favour of the most important one. The other principle was that where there was service by railway, the people would have to get along by railway service, and not indulge in the luxury of a double service. I realize there is some inconvenience in this arrangement; there are some ports which are a little distant from the railway, and which will be better served by having a vessel. But evidently we must come to a conclusion on the situation as it presents itself. The north shore service is not a paying service, as my hon. friend knows, but it is a necessary service. The people are there; they have no railways; they are dependent on water communications, and whether there were 150,000 people down there or 5,000, we have to maintain a service; therefore, as between the service between Campbellton and Paspebiac, and the service on the north shore, I had no hesitation, when I was able to get the Elaine, in placing her on the more important service of the two. My hon. friend will find in the report on mail subsidies and steamship subventions a statement of the traffic carried between Campbellton and Gaspé. It has diminished so greatly that the payment of the subsidy demanded is not justified.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Because the boat was not of the same tonnage as in the old days.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I doubt that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no question of luxuries in that section of the country; what the people want is opportunity to transport their fish. The railway runs along the coast but it does not touch all the little harbours and consequently it cannot always be depended upon. I protest against the cutting down of this subsidy and I hope that when better times come my hon. friend will revise his ideas and re-establish this line between Campbellton and Gaspé. My hon. friend knows that Baie des Chaleurs is an attractive spot for tourists; there is no more beautiful section of the country in the whole of the eastern provinces. We must not discourage tourists from visiting that part of the country.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Nothing would delight me more than to see that route kept up; it is one of the scenic routes of our country. I myself have made the trip several times. But this is no time for tourists; in any case, tourists are not seeking that route at present. Moreover, you cannot get tourist trade unless you have a first-class vessel on the route. After the war is over, however, I hope that many things will come to pass.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister does not close the door completely, then?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, no. I never close the door, even to my hon. friend.

Mr. MICHAUD: I agree with what the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has said with reference to this matter. It is important that the steamer Elaine carry on the service between Campbellton and the northern part of the Gaspé coast. I have received a communication from a citizen of the town of Campbellton with reference to this subject, and submitted it to

the minister, who sent me the following reply, dated May 15:

The Steamer Elaine has gone upon the North Shore, St. Lawrence route, from Quebec eastward and is not available for the Campbellton-Gaspé Service. The amount of freight offering during the last two or three years on that route has been so small that it is not considered advisable to continue the expenditure. Though some inconvenience will no doubt be experienced, there is a railway which runs along that shore which will give a fair service to most of the communities interested.

There is a great fishing traffic along that coast, and the steamer Elaine could render the best service. The cancelling of that steamer for the present summer would seriously affect the business in the northern part of New Brunswick and along the coast of Gaspé. We have not many facilities for exporting fish along the Gaspé coast; many places are not touched by the railway. I hope that the minister will revise his ideas, not next year, but now, and give us a service for the present summer.

Steam service between Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and other north shore ports, $6,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is one of the services that I had to dispense with. The item seems to have got into the Estimates, however, and I move that it be struck out. The service referred to is between Rivière du loup, Tadoussac and other north shore ports. The vessels have deteriorated and changed hands. Last year we had no service because the vessels offering could not pass the examination necessary to entitle them to carry passengers. The whole amount of freight carried in one season on this route was only 142 tons. Had we retained the subsidy we could have bought all the freight, carried it on our backs to the different destinations, and still have had some money in pocket. I could not see that we should, in these times, spend that money on a service which was of so little real benefit. It is a convenience, but not a real necessity, as the freight service shows.

4 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the minister paying subsidies to the Canada Steamship lines?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was going to suggest that he make arrangements with the Canada Steamship lines——the old Richelieu Company—to have a vessel go to Rivière du Loup once or twice a week

Mr. BUREAU: Why? You have the cars there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You have in front of Riviére du Loup the whole county of Charlevois, the river Saguenay, Cap-a-l'Aigle, Murray bay, and other important points. When the people of Rivière du Loup want to do business on the north shore they have to go the whole way around.

[Mr. Michaud.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But the whole of the freight carried there in a season was only 142 tons. You could carry it on a wheel barrow.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The trade has not had a chance to develop there.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This subsidy has been paid for at least ten years. The service has constantly depreciated; more than 1,000 tons was never carried on that route, and now the quantity is reduced to 142 tons. I would rather hire some man to carry that in a canoe, thus saving the public a good deal of money.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) is not in his seat. He is interested in this service, because it is in his riding. My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) said that the Canada Steamships Lines' vessels should not call at Rivière du Loup, because there is no work for them to do. He is entirely mistaken as to that, because they are calling there. Last year they called there at least twice a week. On their way up to Chicoutimi they stopped every Saturday at Rivière du Loup, and on their way back they stopped there on every Sunday. This subsidy was rather for the encouragement of winter navigation on that part of the St. Lawrence river. The little boat that was being operated on that line was doing the service every month of the year, and the new experiment was a very successful one. I hope the minister will see his way clear to restore this service in the near future in spite of what my hon. friend from Three Rivers says about it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would ask the minister to hold the matter open for a few minutes. I see the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) is now in his seat.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Has the minister any good reasons for striking out this item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have just been endeavouring to state them.

Mr. GAUVREAU: If the item is left in the estimates it will always be an inducement for some one to take steps to enter into a contract with the Government

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to draw to my hon. friend's attention the flagellations which have been given to this and

former governments if they have put into their Estimates items which they do not purpose using. I am acting on the sense that has been drilled into me in part from the flagellations received from critics on the other side of the House. Such criticism is quite fair. We cannot stuff our Estimates. There is not the least hope in the world of getting this service put on, and, therefore, I do not want to carry the item in my Estimates. I shall, as my hon. friend suggests, keep an eye on the future, and if we can get a service which will justify a subsidy I shall be very glad to ask this House for an appropriation.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I shall take the drilling out of the minister by telling him that if the money is not spent, neither the Government nor any one else will be hurt, but if the item remains in the Estimates, it will be an intimation to some one that he should go to the minister and endeavour to enter into a contract.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Seeing that the ministers are so hard worked already, why should my hon. friend want to keep this molasses point out to attract all those who would bother the minister in regard to some old tub or other? You cannot get anything but a tub these days.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Am I to understand the minister will restore this item to its proper place whenever a suitable boat is found for the route?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When sufficient grounds are given for the expenditure of money on this route, I shall be quite willing to ask the House for an appropriation.

Vote stricken from the Estimates.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1918, between Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, $7,500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Has any change been made with respect to this route? I think it was the intention to drop Pictou.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The contract has not yet been signed and negotiations are still proceeding. My view was this—and I think it was approved—that the distance traversed between Pictou and Mulgrave was an unproductive part of the route, because, owing to the shallow water in the harbours along that coast, it was difficult for the boat to make uniform, stated calls. That being the case, a year or so ago, a small subsidiary vessel was given a subsidy to take over that part of the route, and I have put in the Supplementary Estimates an item for that service with the view of dispensing with the coal-consuming part of the voyage for small freight between Pictou and Mulgrave and putting the strength of the larger vessel on the traffic which goes and comes between Mulgrave and the north. That traffic, at certain seasons of the year becomes congested even with the two boats whose services are given. The matter, however, has not been settled yet.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am in receipt of several letters asking that this boat touch at Prince Edward Island. I quite agree with the minister that the call at Pictou is not desirable. I never could see any justification for it, because the boat could not, according to the minister's statement, call at any other ports along that route. If the boat would make one trip to one of the Prince Edward Island ports it would be of more service to the people, because we have more business with the island than with Pictou. We have already Mulgrave as a port of call. There is another matter I should like to bring to the minister's attention, and that is the demurrage at the port of Mulgrave. I have had some correspondence with the department with respect to that, and there are two things I would like the minister to bear in mind. First, there is no railway communication with the northern ports. Secondly, navigation is only open for five months in the year. There is a very large population to be served north of Port Hood, and our difficulty is that in the fall of the year, from the first of September onwards, the steamer cannot make regular trips because there are no harbours on that coast. The steamer has sometimes to wait at Mulgrave two weeks in the stormy weather watching for an opportunity to put out, and it is a very great hardship that our merchants should have to pay demurrage on the goods that are kept at Mulgrave until the boats can go out. During the last two years, and this session again, I have had some correspondence with the department and they have replied that concessions have been granted in this respect. I am quite satisfied that that is correct, but the minister will realize that a very large amount of money is paid in demurrage, particularly on account of flour, which comes in carload lots in the fall of the year and has to stay at Mulgrave for two weeks at a time. Of course, the consumer has to pay an increased price on that account, and I would ask the minister to look into this matter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall be very glad to.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understood the minister to say just now that he was making provision for the continued service of the small gasolene schooner between Pictou and Mulgrave, calling at ports in the county of Antigonish. I think the minister has received some correspondence requesting an increased subsidy. I have here figures showing the cost of operation during the past year and the amount of freight and subsidy received, which I will give the House so that the minister can refer to them on Hansard. The total amount received, including the subsidy for the operation of this boat, last year was $2,878. The cost of gasolene and oil was $513.60, wages $960, victualling $320, insurance $100, repairs $423, other expenses, $60, deck and engine supplies, $74, depreciation, $90; making a total of $2,540.60, leaving a profit to the owner of $337.40. The boat is a good one, I am told, and worth perhaps $5,000 or $6,000, and the owner can hardly be expected to keep it in this service for the small profit he is making. The people along the coast fear that the boat will be withdrawn if an additional subsidy is not given to the contractor. The boat performs a very important service in a local way, as many of these people are twenty miles from railway communication and they grow a good deal of farm produce, it being a farming district. They have been urged, of course, to increase their production during the war, and this boat is the only means they have of getting their produce to market. I have received letters from some of these people asking me to urge the Government to keep the boat in operation so that they can get their produce to market. I understand the contractor is asking for another $1,000. If that is too large a sum, the minister might consider adding half that amount to the subsidy in order to retain this boat in the service for the present year. I would again impress upon him the importance of the service in a local way, because it would be a very serious matter for the people along that coast if the boat was withdrawn on account of the small sum that is being earned.

Mr. WIGMORE: I have received a number of letters and telegrams from different people in St. John with reference to the steamer run by Connors Brothers, from St. John to Dipper harbour, Chance harbour, and Mace's bay. Only this morning I received a telegram from Manchester, Robertson & Allison, of St. John, protesting against the withdrawal of the subsidy for the steamer. Connors Brothers say that if the subsidy is withdrawn they will take the steamer off the route. This is a very important service, because the people in Dipper harbour, Chance harbour, Mace's bay and other small places along that shore depend entirely on this steamer for getting their goods from St. John. If the minister has already decided to withdraw the subsidy I would ask him to reconsider the matter. I am not aware how much the subsidy is, but it is important that this boat be kept on the route, both from the standpoint of the merchants of St. John and the people living in the places at which the steamer calls.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The subsidy will not be cut off.

Department of the Interior, salaries, $1,172,125.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There is a very general idea that not much work is going on at the present time in the Interior Department, on account of there being no immigration, for one thing, and I think the minister should inform us whether it is not possible to reduce the numbers of employees and thereby curtail the expenses of his department. A few years ago an abnormal increase took place in the expenses of this department, under one of the minister's predecessors. Has the minister made any attempt to trim the Estimates this year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am surprised that any one should have the impression that there was not much doing in the Interior Department. There is a way of cutting down the number of employees, and that way has been found and acted upon. The number of employees has been very considerably reduced.

The estimates, instead of going up, have been going down. There has been a very pronounced reduction. Nor has the work been going down at the same time; it is being carried on with as great efficiency and in volume almost as substantial as in previous years. The total reduction this year is some $454,000. There were eighty-one employees taken off. They were connected with the immigration service. The Immigration Department has been created, and consequently the volume of immigration does not affect the Department of the Interior work in any degree; formerly it affected it very heavily. The Interior Department has twenty-five branches, including that of Soldier Settlement. The soldier settlement work, which is now added to the work of the department, is by no means an unsubstantial or negligible

amount; it is a factor of great importance in the department, and so long as it is needed it must continue to be a factor of importance. This item is the regular appropriation for Civil Government salaries. The appropriation is $1,172,125, which is an increase of $42,400 over last year, but the statutory increase is $48,737.50, and it cannot be avoided. In giving last year's vote I have, of course, deducted that portion which is attributable to immigration work. Taking that off the figures for this year the statutory increase is lessened by $6,337.50.

Mr. MURPHY: On a previous occasion my hon. friend gave the House some information regarding the mining work that is being carried on by some branch of his department. Does the Mines Branch belong to my hon. friend's department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a Mining Branch of the department, under the immediate control of the chief clerk of the department, Mr. Rothwell. That branch administers the mines that are on Dominion Government property. If my hon. friend would care to make any remarks on this subject they would come properly under the appropriate estimates and we are a long way from that yet. The matter will be under Dominion Lands and Parks.

Mr. MURPHY: The Geological Survey is also under my hon. friend's department, is it not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; that is under the Secretary of State.

Mr. MURPHY: The Topographical Branch?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Topographical Survey and the Geodetic Survey are under the Department of the Interior, but not the Geological Survey.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it the intention of any of the branches to send out a prospecting or exploration party to British Columbia during the approaching season?

Mr. MEIGHEN: An exploration party is likely to make surveys although I could not say for certain as to that. If any hon. friend would tell me what parties he has in mind and where they are going, it is quite possible that I could give him the information that he desires. It is probable that there will be parties sent out by Dr. Deville, head of the Surveys branch. He is sending three parties into British Columbia. The estimates for that branch have been reduced from $776,300 to $496,300, a reduction of $280,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Now that we are at war I would like to ask the minister as to the character of the employment of the officials in the several branches and to ascertain how many are engaged in war work or in connection with the investigation of minerals required in the prosecution of the war. How many of those who are of military age can be dispensed with and how many should be retained?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is any one liable for military service who is sent out with these survey parties. At all events, not one has been since I have been in the department and no application has been made on my part for exemption for any one in the entire department. As to those who are doing work which is directly war work, it is a matter of what is meant by "directly." There are certain parties sent out under Dr. Deville who are surveying land with a view to ascertaining its suitability for soldier settlement and they are perfecting the maps for the Soldier Settlement Board, so that any one calling at the office of the board will be able to get a fair idea of any land or any district where he purposes going. Then we have parties who may be said to be doing war work under general survey work which I will describe when we come to the vote for Dominion Lands and Parks.

Mr. MURPHY: What I want to know is whether those who are to be sent out are going to do work of a general exploratory or academic nature, or if their work is directed towards the investigation of minerals, such as molybdenite, platinum and others which are important in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The parties going out have been directing their attention to those matters.

Mr. J. READ: Does water-power inspection come under the minister's direction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. J. READ: Is the department making any investigation in regard to the water-powers that exist in the tidal waters of the bay of Fundy with the view of ascertaining whether it is possible to harness that tremendous force of "white coal" that is now going to waste.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have an arrangement with the Government of Nova Scotia, whereby, in co-operation with the water-powers branch of the Department of the Interior, under Mr. Challies, an investi-

gation has been under way for two years. That has to do with the water-powers of Nova Scotia but it doubtless would include the water-powers of the bay of Fundy. We are making an arrangement on similar lines with the province of New Brunswick, and a similar proposition has been made to us from British Columbia.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many years does it take before the information so obtained will be of use to engineers in enabling them to decide whether there is sufficient water or not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that very useful information can be obtained from the Water-powers branch as to any powers in Nova Scotia and as to their availability and usefulness for commercial purposes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it published?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whether it is published for Nova Scotia yet I do not know. Some of it is published but I do not know how full the report is. If my hon. friend would call upon Mr. Challies, or Mr. Johnston who is under him, he would get detailed information as to Nova Scotia water-powers and the same information would be available from the officers of the province of Nova Scotia.

Contingencies—clerical assistance, $28,000; printing and stationery, $45,000; travelling expenses, etc., $32,000.

Mr. MORPHY: How does the minister work out the amount of $32,000 for travelling expenses?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The item is the same as last year. The sum of $23,000 will be required to meet the expenses of the permanent officials of Ottawa who are travelling on Government business, and an amount of $9,000 will be necessary to cover the expenditure connected with telegrams, postage, subscriptions to newspapers, express charges, cab hire, a supply of drinking water and other small items relating to the Inside Service of the department in Ottawa. I think the same amount was voted last year, and I understand that almost all of it was spent.

Mr. MORPHY: Since we shall now have ten or eleven thousand miles of Government railway, will the Government officials still charge up railway fares as before?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The orders have been to use the Government railways wherever it is possible to do so. I do not think that will make any difference in the main, because my impression is—I do not know what the impression of my colleagues is—that it would not be wise to adopt the same principle as to Government railways as is adopted with respect to the franking of mail in the Post Office service, and that the Government railways should be credited with their real earnings.

Expenses connected with the Dominion Astronomical Observatory at Ottawa, $25,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Is this the usual vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it could be said to be. Last year the Astronomical Observatory, the International Boundary Commission, and the Geodetic Service, were all included in one vote. This year the services are divided so as to show the apportionment of money to each. This is the apportionment for the Astronomical Service at Ottawa. The vote is the same as last year.

Mr. MORPHY: Who is the chief of the Astronomical Service now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Dr. Klotz.

Mr. MORPHY: He succeeded the late Dr. King, did he?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He succeeded Dr. King in so far as the Ottawa Observatory is concerned. Dr. King, however, had charge of all the branches that I have just mentioned. Dr. Klotz is just the chief of the one service.

Mr. MORPHY: Is he a permanent officer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Expenses connected with the Dominion Astrophysical Observatory at Victoria, B. C., $7,500.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister be good enough to explain the item?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a new item and it is the only increase in the total vote, the reason being that this is the first year this Observatory has been in existence.

Geodetic Survey of Canada—Investigations, triangulation, precise levelling, topographic and field astronomic work, etc., $112,005.

Mr. MORPHY: When is this branch of work going to be concluded?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will occupy many years. The Geodetic Survey was undertaken a few years ago, and an organization was established to carry it out. This survey involves very many years of scientific work. I am inclined to the view that if we had anticipated the war we would have deferred the establishment of the organization. As it is established, however, we are carrying

it on on such a scale as not to necessitate the disbanding of the organization altogether. It is a very important service, there can be no doubt of that. We are establishing points throughout Canada with that precise, scientific accuracy that will enable all engineering work, and all surveys hereafter to be related to those points, to be the better carried on and with a certainty that will dispense with litigation and get rid of many difficulties that heretofore all surveys have encountered. I may say that all countries are carrying on this work. The item is the same as last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think this would be a suitable opportunity to bring to the attention of the committee a statement which has been handed to me, entitled "Memorandum re An Economic Route for Completion of Inland Deep Waterway" which is signed by a very eminent engineer of the city of Ottawa, Mr. Noulan Cauchon. I wonder if my hon. friend has heard of this project. Perhaps I might be permitted to read the memorandum so that it may be placed in Hansard:

Ottawa, 24th May, 1916.

Ottawa.

MEMORANDUM RE AN ECONOMIC ROUTE FOR COMPLETION OF INLAND DEEP WATERWAY.

The New Welland Canal.

Now that the Country is committed to and constructing the New Welland Canal, it follows as a logical consequence that the 25 (25-30) foot draft must ultimately be carried through to Montreal and tide water.

Pending this outcome the New Welland Canal appears as an unproductive load of $60,000,000 to ourselves, but of some benefit to our neighbours.

The St. Lawrence Canals—Deepening and Enlarging.

The St. Lawrence Canals are 14 foot draft. They begin at Cardinal and end at Montreal, embracing 45 miles of canals, including 18 locks. There are also about 68 miles of river stretches.

The principle upon which the St. Lawrence canals depend for their depth and their further deepening is that of lowering the bed of the locks and canals, and also where necessary of the channels in the river stretches as well. The St. Lawrence canals being mainly along an International Waterway, the surface levels could not be disturbed, I take it, without complications with vested interests and the United States.

Due to the foregoing conditions, I have estimated the cost of the deepening and the enlarging of the St. Lawrence canals and river stretches at about $150,000,000, as the construction work would be mainly under water work and much rock, of an expensive variety.

Deepening these canals necessarily entails "scrapping" existing works which have cost over $25,000,000, yet retaining their cost in the capitalization of the improvements.

As the opportunity is denied of retaining depth on the St. Lawrence, by dams, the alternative, the deepening and widening of the channels will accelerate the flow and cause earlier and longer low water.

Similar results have followed the continuous deepening of the St. Lawrence channel between Montreal and Quebec; the writer believes in barrages and locks to obtain depth there instead of continuing further deepening and also as a means of redeeming the evil results of the past methods.

Any tendency to lower Lake Ontario level would arouse United States protest and bring international complications; our own harbours on Lake Ontario would likewise be depreciated.

The Georgian Bay Canal.

The other alternative for a deep waterway from Port Arthur to Montreal has been the proposed Georgian Bay Canal.

The principle upon which the required depth in the Georgian Bay Canal is obtained is that of building dams and raising the level of the river, generally so providing the required depth not only in a channel but over a considerable width affording freer movement for vessels; a fairway.

The cost of the Georgian Bay Canal would now probably run to at least $150,000,000, due to the increased cost of living and of materials and the greater disturbance of established conditions.

The New Route.

I propose that the Great Lakes Route be accepted via the Welland to Cardinal at the head of the St. Lawrence rapids and canals.

I find that a deep canal can be, easily, carried through at Lake Ontario level from Cardinal to the vicinity of Ottawa, at which latter point it would require a 105 foot drop to the proposed level of the Ottawa river (say by three locks).

The canal on leaving the St. Lawrence would be through a 30 foot cut for three miles or so and then through level rich farming land as a level ditch following the contour of a gently sloping side hill.

The distance is about 50 miles from the St. Lawrence to the Ottawa, and would cost about $50,000,000. I am confident that the estimated cost would be much reduced on actual survey.

Using the Ottawa River—Ottawa to Montreal.

As already shown the attainment of the required levels in the Georgian Bay Canal, particularly in that portion of it which I propose to use, would be comparatively simple and inexpensive, due to its accomplishment mainly through the means of two dams and the consequent raising of the river levels.

In proposing the adoption of that portion of the Georgian Bay Canal from Ottawa to Montreal, I would draw attention to the fact that there are only five locks which with the two dams afford long stretches of uninterrupted fairway.

Moreover the cost of the Georgian Bay Canal from Ottawa to Montreal as given in the Government estimates of that scheme is about $30,000,000, and owing to the work being all included in a few structures, the margin of error in the estimates should not be very great. As to that portion of the Georgian Bay Canal which extends from Ottawa westward and includes such a great amount of rock work, there is of course a larger margin of probable increase in estimate, and under the present conditions I have therefore assumed the total

cost of the Georgian Bay Canal at about $150,000,000 for comparative purposes.

Summary.

Comparative Approximate Estimate.

Alternatives:—		
Georgian Bay Canal, 22 ft., or deepening St. Lawrence Canals, 14 to 22 ft.		$150,000,000
New canal from Cardinal to Ottawa, 30 ft.	$50,000,000	
Adopting Georgian Bay Canal, Ottawa to Montreal	30,000,000	
		$ 80,000,000
		$ 70,000,000
Saving of St. Lawrence Canals		25,000,000
Total advantage by new route		$ 95,000,000

to which may be added many millions from non-interference with the country's traffic during the busy seasons of several years.

The saving of the St. Lawrence canals, as mentioned would have the further advantage of leaving us with two routes from Cardinal to Montreal.

From the foregoing it is my opinion that the scheme which I have outlined would mean an economic saving to this country of over $100,000,000, better than by the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals or the building of the Georgian Bay Canal.

It would seem wise in the public interest to establish now by a preliminary survey the cheaper and thereby more likely and nearer fulfilment of our needs.

The required survey should cost about $20,000.

N. Cauchon.

Of course, a matter of this kind would specially pertain to the Department of Public Works. But the conclusions are rather addressed to my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), because the country cannot commit itself at the present juncture to such a vast expenditure. The writer of this article, who is a well known authority, asks that preliminary surveys be made by the Department of the Interior. I would ask the minister to read this communication, which is now on Hansard, and submit it to the officers of the Geodetic Survey. Mr. Cauchon is of the opinion that the construction of this canal between Cardinal and Ottawa would save a tremendous amount of money and would solve the question of transportation.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the minister state approximately how many miles have been surveyed? What is the total amount of precise levelling done by the Geodetic Survey?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think there is a misapprehension as to the Geodetic Survey. To the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) I may say that the project which he read could not be taken up by the Geodetic Survey. The Geodetic Survey merely fixes the precise location of points, and surveying for other purposes is made with reference to these fixed determined points. The subject covered by the memorandum would come entirely under the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that. But the inception of the work is with the Geodetic Survey, on which the other surveys are based.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In so far as that is concerned, the Geodetic Survey now has work under way along the St. Lawrence, and, I think, has work under way at all points where it will be available for the surveys of engineers who may go out in pursuance of such a suggestion. But the initiative in this matter is with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), and, with his well known views on economy in war time. I am afraid he is very likely not to embark on it at present. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) asks as to the number of miles surveyed. There are no miles surveyed at all in the Geodetic Survey. It merely locates points. Surveys that are made longitudinally and latitudinally are made by the Topographical Surveys under Dr. Deville.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I have here the report of the Interior Department for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917, and on page 24 I see:

> The total amount of precise levelling of the Geodetic survey of Canada is now over 9,700 miles, and about 2,800 standard bench-marks have been established.

I wanted to know if the number of miles had increased during the fiscal year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What my hon. friend refers to is the levelling. It is an item included in this vote, but it is known as "precise levelling." That is the mileage covered. He asks whether it is equal to last year's or not. Last year's amount equalled the previous year, and this year's it is estimated, will be about the same.

> Expenses connected with the survey and demarcation of International Boundaries including $1,000 to J. J. McArthur as International Boundary Commissioner, $60,495.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Has the department the same number of parties working on these surveys?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The work is undertaken jointly by the United States and

Canada. We have had the same number working this year as last. We have the same number as the Americans have.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is this a necessary work to be performed during the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is pursuant to the Treaty, and is nearly completed. It is expected the coming season will see the completion of the survey and demarcation of the international boundaries.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Wnat will it cost to complete this survey?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This item completes it.

Mr. ROBB: A few years ago, the minister of the day made the statement that in the negotiations with the United States we were arranging for two hundred feet of a neutral zone to be used as a highway along the international line. Has any progress been made in these negotiations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so.

Government of the Northwest Territories—salary of Mr. George D. Pope as accountant to the commissioner, $300.

Mr. MORPHY: What salary does this gentleman get besides the amount mentioned here?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Pope is head of the Revenue Branch of the Interior Department, in which capacity he receives a salary of $3,300. Mr. Du Plessis, secretary to the commissioner, is under the Northwest Mounted Police Department, at a salary, I believe, of $2,300 or $2,400.

Mr. MORPHY: What extra work does he do for this $300? It is so small that it looks like a sort of Christmas box.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really cannot give any information further than may be inferred from the name of his office. I assume that he conducts all the correspondence for the commissioner.

Government of the Yukon Territory, $185,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a very radical reduction here of $135,000. In administration alone a reduction of $35,000 is effected, due to the reorganization of the whole administrative machinery of the Yukon. Large numbers of officers have been relieved of their duties, with considerable saving to the country. The following offices are abolished: commissioner, $12,000, excepting $3,000 which he received during the period of his enlistment; administrator, $6,000; registrar, $5,000; director of surveys, $3,500; mining inspector, $3,300; draftsman, $3,000; clerk, $2,700; clerk, $2,160; legal adviser, $3,500; mining recorder, $3,300; mining recorder, $3,000. Assistant gold commissioner, Whitehorse, $6,500, office continued; clerk, $2,400, office continued.

Mr. CAHILL: Has any provision been made for the men whose offices have been abolished?

Mr. MEIGHEN: All members of the original party which went up there got their aggregate leave of absence, that is to say, the holidays which had accrued, and were also paid their expenses. The Director of Surveys was simply stationed there. He is still in the department, but he does not get his Yukon allowance.

Dominion Lands and Parks—salaries of the Outside Service, $440,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a reduction of $45,000, effected in this way: Seven Dominion land offices and twenty-two sub-offices in Western Canada have been closed and the work is being carried on by the staffs of the remaining offices, with some additions from those closed.

5 p.m.

Mr. CAHILL: Are any homestead lands now open for settlement by civilians?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, all excepting those reserved.

Mr. CAHILL: What lands are reserved?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Speaking generally, all lands within fifteen miles of any railway.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention to continue to allow settlers to go on lands which are twenty, thirty or forty miles from a railway?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no embargo on that. A man can settle on any homestead land that is available, land that is surveyed and thrown open for settlement, if it is not held for soldier settlement or otherwise.

Mr. CAHILL: Would not this be a good time to put an embargo on the outlying lands instead of allowing people to settle anywhere out in the West, and then cry for railroads? The department should adopt some policy of directing the settlement of homestead lands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only way in which that could be effectually done would be to withdraw homesteads from entry and perhaps abolish the homesteading privilege altogether, and then sell lands only as may be thought wise. In this way men could not settle at far-away points and the obliga-

tion to build railways to those points would not be incurred. No decision has yet been reached on that subject.

Mr. CAHILL: Has it been considered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The subject has been considered in a general way.

Surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, $496,300.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: How many parties will be employed this year in the survey?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Thirty-seven.

Protection of timber in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Northwest Territories, and the railway belt in British Columbia; tree culture in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and inspection and management of Forest Reserves, $650,000.

Mr. ROSS: I should like to have a statement from the minister of what is being done in this connection. A report was laid on the Table last night, but we have not yet had an opportunity of perusing it. I understand, from a notice I saw in the press, that that report is in connection with this item. This is one of the most important branches of the work of the Department of the Interior. Not very long ago I had an opportunity of reading a report made, in December, 1916, I think, by a special committee appointed in Great Britain, consisting of some of the most eminent men. Their report dealt with this question of timber, and it was pointed out that after Russia and the United States, Canada was, so far as supplying timber to the British Empire was concerned, the third nation in importance. It was also pointed out that in recent years Great Britain had depended upon Russia for her supply of timber, as we were shipping most of ours to the United States. Great stress was laid upon the fact that for the defence of the Empire a sufficient supply of timber was most essential. In view of the fact that Great Britain can no longer depend upon supplies of timber from Russia, in view of the critical stage in which the war now is, and also in view of the importance placed upon the timber supply to the Empire, I should like to know what policy the department is pursuing in this matter. I see the item is not increased. In the report it was stated—I am speaking entirely from memory—that the governments of Great Britain and the overseas Dominions were in communication on the subject. What communications have been received by this Government? And what steps are being taken to follow the suggestions made in that report?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The subject to which my hon. friend alludes has been under review, not by the department, but by a subcommittee of the Reconstruction Committee of the Government, the vice-chairman of which is the Hon. Mr. Maclean. I know that that subcommittee has made a preliminary report, but if it has made a final report no copy has been sent to the chief of the Forestry Branch. This appropriation is the same as last year. I could not see my way clear to make any reduction in it. More money is now required to do the same work as in previous years unless one can effect a better organization. That I am trying to do.

Mr. ROSS: I am not asking the minister to make a reduction in the amount. I am suggesting, in view of the situation in Great Britain, it might be wise to increase it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like very much to do so, but I do not see my way clear. The importance of the work no one can over-estimate. The preservation of our forests means the preservation of one of the main assets of Canada. I do not think, however, that under present conditions we can justify an increased expenditure under this heading.

Mr. CAHILL: To what extent is tree culture being carried on?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the sum of $60,000 of this amount is attributable to that head. There are established in the West stations at which tree culture is carried on. The trees are, as a rule, given free to farmers who wish to use them. My hon. friend, knowing conditions in the West, knows that one is performing a real service when he increases the number of trees in the almost treeless plains.

Mr. CAHILL: Where are the stations located?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At Indian Head and Saskatoon.

Mr. CAHILL: Are those all there are in the West?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: There are none in Alberta?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is there any co-operation between the department and the provincial forest services in regard to the protection of forests?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I do not know that I can exactly define the extent of it. There are two main branches of our work.

Forest protection is carried on with considerable intensity in our own reserves, which are the reserves that we should exert our energies to protect. We carry on, not so intensively, another work in the other forests of the Dominion. Our duty is, in the main, to preserve the forests owned by ourselves. Nothing definite has been agreed upon in regard to co-operation with the provinces, although they are getting the benefit of some of our work. The provinces protect their own timber.

Mr. ROSS: Have any special precautions been taken in recent years for protecting the forests from fire?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. For instance, we are establishing a system of licensing whereby a permit must be obtained before any fire can be set on unpatented lands. The provinces are doing the same with regard to their lands, and we utilize their officials as far as possible. Then we have a patrol system extending through our whole forest area.

Grant to Canadian Forestry Association, $3,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this for the annual convention of the Forestry Association?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is for the general work of the association, of which the convention is an important feature.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think it is an excellent idea to give the association this small grant, because it is doing good work. I must say on behalf of my province that the Commission of Conservation has paid great tribute to the work performed by the Forestry Department of the province of Quebec. The Commission of Conservation in their last report state that Quebec stands ahead of all provinces in the matter of forest protection, and Sir Clifford Sifton in the same report pays high tribute to Mr. Piché, the forestry engineer of the province of Quebec. In fact, the other provinces, notably New Brunswick, have asked the government of the province of Quebec to loan Mr. Piché and his staff to organize the same service in their provinces. I think with a proper, up to date, organization in the different provinces we could save large tracts of forest from the fires that are caused by railway trains and by smokers cruising the forests. I hope the Forestry Association will continue its good work and that the department will substantially help it with a grant.

To pay expenses connected with water-power investigations and reports in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the railway belt in British Columbia, $144,000.

Mr. CAHILL: This seems a large item in these times.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a reduction of $15,000 as compared with last year, although I do not think there has been any reduction in the volume of work carried on. I do not see how we could afford, even now, to neglect to procure all possible information about the primary sources of our power and make it available for capital, because there never was a time when water-powers were more needed than now, and there never will be a time when the development of our water-powers will mean so much to this country as within the next ten years.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Are these investigations carried on only in those provinces where the natural resources are owned by the Dominion Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: While we give special attention to the water-powers that are owned by the Dominion, we make arrangements with the provinces to place our staff at their disposal on fair terms, meaning in every case a charge upon us. We have already made such an arrangement with Nova Scotia and are making a similar arrangement, I understand, with New Brunswick and are prepared to do so with any province.

For surveys and works under the Irrigation Act, etc., including $400 for P. Marchand as auditor of disbursements made by companies acquiring lands under the Irrigation system, $169,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister leave an item on which I could discuss irrigation matters, as I have not the data with me now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. We will leave one item.

Canadian National Parks, $300,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this for the buffalo herds and such like?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This includes all the parks. We have over three thousand buffalo, and I believe the calf crop this year is estimated at between seven and eight hundred.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They multiply fast.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are doing very well.

Administration of the North West Game Act and the Migratory Birds Act, $18,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not remember just what was the scope of the Migratory Birds' Act passed a year or so ago, but I should

like to call the minister's attention to a famous rock in the Gulf of St. Lawrence called Birds' rock. It is one of the most picturesque sights in the Gulf, and in normal times is visited every year by many tourists from America and even Europe, who go there to see the millions of birds—and there are literally millions of them. Some years ago some enterprising American and even Canadian business men started to kill the birds for use in ornamenting ladies' hats, and the eggs were stolen with a view to selling them. I do not know whether the Migratory Birds Act applies to those sea birds in the Gulf of St. Lawrence or not but I would ask my hon. friend to look into this matter and get some information in regard to it. It would be a sorry day if these bird species were to disappear from Canada. When I say that there are millions of birds on this rock I do not exaggerate. The rock itself is about the size of the grounds around this building and there is enough space on the top of the rock, which is about three hundred feet high, to enable the lighthouse keeper to live there. He has a cow or two and he can have a few hens on the rock, but all the sides of the rock are inhabited by these birds. When the steamer goes nearby it is easy to see these birds by the millions. Strange to say, the first people to protest against the destruction of these birds were the Boston people. They are very good people as I know. I remember having read in some publication in New England a protest against the destruction of these birds. The Migratory Birds Act should apply to sea birds as well as to land birds. Does my hon. friend know anything about this matter?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The rock to which my hon. friend refers, I believe, is called Percé rock.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Percé rock is another one; it is near the land and within Chaleur bay. As a matter of fact, some years ago there were many sea birds on that rock but they have been disappearing at a terrible rate every year, although there is still a large number there. The rock I have been referring to belongs to the Magdalen Islands group, about ten or twelve miles from Bryon island. There are three or four rocks at that place. This one is called Birds rock and from afar it looks like a big stone tower in the sea. It is about the size of these grounds; it is three hundred feet wide and of a round configuration and in the interstices of the rock around the edge there are millions and millions of birds of many kinds. Some people approach the rock but not on stormy days, because it is very difficult to land there. The sides are very steep and there is no shallow water around the rock. The lighthouse keeper is obliged to use a hoist for his provisions. When the steamer comes in the fall to take his family away, or in the spring to bring his family, they have to use a hoist; there is no other means of getting access to the summit. I believe that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should not allow the lighthouse keeper to use a gun for signalling purposes. Every time the gun is fired the birds rise in flight. It is a necessity I suppose and perhaps I should not object to it, but I do most decidedly object to the persistent destruction of these birds by parties coming from all parts of Canada and the United States who kill the birds for their feathers and take the eggs. The Government of Canada should protect this bird sanctuary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Migratory Birds Act covers under its provisions all migratory birds, whether sea or land birds. The rock to which my hon. friend refers is Birds rock. I will have to introduce what I propose to say by reference to Percé rock. That being a natural bird sanctuary, negotiations were carried on with the Quebec Government for some time with a view of establishing it as such, the intention of the department being, first, that it should be so established provincially. But that not being accepted, we have tried for some time to have it so established under our own department. The Conservation Commission has also treated with the Quebec Government for some years to the same end, but so far without success; not that they are opposed to this being done but there has been some difficulty in securing the title. Options were taken but they could not get sufficient options to cover it all. While we have looked to the same end in connection with Birds rock very little progress has been made. The same situation applies to Birds rock as to Percé rock. The killing of migratory birds on this rock is now forbidden under the Act. The Quebec legislature has passed legislation which conforms to the legislation of the Migratory Birds Act, so that now any one will be committing a breach of the law who destroys birds there, and it is within the power of the local Government to enforce the law. Of course, it comes under the general provisions of the Migratory Birds Act as well, but it is made a bird sanctuary for the reasons I have given.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the department been in communication with the Quebec Government in regard to the matter?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If it is the intention of the department to make these two rocks sanctuaries for birds I would assist my hon. friend with the Quebec Government, because I think it is the wish of the people of Canada as a whole that these birds should be preserved.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it the duty of anybody to see that the Act is enforced along the coasts of the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act is based on the principle of provincial co-operation, and as the provinces have jurisdiction it is the intention that each province shall pass an Act conforming to this Act and take charge of its administration.

Engraving, lithographing, printing and preparation of maps, plans and kindred publications of the Dominion, including necessary materials for same, $74,375.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the cause of the increase in this item?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is entirely due to the increased cost of paper.

Mr. BUREAU: Should not the expense under this particular heading be decreased? I understand that a great deal of the expenditure for lithographing and printing, and for the preparation of maps, and so on, heretofore, has been incurred by the Immigration Branch in its work of attracting immigrants to Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a different item altogether. This particular work is under the chief geographer. What my hon. friend refers to would be under the Natural Resources Commission. This particular vote consists of two divisions. The sum of $31,100 is the estimate of the chief geographer, which shows an increase of $600. What my hon. friend refers to has nothing to do with that. The next item is the estimate of the Superintendent of the Natural Resources Intelligence Branch, $35,000, which shows an increase of $7,675. That increase also is due entirely to a thirty per cent increase in the cost of printing.

Mr. BUREAU: Does not the expenditure for the preparation of maps showing the mining areas, the timber areas, etc., in Canada, come under the item of Natural Resources?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Is not that part of the literature which is used by the Immigration Department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. If so, it would come under the immigration vote. This is for maps and reports of practical value in placing before the public accurate, graphic evidence of the economic aspect of the natural resources of the Dominion; special attention being given to those resources the development of which is essential on account of the war. It is vitally necessary, in view of the economic conditions in Canada, that the Dominion be in a position to meet legitimate inquiries concerning these resources and their development. The present year has shown an increase of 107 per cent over the preceding year in the demand for information of this nature.

Mr. BUREAU: The other day I received a report which I have not yet had time to carefully peruse. It seems to be the report of the commission appointed by the Government to investigate the natural resources of Canada, its mining possibilities, and so forth. May I ask if that commission is the same as that now under discussion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what commission my hon. friend refers to, unless it would be the Economic and Development Commission. If that is so that commission procured a great deal of its data from our Natural Resources Intelligence Branch, which is under Mr. F. C. C. Lynch.

Mr. BUREAU: To whom does the commission which I have reference to, report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: To the Prime Minister, at least that is my recollection.

Mr. BUREAU: Is he the minister in charge of that particular commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the commission referred to was appointed in something like the same manner as the Food Controller was appointed at first, and that it is reporting direct to the Prime Minister. I may be wrong, but that is my impression. There is a commission known as the Imperial Resources Commission, which I think is under Colonel Cantlie.

Mr. BUREAU: Can any of the information which is obtained from Mr. Lynch's branch be used by the commission under Colonel Cantlie, and is this an Imperial or a Dominion commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A Dominion commission. I think it is known as the Imperial Resources Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: So it appears we have triplicate commissions engaged in kindred work. There is the commission to inquire into our economic resources, another to inquire into our industrial resources, and the one that we are considering dealing with our natural resources. I suggest to the minister that money might be saved by handing over to these commissions the information collected by his department, so that it can be used by them in conducting their investigations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: While it may be true that the Imperial Resources Commission obtained information from the Natural Resources Intelligence Branch, they would not get from it all the information that is to be found embodied in their reports. I have seen some of the reports of that commission and they seem to me to be very valuable. The present vote is for maps. There is, for example, the homestead map of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, for which a vote of $7,150 is asked. This series of homestead maps is in demand more and more every year. There is a similar homestead map of Northern Alberta; an elevator map of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta; a serial map of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and, in addition, there are bank maps. These comprise a bank map of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, a bank map of Ontario and Quebec, a bank map of the Maritime Provinces, a bank map of British Columbia, and so forth. I may say that the hon. member can get access to these maps at any time, and they will show the position that every parcel of land is in—whether it is Crown land, or whether it is homestead land, and if so, of what character; whether it is alienated or not, and if it is alienated, whether it is cultivated or not; if it is not alienated, whether it is cultivated or not.

Mr. BUREAU: Are the maps printed each year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the sixteenth edition of the homestead maps. I do not think the map I have just described was ever printed before until this year. I think Mr. Lynch has only completed those maps recently. The value of the information obtainable from them, and their clearness, is a real revelation.

Mr. BUREAU: Does that cover the three provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. BUREAU: Some of these maps were sent to me during the recess on which the homestead lands taken up and their character were indicated by shades of colour. I would like to know if the same map, showing the lands disposed of, is printed every year, and if so why the old "cut" could not be used, with appropriate markings to show what lands had been disposed of in the interval?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That doubtless is done with reference to the homestead maps, but the new maps were not intended for homestead maps. I think the natural resources map contains information that never was shown before.

Mr. BUREAU: In what line?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the cultivation, as to the purposes for which the lands are being used, and the purposes for which they are yet available.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The hon. gentleman speaks of a Dominion commission under the control of this Government bearing the name of the Imperial Resources Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Does not the minister think the resources of this country are primarily national resources, and that the good old name of National Resources Commission should be retained? What is the meaning of "Imperial Resources Commission?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may have the name wrong, but I do not think I have. I think the significance of it is entirely misapprehended by my hon. friend.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I do not like these names which mean nothing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have no particular repugnance to me. The word "Imperial" there, if it is the proper word, would be intended to signify this: the resources of Canada, belonging to Canada solely, that could be used for the Imperial purposes of the war. It may be "Imperial War Resources Commission," I am not quite sure. But I think the word "Imperial" is used

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is the hon. gentleman sure that it is intended only for the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. All the reports I saw in reference to that, I am sure, are only for the purpose of the war.

Mr. BUREAU: Even if they are only for the war, why not name it the Canadian Resources Commission? That would not prevent the resources of Canada being used by Great Britain—

An hon. MEMBER: Or by the Allies.

Mr. BUREAU: I think the point raised by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) is well taken. If it is a question of the natural resources which we are to supply to the Allies, in the shape of ore or anything else, they should be furnished as coming from Canada, as Canadian and not Imperial. That will arouse a proper spirit, and make our people develop proper pride, and perhaps we may come closer together if the word "Canadian" is held more in honour.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am glad the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) is now in his seat. As he is going to leave shortly for England, I am glad he has listened to the remarks that have just been made, and hope that he will make everybody understand that the resources of Canada are national resources, Canadian resources.

Mr. BUREAU: The same as all the rest.

Mr. ROWELL: I am glad to have heard the remarks of my hon. friend. I always listen to him with pleasure.

Mr. BUREAU: The listening is very easy. What impression has it made on the hon. gentleman?

Mr. ROWELL: Very favourable.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not the listening we care about, it is what will be the result of the listening when he goes over to the other side. We want to know what impression he is getting.

Mr. ROWELL: A very favourable impression.

Mr. MORPHY: While we are on this subject, I may suggest a compromise. We will call it the "British-Canadian War Resources Commission."

Mr. BUREAU: I take exception to that. I think there is an imputation in the use of the term "British-Canadian." We all know that what is Canadian is British. I object to that name being accepted.

Ordnance Lands, salaries and expenses, $1,695.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know whether the minister has the information at hand, but if he has not, I take this opportunity of asking him if he would send me a letter regarding ordnance lands in Trois Rivières. I have tried to get exactly what the area of these lands is, situated in the centre of the city, where the public buildings are erected. I once made application to get a plan, but did not get what I wanted. I would ask the minister if it would not be possible to get a plan or blueprint showing the limits of this property.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will procure that and send it to the hon. member.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If I remember rightly, these lands are in charge of the Militia Department. Plans were sent to the hon. member once before, I remember looking it up. All the lands we hold there are the drill hall, the parade ground up on the hill, and some land on the hill.

Mr. BUREAU: What I received was a plan of the military camp, which is under the control of the Militia Department. But the land in the centre of the town, on the river front, was not indicated on that plan.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thought it was.

Grant to Alpine Club of Canada, $1,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to know what this club is and why it should be an object of public benefactions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That question occurred to me also when the item was under review. But it is thought that the grant is worth the money. It is much on the same principle as the grant to our parks. The advertisement which the mountains and scenery of Canada receive through the activities of the club is worth the money to this country, just on the same principle as by the tourist traffic encouraged the money spent on our parks is becoming more and more an asset and a profitable investment for this country.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with care to the explanation made by the minister, but I must say that I cannot follow him in what he says. Mountain climbing is a sport of wealthy folk, and the Government propose to give, at a time of stress and strain like this, one thousand dollars to this club. I protested very strongly the other evening against a grant of $5,000 to assist in cultivating the habit of eating fish in Toronto, in other words a gift of $5,000 to the Toronto Exhibition, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told me was to be spent on fish dinners.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a good thing for Toronto to eat fish.

Mr. McMASTER: That is not the question. What I would impress very strongly upon the minister is that the Government are asking the people of Canada for sacrifice, and are properly asking the people to economize in every possible way. What will the man on the small salary—for he is the man above all who is hit hard by present conditions—think when he hears that the Dominion Government has given $1,000 to a club of rich folk to climb mountains in the West? It may be quite proper to encourage this sport in time of peace, although I doubt it very much. I am not in favour of this artificial stimulation of the climbing industry or any other industry. In time of war this is an improper grant, and I hope the minister will follow the dictates of his own common sense by cutting it out altogether. If I can find a seconder I will so move, unless the minister feels he should cut it out. It should not be in the Estimates in the fourth year of a world war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is this a grant to the Alpine Club or is it to support the Swiss mountaineers who are laying out paths all through the Rockies? I understand there are a number of Swiss mountaineers living in the Columbia valley, who are opening up pathways all through the mountains for the use of rich and poor. Is the grant for them or for the Alpine Club?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a vote to the Alpine Club direct; it has nothing to do with the people referred to by my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes). The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is proceeding on a wrong hypothesis. The club is not an association of rich people. Indeed, one who has been active in its work is a poorly-paid Presbyterian minister. Others are school teachers.

Mr. McMASTER: If we make a special grant to the poor Presbyterian minister, I shall not object so strongly. But I do not like this grant to the club and I ask the minister to withdraw it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The vote is not in the nature of a charitable grant; it is in the nature of an investment. The work of this association is of an exploratory character and is of benefit to the country because of the advertising which it gives to Canada. They publish an annual report, which goes all over the world.

Mr. McMASTER: I move that this item be struck out.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest that this item pass, because it is part of one estimate, and if this item stands the whole estimate will have to stand. The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) may bring up the matter he wishes to discuss under the Indian Lands estimates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: All right.

Amendment (Mr. McMaster) negatived on division.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the hon. gentleman has any more estimates, let us take them now, and then adjourn.

Mr. McMASTER: Let us sit to-night and get through.

Mr. BUREAU: We can keep on until eight o'clock and then adjourn.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the proposal; are we to sit after six?

The CHAIRMAN: The understanding is that, by mutual consent, the Committee will sit until the Indian Lands estimates are passed, and that when the Committee rises the House will adjourn until Monday at eleven o'clock.

Soldiers' Land Settlement, $2,916,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the first vote under the Soldier Settlement Act, 1917. The Soldier Settlement Board, appointed on January 31st last under the Act, consists of Mr. Samuel Maber, acting chairman, formerly head of the British Columbia Lands Branch of the Department of the Interior, who is serving on this board without extra salary; Mr. C. F. Rowland, and Major Ashton. Mr. Maber is an old officer of the department and was appointed in order that we might have the benefit of his wide experience and his excellent ability as a departmental officer. The activities of the board were first addressed to the taking care of such loans to returned soldiers as would be necessary to enable them to do their spring seeding. Very satisfactory results have been accomplished. Applications have been disposed of to the number of 272. The advances in loans amount to $341,558, an average for each settler of $1,256. The Dominion land agencies throughout the country have been made agencies of the Soldier Settlement Board in order to avoid the expense of a duplicated organization.

6 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you adopted the famous Van Horne plan of radial colonies? Do you take the lands here and there with-

out regard to the number of returned soldiers applying for them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not select the land for them. The soldier may settle on Dominion lands and get free entry. It is quite true that only a limited area of good land is available, but I think there is enough to enable the board to be very useful to the soldier, for a time at all events. So far the board has not encouraged settlement in communities. The soldier may buy his own land anywhere, or if he has land and can give the board a first mortgage thereon, he is entitled to a twenty-year loan at 5 per cent. This is the class of men who have so far chiefly availed themselves of the Act, although in some cases they have gone on unpatented homestead lands. I cannot say how many have made entries because our regulations have only recently been adopted. The machinery, however, is complete for taking care of entries made by returned soldiers.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Is it the intention of the board to allot this land at present? If the area of available land is limited, what will be done in the case of soldiers who return two or three years hence?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In governmental services we very seldom make arrangements for two or three years hence. It is sufficient to take care of the present and the immediate future. As a matter of general policy, however, it is my desire and the desire of the Government to work towards co-operative arrangements with the various provinces. Some progress has already been made to that end. We want to make arrangements whereby the assistance of the Dominion Government can be given to provincial plans and policies of soldier settlement, because we want to have regard to the fundamental principle of our constitution that the control of patented lands, civil rights and local administration is in the province.

Mr. NESBITT: Is there any intention of giving the soldier in the province of Ontario assistance to locate on land or in such business as he might carry on?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. We have not yet got our organization in Ontario. We had first to take care of those districts from which the demands for land came, or where there was an immediate necessity of providing money, but we are now engaged in the work of establishing an organization in Ontario. It will be available for all soldiers settling in Ontario who select, or who have, land in that province and can avail themselves of the privilege of the Act and give the Soldier Settlement Board a mortgage on their land. Any one so settling can get a loan of $2,500 if the value of his land warrants that being done. As to any scheme of soldier settlement generally, we hope, having in view the acquirement of land for the purpose, to work in co-operation with the Ontario Government.

Mr. CAHILL: What basis of security is the Government taking for the loans they have made to the 272 settlers? I was in the office of the Soldier Settlement Board some time ago, and from the regulations as outlined to me by one of the commissioners, it did not seem to me that the proposal was of any great benefit to the soldier. I understood the purpose was to advance to the soldier settler about fifty per cent of the value of his land or undertaking. He could borrow as much as that from any one, but he is, perhaps, getting it at a little better rate of interest than he would be charged by a loan company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He gets very considerable advantages. There is, of course, a limit to what can be done, because we must remember that the number of returned soldiers now is small as compared with what it will be, and that the standard of assistance set for one must be set for all. The soldier is entitled to get a loan, first of all on his soldier entry to which he does not get title. That loan nobody else can get. The soldier gets it at five per cent, repayable on the amortization plan in twenty years. He gets it without cost; he has no solicitor's fees to pay, as that is all taken care of by the board. And the soldier is able to get a larger per cent of the value of his property as a loan than would the ordinary settler.

Mr. CAHILL: What per cent?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It varies, depending upon the quantity of lands immediately available for cultivation, on the revenue bearing power of the property more than on its immediate value in the market. But I think as high as 70 or 75 per cent has been advanced.

Mr. MOWAT: The question asked by my hon. and gallant friend from Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon) raises a question which I am not sure has sunk into the mind of either the minister or any other hon. member. My hon. friend has pointed

to the time "when the boys come home." At the present time there are vastly greater numbers overseas than there are in Canada, and I am told there is a feeling overseas that the soldiers' interests should wait for consideration until the main body comes home. Here is a question again as to there being just so much available land, and it is very important that the Government should keep in mind that the main body is still overseas. As I understand the matter, soldiers are divided in feeling to some extent. Two returned soldiers have called upon me lately protesting against claims that have been presented by self-constituted champions of the returned soldiers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are they? Veterans?

Mr. MOWAT: These soldiers want the main considerations to wait until everybody is represented. I should like the House to keep this in mind when we are dealing with the returned soldier, that there is the quiet returned soldier and there is the one who meets with his fellows and passes resolutions which may be in his interest but with which the others do not agree. I do not know how far this difference extends, but it is there, and it is important for us to remember there are different kinds of returned soldiers and that they have different ideas as to what they want.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am at a loss to understand exactly what my hon. friend means by his language about the returned soldiers. Does he mean to say that some of them are so disreputable that we should not believe what they say? I understand there is a Great War Veterans' Association which speaks for the returned soldiers generally. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the Government should not listen to the claims of the veterans, but should wait until the other soldiers who are still overseas return to Canada? What the hon. gentleman states is all mythical.

Mr. TURRIFF: Did I understand the minister to say that when a soldier applies under this Act for a quarter-section he can take a homestead whether he has had one previously or not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he is entitled to a homestead, he gets one.

Mr. TURRIFF: I should like to know if any provision has been made so that a soldier can get a bonus of a few hundred dollars in lieu of applying for a homestead under this Act, and still have the right to borrow $2,500. I have had a long experience in the West of men going on land under the tutelage of associations, or governments, or colonization companies, and as a rule, those people have failed. When an association has placed people on lands in the West and advanced money and taken mortgages on their farms in nine cases out of ten, or in nineteen cases out of twenty, those people have failed. I do not say that a man who is a farmer and who takes land under this Act will not make a success of it, but the great bulk of them will not be farmers. I don't care what conditions hedge around the grant of $2,500, or what precautions are taken to see that the men buy the right kind of horses and implements, in two or three years these men, who are forty or fifty miles away from a railway, will have spent that money and mortgaged their land, and the Government will have to take the land back and the money will be gone. The soldiers who take up land under this scheme will cost the country a lot of money in the end, for many of them will not make good, to put it mildly. I think it would be better for the country and more in the interest of the soldier in many cases, to give him the option of a cash bonus. I would ask the minister to consider that suggestion in the hope that when we meet next session something along that line will be done.

Mr. MORPHY: This is the biggest question, I believe, that is before this country to-day, and I rather deprecate the idea of forcing it through like this. I think we should let the matter stand over until Monday to give hon. gentlemen an opportunity of expressing their views and hearing what the policy of the Government is in the matter.

Mr. NESBITT: I would suggest that if we are not going to thresh it out now we had better rise and come back at eight o'clock, because we all want to get away on Wednesday, and if we devote Monday to discussing this matter that will be so much time lost for other legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite prepared to make a statement of policy in so far as it is possible at this date to do so, and to give all the details that can be given. As to soldier settlement, there is only one statute now under which soldier settlement takes place. Provisions have been made with regard to a soldier taking an entry on Dominion lands, and on other lands, provisions have also been made for the administration of the Act, and the board is in

active operation. We have entered into negotiations, which I think are virtually completed, with one province, looking to an arrangement whereby that province assumes supervision of its soldier settlement and receives financial assistance from the Dominion to enable it to take care of by far the greater portion of the financial obligations thus entailed. We have now under review similar arrangements with other provinces, and I am in hopes that we shall succeed in coming to an agreement. I believe that is the proper principle. I believe that by local administration you will get the best results both for the soldier and for the country. I do not think any good is done by merely making an advance to the soldier and placing him on the land. I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I have seen too much of settlement both in Eastern and Western Canada, seen too many attempts to make men farmers by capital advances, to have much faith in that method ever making a man a success on the land.

Mr. MORPHY: Did the minister ever conceive the idea of the Dominion Government cultivating the land for the first two years and letting the soldier learn how to farm during that time, and receiving his pay, so that at the end of the period he could take the land over with some knowledge of farming? There are other policies besides that of the minister that I would like to discuss.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That method has certainly been thought of by myself. It has been given more than thought by one province. The province of Ontario has adopted the principle of provincial assistance, accurately described, I think, by my hon. friend. I make this suggestion to the committee: That having in mind the principle which animates my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), having in mind the wisdom of not going too fast at the present time, having in mind the fact that the great majority of the soldiers are overseas, and that they should have a say in the final disposition of this property as well as those at home, I think it would be well to watch the development of the project in Ontario, to see how it works out, and what lessons we can gain from it, before committing ourselves to any particular policy. The scheme in Ontario is well under way, and I think that before the next session of Parliament we can form very intelligent conclusions as to the success of the enterprise, and whether or not it embodies sound principles of settlement. For the present I think it would be well to keep in mind the main goal of making the soldier settlement a success by personal supervision on the part of the board both as regards unpatented land and land owned by the soldier, and confine outside operations to an endeavour to make suitable arrangements with the provinces whereby they can carry on successful provincial schemes.

Mr. CAHILL: Would an arrangement with other provinces similar to that made with Ontario involve giving to the provinces their natural resources?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have no arrangement with Ontario. That province has not approached us in regard to the matter. Ontario has a policy of its own along the line stated by my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy), of taking an area of land, purchased or its own property, improving that area, and making individual settlements out of it by the utilization of soldier labour, paying the soldiers for their work with a view to selling them the land ultimately on terms.

Mr. CAHILL: An arrangement of that kind would be impossible unless the province had the land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Or acquired it.

Mr. CAHILL: A province would hardly be likely to acquire land seeing the Dominion Government owns vast areas.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The province would not acquire land owned by us, but provinces that have full control or ownership of the land can bring the land under a scheme of co-operation with the Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will it be optional for the soldier to come under a provincial or a Dominion scheme? Has he to take up land in a particular province? The Dominion lands are in Western Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We put no restraint on the soldier at all, but it is quite true we are able to offer greater inducements in the West because we own the lands there. On the other hand the provinces in the East can offer greater inducements if they wish, under their own individual policy, so I think the balance is about fair.

Mr. MANION: With the Dominion land agents mostly in the western provinces, would it not be rather difficult for a soldier farmer in Ontario to get a loan on his land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That point is well taken, and we are intending to meet that difficulty by the establishment of offices in Ontario for the taking of soldiers' applications in this province.. We will have an inspector and a supervisor for that purpose.

Mr. MANION: In the near future?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the very near future.

Mr. MANION: I think it should be a Dominion-wide proposition.

Department of Indian Affairs—salaries, including A. S. Williams, Law Clerk at $2,900, $133,075; contingencies, $19,000.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: As we are dealing with the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs, I wish to refer to a matter about which I spoke to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). It is in connection with certain charges against Mr. Taylor, now agent at the Crooked Lake Indian Reserve. Under the old system I had the patronage of the Government for seven years and I never in my life asked for the dismissal of a single individual, and never have I countenanced anything in that way. But I must admit that on the present occasion I feel that it is time that an official of the department who has not been dismissed should be dismissed, and I trust that the department will take some action in the matter. Last fall and winter I heard so many complaints about this agent, Mr. Taylor, that I thought it would be well to go into the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where is he located?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: A short distance north of Broadview near where I live. I therefore invited some of the people who were complaining of his actions to meet me at Broadview on a certain occasion. I asked Mr. Boyer also, the clerk of the agency, who was more or less conversant with what had been going on, to meet me there. I did not make any attempt to have a thorough investigation into the affairs in connection with the agency, but while I was satisfied that I had only touched the fringe of the wrong-doing of the agent I felt that I had heard enough to justify me in asking the department to immediately suspend the agent pending inquiry, to institute a thorough inquiry into his conduct, and also to recommend that the investigation be not placed wholly in the hands of Commissioner Graham. I did not wish then, nor do I wish now, to question the fact that Mr. Graham is a very competent official, but there were what appeared to me good reasons why Mr. Graham should not be the sole investigator in that particular case. The department provided for an investigation by Mr. Graham alone, but did not suspend the agent, thereby leaving the people from whom the evidence against him must mainly come under the thumb of the accused. That was not a correct principle. This investigation was, to my mind, anything but thorough. I believe, however, that the evidence brought out not only justified the dismissal of the official but made it the duty of the department to dismiss him. The Indian Act, section 42, provides among other things that:

No official or employee connected with the Inside or Outside Service of the Department of Indian Affairs . . . . shall without special license in writing of the Superintendent General trade with any Indian or sell to him directly or indirectly any goods or supplies, cattle or other animals.

Section 131 provides that in case of violation of the provisions of this section, the person so violating shall be liable to a fine equal in amount to double the sum received for the goods, supplies, cattle or other animals sold.

And, in addition to that, the costs of the prosecution.

Mr. Taylor admits purchasing the following goods from Indians:

1. Hide from Old Francis.
2. Hide from Kenowekesequake.
3. Pony from Stevenson.

He admits having made the following sales to Indians:

1. Horse to Stevenson, bought at $142, sold to Indian at $175.
2. Horse to Kenoweswanwetang, which he claims belonged to his father's estate.
3. Horse to Zac Le Rat. Mr. Sugden says Mr. Taylor bought this horse from him at $126. This is not denied by Taylor. The clerk says the books show the horse was sold at $160. This price is not denied by Mr. Taylor.
4. Horse sold to Angus Alex. Mr. Sugden says he sold this horse to Taylor for $120, and the clerk says the books show the horse was sold at $140. Mr. Taylor does not deny either of these prices.
5. Horse to Tom Shesheep. Mr. Taylor says this horse belonged to his father's estate.
6. Horse to Harry Favel. Mr. Taylor says this was one of his father's horses.

Here are nine, or if we count the two deals with Stevenson as one trade, at least eight, distinct violations of a very important provision of the Indian Act. It seems to me that the policy of maintaining an Indian Agent in charge of a reserve who habitually violates one of the most important provisions of the Act is one that cannot be countenanced by any one who wants to see the Department of Indian

Affairs carried on as it should be. Mr. Taylor said:

I knew that the regulations prohibited me from dealing with Indians.

He showed nothing but contempt for the law and the department, shows little more respect for it in continuing in office an agent who thus openly and repeatedly violated one of the most important provisions of the Act under which he is working. Harry Cameron, the interpreter, who can hardly be accused of unfriendliness to the agent, in answer to a question says:

The agent often makes deals with the Indians, and I don't think he loses anything. I don't know how much he makes.

Neither do I know how much he makes nor is the department likely to know how much he makes until a more thorough investigation is held. The investigation, however, shows that in three of the deals referred to he sold for $475 horses that he had bought for $388, and so far as I can find the department has not punished him, or even asked for a refund of the difference.

Notwithstanding these many serious violations of the provisions of the Act, Mr. Graham in his report glosses them over by saying:

The Department's regulations state that no employee shall trade with the Indians, but I don't think that this regulation was intended to apply to employees purchasing berries, baskets, wood, water or hay for their own private stock on the reserve, and if not I cannot see that purchasing a hide to be used as a robe for one's family should be considered as exceptional.

Evidently Mr. Graham seems to think it is only in exceptional cases that law-breakers should be punished. I think it is only in exceptional cases that they should be allowed to go scot free. Further on he says with regard to those breaches of law:

There is no doubt at all but Mr. Taylor has been exceedingly indiscreet in his dealings with the Indians. He should have obtained permission from you before selling horses to them.

"Indiscreet" is a very gentle term to use in this connection. Still I suppose every law-breaker is "indiscreet." Speaking of Taylor's deal with Stevenson, Mr. Graham says:

I am satisfied there was no intention on his part to make anything out of the Indian.

This in face of the fact that Taylor himself says:

I consider I made $27.30 assuming the pony was worth $50.

And he does not appear from the evidence to question the fact that the pony he got from Stevenson in the trade was worth $50.

Mr. Graham, during the investigation, made this statement:

The late farm instructor Sugden states you have been in the habit frequently of using the Government blacksmith shop (at the agency) for repairing your own farm things, using coal and iron, the property of the department. Your own men and yourself did the work.

Mr. Taylor says in reply:

I do not remember working there myself, but my man used it two or three times doing private work.

No denial is made of the charge of applying the Government coal and iron to his own use. Mr. Sugden, in his statement, says that Mr. Taylor had his private threshing engine repaired in that way, but no notice of this was taken at the investigation. With regard to the tools said to have been taken from the Government threshing outfit, and afterwards found in Mr. Taylor's possession, that gentleman said, in answer to a question:

Yes, I had the tools, they are still in my car in the shed, I think.

Regarding the charges of using the Government blacksmith shop, the Government coal, and Government iron and tools, Mr. Graham says in his report:

Mr. Taylor admits his hired man used the Government blacksmith shop on two or three occasions doing private work. He also admits having used on his own motor, tools that belonged to the threshing outfit. It seems to me this latter charge is ridiculous.

It will be noticed that Taylor says, with regard to the tools: "I have the tools," while Mr. Graham softens it down by saying he had used them. The charge may, in Mr. Graham's mind, be ridiculous, but I am satisfied that had any one else appropriated the Government's property in this way, and had the fact come to Mr. Graham's attention, the offender would have been prosecuted for theft. I think these repeated breaches of the provisions of the Indian Act, and improper dealings with Government property should have insured the dismissal of the agent. I would not be taking up the time of the House, however, but for the fact that serious charges of immorality are made against this agent. I am satisfied that even the faint-hearted investigation held disclosed a state of affairs that called for his dismissal. It seems to me the House will agree that this is a very serious thing on

the part of an Indian agent. We know that the Indians are somewhat susceptible people, and it seems to me that it ought to be understood at all times that no one should be employed in the capacity of agent against whose moral conduct anything can be said. I am told that these charges of immorality against Indian agents and officials are very common—in fact, I am given to understand they are levelled against all of them. That may or may not be true, but as far as regards the particular locality of which I speak—and I have been living there for the last thirty-five or forty years—this is the first time I ever heard any suggestion of the kind with respect to the Indian agents on the Crooked Lake or Assiniboine reserves.

Mr. Graham appears to recognize the incompleteness of the evidence forthcoming, but seeks to lay the blame on some one else. So far as I know I was the only person laying any charges, but Mr. Graham chooses to ignore me altogether, and the investigation was over before I knew it was being held. Mr. Graham tries to throw the responsibility for what happened on Mr. Boyer, the clerk, and says of him:

> He has had every opportunity to have witnesses at the investigation to corroborate the charges made by the Indians and others, but there were none, and it was only a case of one person's word against another's.

Now Mr. Boyer has advised me that on the day the investigation commenced, Mr. Graham and his secretary arrived at the agency about 2 p.m., and they said nothing whatever to Boyer about any impending investigation until about 5.30 p.m., when that gentleman was preparing to go to his home. Then it was that he received the first intimation that an investigation was to be held. He was instructed by Mr. Graham to be present at the office at 7 p.m., when the investigation was commenced. Boyer has assured me that it was never intimated to him that he was to be in any way responsible for the prosecution, or that he had any authority to call witnesses. Mr. Boyer appears to have had connection with only five charges. On three of these Mr. Graham finds the charges proved. On another, with regard to oats, he finds Mr. Taylor's actions irregular and unbusinesslike.

I dislike very much taking up the time of the House with regard to any matter of this kind. I dislike to find fault with any official of the Government, but I believe the situation is so serious there that the dismissal of this official is necessary. I do not propose to stand by while any official, in a locality so near to my home as this is, acts in the manner in which this official has acted, without raising my protest against it.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The case which the hon. member has brought to the attention of the Committee is well worthy of a considered reply. Shortly after I assumed office, certain complaints reached the department and reached myself, forwarded by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) as to the conduct of this Indian agent. The complaints in question were not forwarded on the responsibility of the hon. member; he was simply a communicant to the department; the complaints were forwarded on the responsibility of one Boyer, who is clerk of the Indian agency, and were supported by his affidavit. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle asked in his communication that an investigation into the truth or falsity of the charges be made. I immediately ordered an investigation. The charges alleged in the main, immorality with Indian women. I appointed the most experienced inspector and one of the most highly valued and highly esteemed men in the service of the Government, Mr. Graham, to conduct the investigation. Beyond instructions to him to fully investigate the charge, no intimation whatever was given. Mr. Graham held his investigation, and heard Mr. Boyer, who was present throughout the proceedings, and Mr. Graham made a report from which my hon. friend has quoted. He found there were violations upon the part of Mr. Taylor of the regulations and laws of the department, as to dealing with the Indians. He found, however, that all charges on the other score were not proven. He recommended that the Indian agent be retained, but that he be reprimanded for his dealings with the Indians. He did not find that there was the slightest dishonesty or advantage taken of the Indians in respect of any of the dealings referred to. The report of Mr. Graham was concurred in by the deputy minister, and a letter was written to the agent, drawing his attention to the report and severely reprimanding him for the refractions of the law on his part. In that connection it was brought to my attention that minor trading, when no advantage is taken of the Indians, has been frequently indulged in by Indian agents, and to adopt a policy of dismissing every agent for breach of that regulation would be a very serious step. At the same time, the department disapproves of this practice, and has clearly made known to Mr. Taylor that he must cease entirely, whether he takes

advantage of them or not, the practice of trading with the Indians in any way.

On the other more serious score, as I say the report cleared Mr. Taylor. It found that no charge whatever was proven. Mr. Taylor is a most efficient agent who produces most excellent results. Mr. Graham, as I said, is an investigator upon whom I cannot improve in the Indian service. I have accepted his report, concurred in by the deputy minister, and I propose to hold Mr. Taylor to the line of duty. If other charges are made by responsible parties they will be investigated. Mr. Boyer, by whom the charge was made, has resigned his post as clerk.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec, $81,775.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to offer my thanks to the Minister of the Interior for the aid given by the department to the hospital at Caughnawaga. The hospital has done much good on that reserve. I have, however, a favour to ask on behalf of the good lady who has charge of that hospital. There is a quarry not far from the hospital, leased to a certain individual whose name I forget. It is very annoying to the patients, most of whom are young women, to hear the noise from the quarry all day, and not only the noise, but there is also in summer a great deal of dust from the quarry. I would like the minister to give special instructions to the agent through Mr. Scott to stop the exploitation of the quarry near the hospital.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it being done by the agent himself?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. The quarry has been leased by the department or the Government to a third party. A few years ago it was to a gentleman from Montreal, Mr. Giroux, I don't know who is the lessee now. My hon. friend can very well understand how annoying it is for the patients in the hospital to hear the noise from the quarry from morning until night, and to have the dust blown into the hospital whenever there is a slight breeze. The department has been exceedingly kind in the administration of this hospital and I would like the minister to give special instructions regarding this matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will call the attention of the deputy to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is also another matter. The authorities of the hospital are obliged in winter to draw water from the river St. Lawrence. Last winter the man who carries the water from the river to the hospital nearly drowned himself on account of a break in the conduit system. My hon. friend knows that the current is very swift at that point, which is near the Lachine rapids. For a very small expenditure a well could be bored near the house which would obviate the necessity of going to the river in winter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will call the attention of the deputy to both matters.

Indians—Nova Scotia, salaries, etc., $24,300.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The agent at Heatherton in the county of Antigonish departed this life recently. Has the minister appointed a successor yet?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did he die?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Only a few weeks ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I have not.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How will the selection of a new Indian agent be made?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The appointment will probably be made by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the commission.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will applications be received from persons desirous of filling the position?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Applications should be sent to the commission.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The agent who occupied this position some years ago is still at Heatherton. He was dismissed after the change of Government in 1911 in order to make room for the friends of the late administration. He had been a satisfactory officer. As this is not a partisan Government I thought that perhaps the six or seven years he has been out of office would be sufficient punishment for having voted Liberal, and that the minister might consider the question of reappointing him. I do not know whether it is in order to say anything, because now there is no patronage and I am not at liberty to write a letter to say that he is a good man. He held office for a number of years with great satisfaction to everybody and he was removed in 1911 with a host of others in Nova Scotia. I think he would take the office back if it were offered him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is his name?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: John R. McDonald.

Mr MEIGHEN: I will look into the matter. The salary is $200.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories, $508,149.

Mr. TWEEDIE: With regard to the Morley and Blood reserves in Alberta I think there are some matters to be taken up by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Shaw) and by myself. I presume we can discuss these later on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. KNOX: This appropriation is $50,000 less than last year. It is very unwise to cut down any of the appropriation in these provinces. We have a number of reserves in Northern Saskatchewan capable of producing foodstuffs at the present time. We have suitable land there and a large amount of cheap labour on the reserves. I do not wish to say very much on the subject, but I feel very strongly the importance of not reducing the appropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree with the hon. member. The reductions here will not interfere with that. We have a special vote for that purpose.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the House adjourned at 6.57 p.m.

Monday, May 20, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

MR. MAIN JOHNSON.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council) laid on the Table copy of Order in Council, passed under the War Measures Act, with reference to the appointment of Mr. Main Johnson.

REPORT.

First Report of the Munition Resources Commission.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1918-19.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1919, was presented by Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 107, to incorporate The United Canadian Insurance Company.--Mr. Stevens.

[Mr. Meighen.]

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I have a question to put which is of some urgency, and as the Minister of Labour is not in his seat perhaps one of the other ministers might reply. The strike at Winnipeg seems to have developed into serious proportions, all the public services of the city being practically in a state of collapse. Is the Government in a position to say what measures have been taken to prevent the strike spreading; whether a compulsory investigation under the Industrial Disputes Act has been applied for, and if so, will it be granted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Labour will be better able to answer as to some matters than I am, but I understand that a proportion of the employees have agreed to or applied for a board. With reference to the civic employees as a whole, my hon. friend will no doubt realize that the relations between the employees of a municipality and the municipality itself are a matter of provincial jurisdiction and provincial concern. We are advised by the law officers of the Crown that it is not proper for this Parliament to undertake to regulate the employment of civic officials, as that is a matter which must be dealt with by the provincial legislature, and by the municipality itself under the authority of the provincial legislature. The Government has received a good many communications on the subject. When asked to pass certain regulations, it has been pointed out to those who are anxious about these matters, that as far as civic governments are concerned it is both the right and the duty of the provincial legislature to make such regulations as they may see fit. Further than that, it has been pointed out that, under section 164 of the Criminal Code, any person who violates the provisions of a provincial statute is guilty of a misdemeanour and punishable as is in that section set out. With respect to the sympathetic strike alluded to, we have not absolutely full information. It is probable that it will be received in the course of the day. I should very greatly doubt, speaking without full consideration, whether persons, who carry out what is known as a sympathetic strike, would free themselves from the penalties imposed by the Order in Council passed early in April and popularly known as the anti-loafing law. That is a matter for the provincial authorities of Manitoba and the civic

authorities of Winnipeg to consider and to act upon as they may be advised by their counsel.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to set up my opinion against that of the law officers of the Crown, but might I be permitted to suggest that the Industrial Disputes Act does not make any distinction between provincial and other public utilities. The Act applies to all public utilities. I would suggest that it would be well if the Government could intervene in time to have a compulsory investigation so as to avoid the application of the criminal law.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not wish my hon. friend to understand that the Government have not been making any efforts to end the strike. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has, in every possible way, lent his services to composing the differences which have arisen. More than that, on Friday evening last, I addressed a personal appeal to the head of the Trades and Labour Council in Winnipeg. I have not a copy of it before me at the moment, but later on in the day, if I have the opportunity, I shall bring it down and make the House acquainted with its terms. It is perfectly true that the Government has not seen its way clear to act upon some of the suggestions which have been presented to us but, apart from that, every effort that could possibly be made by conciliatory methods to compose this difficulty has been made. I hope my hon. friend will realize that. Further, it is hoped that, to-day or to-morrow, some more effective effort can be undertaken.

REPORT ON THE MILLING INDUSTRY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. NICKLE: Would the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) be disposed to advise the House as to whether or not it is the intention to lay on the Table, before the House rises, the report on the milling industry of which my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) spoke some few days ago?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will ask the Minister of Labour in regard to it. He has not communicated to me recently on the subject, and I am not in a position to say at the moment.

ABOLITION OF TITLES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether the intimation was given on Saturday, but I desire now to state that to-morrow we shall resume the debate in regard to the abolition of titles. Perhaps an intimation was given on Saturday to that effect?

Mr. NICKLE: My right hon. friend was good enough to tell me that it would be taken up to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, but I do not know that I made a public statement. I desire now to inform the House that we will take it up to-morrow.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 100, for the relief of David M. Sloss.—Mr. Copp.

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Lillie Mabel Billing.—Mr. Mowatt.

Bill No. 102, for the relief of Emily Kathleen Cochrane Lackey.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 104, for the relief of Alonzo Jesse Chapman.—Mr. Copp.

No. 105, for the relief of Margaret Bell Charlesworth.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 103, for the relief of Alfred Frank Scott.—Mr. Harold.

Progress reported.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are to be indicated by an asterisk.)

ANTI-UNIONIST CANDIDATES.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

How many persons who were candidates against the Union Government at the last election have received appointments from the said said Government, since the said Government assumed office and abolished patronage?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: The Government has no record of any such appointments.

REVISING BARRISTER, HANTS COUNTY.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY:

1. Was Percy Blanchard, of Ellershouse, Revising Barrister for the Constituency of Hants County in connection with the electoral lists for the last Federal Election?
2. If so, what amount did he receive as salary and expenses?
3. Is the said H. Percy Blanchard a practising Barrister of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia?
4. If so, where does he practise since going to Ellershouse, to reside?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. $82.05.

3. No information.
4. No information.

CLAIM OF DR. L. FOISY.

Mr. SEGUIN:

What is the total amount claimed by Dr. L. Foisy for his services as returning officer for the Electoral District of L'Assomption-Montcalm?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: Personal services, $266. Total claim for expenses of election, $2,937.70.

DEPUTY REGISTRAR KINGSTON, ONT.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Major H. P. Cooke, Deputy Registrar at Kingston, Ont., any staff of clerks, stenographers, typewriters, messengers, etc., working with or under him, at Kingston, Ont., in connection with the Military Service Act, 1917?
2. If so, what are the names, addresses and salary of such clerks, stenographers, typewriters and messengers, and nature of their employment, the date of their respective appointment, and is their employment temporary or permanent?
3. Does the Government, besides paying the salary of said clerks, stenographers, typists and messengers, make or grant any extra allowance for their travelling expenses, either in money grant or railway transportation or passes?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to increase or reduce such clerical staff?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. All the employment is temporary. List filed with the Clerk of the House.
3. No travelling expenses, money grant or transportation are paid to any member shown on list of Deputy Registrar's staff. Certain members shown on the Public Representative's staff, whose duties require it, are furnished with transportation to enable them to attend the sitting of the various tribunals in the district.
4. The staff fluctuates in numbers as the work increases or decreases. It is and has been reduced immediately the pressure of work permits.

APPEAL TRIBUNAL, BROCKVILLE.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has one G. O. Aiken been appointed to the Appeal Tribunal at Brockville under the Military Service Act, in any capacity?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. Who recommended, or was otherwise responsible for, this appointment?
4. Was Aiken sent from Kingston to Brockville? If so, why?
5. Is this the G. O. Aiken who was suspended from his position as Guard by the Warden of Kingston Penitentiary, who was later reinstated and then allowed to resign?
If so, what was the reason for his being suspended?
6. Why was the new position filled by Aiken's appointment not given to a returned soldier?

[Mr. Burrell.]

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. Local public representative at Judge Reynolds' Appeal Tribunal.
3. This appointment was authorized by the Registrar for the district.
4. Yes. He knew the district surrounding Brockville thoroughly, and there was no other local Brockville man available who was as generally valuable.
5. Yes. He was suspended owing to the complaint of a convict that he had used unbecoming language to him and had prevented him from performing work that another guard had ordered him to do.
6. There was no returned soldier on the list of applicants. Aiken's place as guard was filled by the transfer of R. C. Morris from the staff of watchmen.

J. B. PAQUET.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has Mr. Laparre Marsan, Chief of Police of Lévis, received from the Government, instructions to dismiss J. B. Paquet, of Lévis, who was a watchman at the Lauzon Dock, and to replace him by one of his own friends?
2. If so, for what reason was J. B. Paquet dismissed?
3. If not, will this man be reinstated?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: I think the hon. member will have to change the question, because I cannot understand what it means. The hon. gentleman asks if Mr. Laparre Marsan, Chief of Police of Lévis, received from the Government instructions to dismiss J. B. Paquet, of Lévis, who was a watchman at the Lauzon Dry Docks. The Chief of Police of Lévis has nothing to do with the men employed at the Lauzon Dock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

BISHOP FALLON'S MISSION.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Concerning the official visit of His Lordship Bishop Fallon to the front, is the Government aware that His Lordship is also going to Rome?
2. Are the trip expenses of His Lordship to both the front and Rome being paid by the Government?
3. If so, what amount has been paid to His Lordship?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.
2. Please see answers already given on May 1, pp. 1351 and 1352, Unrevised Hansard.
3. Nothing has yet been paid by this department.

ARMY MEDICAL CORPS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the following item in John Bull, of March 2, 1918:—

"There is serious discontent among the Quartermaster ranks in the Canadian Army Medical Corps. A number of the men who have been in the Army since war broke out are still Honorary Lieutenants—whereas fresh men from Canada, who have never seen Service, arrive with the rank of Honorary Captain or Honorary Major. This is grossly unfair, and we are taking the matter up with Ottawa."

1. Have any representations been made to the Government regarding the alleged discontent in the Canadian Army Medical Corps?

2. If so, what action has been taken in the matter?

3. Has the Government received any other complaint regarding the Overseas Medical Service?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who are the members of the Government who will go to London this spring to take part in the Conference with the Imperial Authorities?

2. When will this trip be made?

3. What are the reasons for this trip?

4. Can the Government say what questions are going to be discussed in London, and who will act at said conference?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to the first question an announcement will be made in due course. As to question No. 2 it is deemed inadvisable in the public interest to make any announcement. The answer to the third question is: For the purpose of attending the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial Conference. In answer to the fourth question I may say that the subjects for discussion are confidential until after the discussion shall have taken place.

EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS—BONAVENTURE COUNTY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. What is the total amount paid or payable for the services of the several Exemption Tribunals in the county of Bonaventure?

2. What amount has been, or is still, payable to each of these tribunals for rent, fees for judges and salaries of other employees?

3. What are the names and addresses of the persons who have been so paid or to whom amounts are still due?

4. What amount has been paid, or is still due, to each of these persons, and for what service?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. $2,331.71, paid.

2. All accounts received at this office have been passed for payment.

3 and 4. Tribunal No. 26: Pierre Ferlotte, Ruisseau LeBlanc, services, $105.04; Pierre Ferlotte, Ruisseau LeBlanc, postage, $4.16; A. Arsenault, Bonaventure, services, $161.50; total, $270.70. Tribunal No. 27: George Gauthier, Matapedia, services, $154; George Gauthier, Matapedia, services, $95; Andrè Arsenault, Matapedia, services, $95; Andrè Arsenault, Matapedia, services, $110; Albert Gravel, Matapedia, clerk and interpreter, $102.50; total, $556.50. Tribunal No. 28: J. Narcisse Cyr, Bonaventure, expenses and services, $148.99; Angus N. Campbell, New Richmond, stationery and services, $145; J. P. Gauthier, New Richmond, services and rent, $97; total, $290.99. Tribunal No. 29: W. A. McPherson, Pt. Daniel East, services and expenses, $99.15; Pierre Deraiche, Pt. Daniel East, services and wood, $100; Probin, Jones & Whitman, Pt. Daniel East, stationery, etc., $6.42; total, $205.57. Tribunal No. 30: S. P. Lebel and Chas. Cook, New Carlisle, expenses, services, etc., $526.30; S. P. Lebel and Chas. Cook, New Carlisle, expenses, services, etc., $227; total, $753.30. Tribunal No. 31: F. L. Cullen, Carleton, services, $65; H. J. E. Martin, Carleton, services and expenses, $122.70; T. B. Clapperton, Carleton, services and expenses, $56.95; total, $244.65. Cannot say what amounts are due, as no accounts have been received.

Lt. Col. GEORGE GILLESPIE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is Lt. Colonel George Gillespie, of Kingston in the employ of the Department of Militia?

2. If so, what is the nature of his employment?

3. What salary does he receive?

4. How much has he received to date for salary or remuneration, and for living and travelling expenses?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. Holds appointment of organizer and inspector of Cadet Corps, Military District No. 3, and assists the General Staff Officer and D.A.A. and Q.M.G. at District Headquarters when necessary.

3. Pay and allowances, $8.25 per diem.

4. Total amount received from date of appointment, 1st April, 1913, to 30th April, 1918 (5 years), $15,468.20.

WAR COUNCIL.

* Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who are the members of the Cabinet who constitute the War Council?

2. How often has said Council been convened since 1st January, 1918?

Hon. N. W. ROWELL:

1. The names of the members of the War Committee of the Cabinet are given in Order in Council (P. C. 3005) of 23rd October, 1917, which was laid on the table of

the House at the opening of the session. by a subsequent Order in Council the Right Hon. Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, was added to the Committee.

2. Twenty-five before the opening of the session. Since then the regular meetings of the committee have been merged in those of the Cabinet. A few special meetings have been held.

HON. SENATOR SCHAFFNER.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Was Dr. Schaffner, now senator, employed in any capacity at Camp Hughes or since the camp closed?
2. If so, what was his rank?
3. What salary did he draw?
4. What Separation Allowance did he draw?
5. What was the total amount he drew?
6. Is he still employed, and in what capacity?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes. He was employed in Military Hospital at Camp Hughes from 19th May, 1916, and later took over duties of Sanitary Officer at the same camp. On November 1, 1916, he was appointed, temporarily, as a Deputy Assistant Director, Medical Services (sanitation) at Headquarters, Military District No. 10, Winnipeg, with the proviso that he be replaced by another officer when absent on parliamentary duties. On 10th October, 1917, he was detailed for special duty to supervise medical boards under the Military Service Act, and was relieved from further military duty on the 28th February, 1918.

2. This officer has held the rank of Captain in the Army Medical Corps since his appointment, and was granted the temporary rank of Major whilst superintending duties of medical boards under the Military Service Act, as noted in reply to question 1. He relinquished the temporary rank of Major on the 28th February, 1918.

3. The pay and allowances of his rank.

4. $40 per month.

5. $200, total amount of separation allowance received.

6. This officer is not now employed in any military capacity.

DAM AT GRAND'MERE?

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Has the Government awarded to the Laurentide Company, Limited, of Grand'Mère, a contract for the erection of a dam on the St. Maurice river, at Grand'Mère?
2. If so, what is the amount, and what are the terms of said contract?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

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

[Mr. Rowell.]

REV. C. W. GORDON.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. When did (Rev.) C. W. Gordon, of Winnipeg, receive his appointment as a Chaplain in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. What is his rank and rate of pay?
3. Was he on the pay-roll of the Canadian Forces in the months of October, November and December, 1917?
4. If so, how much was he paid during the said three months, including travelling and living expenses?
5. Is he still attached to the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, and, if so, in what capacity?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. 30th April, 1915.
2. Honorary Major; pay of rank.
3. Yes.
4. $1,530.08.
5. He is still on strength of C. E. F., and detailed for special duty.

ANNUAL REPORT ON PENITENTIARIES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When was the manuscript of the Report of the Inspectors of Penitentiaries for the year 1916-17 received at the Printing Bureau?
2. When will the said report be ready for distribution to members?
3. What is the reason for the delay in submitting this report to Parliament?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Not yet.
2. As soon as printed.
3. Partly owing to delay in getting corrected statistics from some of the institutions, and partly due to temporary illness of the inspector that restricted his services to more urgent and necessary routine work.

VICTORY LOAN—PAYMENTS TO BANKS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

What amounts were paid each of the Canadian Banks in connection with the Victory Loan?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Bank of Montreal, $141,043.76; Bank of Nova Scotia, $57,299.03; Bank of British North America, $42,900.82; Bank of Toronto, $44,076.19; Molsons Bank, $35,260.96; La Banque Nationale, $17,630.50; Merchants Bank of Canada, $61,706.66; La Banque Provinciale, $8,815.26; Union Bank of Canada, $44,076.19; Canadian Bank of Commerce, $132,228.52; Royal Bank of Canada, $113,819.67; Dominion Bank, $52,891.43; Bank of Hamilton, $26,445.73; Standard Bank of Canada, $30,093.65; La Banque D'Hochelaga, $35,260.96; Bank of Ottawa, $35,260.96; Imperial Bank of Canada, $61,706.66; Home Bank of Canada, $17,165.91; Northern Crown Bank, $12,600.94; Sterling Bank of Canada, $10,715.12;

Weyburn Security Bank, $3,396.72; total, $984,395.64.

Mr. J. P. JAFFRAY.

Mr. EULER:

1. Is J. P. Jaffray an officer of the Canadian Immigration Department in the city of Philadelphia?
2. If so, what is his salary?
3. What are his duties?
4. How many immigrants did he secure for Canada in 1917?
5. Does the Government believe the results of his work justify the retention of his services?
6. Is the Government aware that the said J. P. Jaffray has regularly contributed and is still contributing offensive and partisan political article to the Galt Reporter?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Yes.
2. $2,000 per annum.
3. Canadian Government agent and inspector of immigration at Philadelphia.
4. It is impossible to say how many immigrants came to Canada as a result of the work of Mr. Jaffray.
5. Yes.
6. No.

RIDEAU CANAL.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie).

1. What was the total tonnage of freight carried on the Rideau Canal during the year ending March 31, 1918?
2. What is the total number of employees in connection with the operation of above-mentioned canal?
3. What is the total number of passenger boats passing through or operating on said canal?
4. What tolls are charged for freight boats?
5. What tolls are charged for passenger boats?
6. What tolls are charged on motor boats or motor launches for pleasure purpose?
7. How many locks are in the canal, how many lock-keepers, and how are they hired, by the month or year?
8. What is the total cost of repairs chargeable to canal for year ending March 31, 1918, also in 1917?
9. What is the total revenue derived by Government from operation of Rideau Canal in year ending March 31, 1918?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. 84,549 tons.
2. 90.
3. 4.

4, 5 and 6. All canals are free of tolls in Canada.

7. 49 locks, 24 lockmasters, 51 lock labourers. Lockmasters are employed the year round. Lock labourers are employed for season of navigation only.

8. Expenditure on account repairs for year ending March 31, 1917, $71,498.90; expenditure on account repairs for year ending March 31, 1918, $67,801.81.

9. Total revenue for year ending March 31, 1918, $9,006.65.

Mr. ROBERT FOWLER.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. At what date was Mr. Robert Fowler, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, appointed in the Civil Service?
2. What was his salary for the following fiscal years, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917?
3. Has Mr. Robert Fowler been recommended for an increase of salary during the present fiscal year?
4. If so, what is the amount of the said increase?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. June 25, 1910.

2. For fiscal year commencing April 1, 1913: From April 1, 1913, to November 30, 1913, at the rate of $1,200; from December 1, 1913, to December 31, 1913, at the rate of $1,600; and from January 1, 1914, to March 31, 1914, at the rate of $2,100.

For fiscal year commencing April 1, 1914: From April 1, 1914, to October 19, 1914, at the rate of $2,100; and from October 20, 1914, to March 31, 1915, at the rate of $2,200.

For fiscal year commencing April 1, 1915: From April 1, 1915, to September 30, 1915, at the rate of $2,200; and from October 1, 1915, to March 31, 1916, at the rate of $2,800.

For fiscal year commencing April 1, 1916: From April 1, 1916, to September 30, 1916, at the rate of $2,800; and from October 1, 1916, to March 31, 1917, at the rate of $3,500.

For fiscal year commencing 1st April, 1917: From April 1, 1917, to September 30, 1917, at the rate of $3,500, and from October 1, 1917, to March 31, 1918, at the rate of $3,600.

3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

CANADIAN WAR RECORD OFFICE.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. How many employees are on the staff of the Canadian War Record Office, London?
2. What did this branch cost during the calendar year 1917, for salaries, rents, printing and all other disbursements?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. This information is not available in Canada, but is being requested, by letter, from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.

MOTOR BOAT "HELENA".

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the size of the Steamboat Helena, employed by the Customs Department at Sydney, N.S.?
2. What is her net tonnage?
3. Will the Government put this Service up for tender?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The size of the motor-boat Helena is as follows: Length over all, 38 feet 10 inches; length water line, 36 feet; breadth

extreme, 8 feet 2 inches; breadth water line, 7 feet 4½ inches.

2. The Customs Department has no record of the net tonnage. The displacement is 54 tons.

3. The question of calling for tenders will be inquired into.

CIVIL SERVICE LAW.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. When the new Civil Service law takes effect, to whom will the general public address its letters of recommendation for office, etc., where such business is supposed to receive recommendations from no one in particular designated by constituencies for that purpose?

2. Is there any limit to the correspondence of that sort that may be received?

3. Will it all be officially replied to?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The Civil Service law alluded to provides that persons shall be appointed to the public service after competitive examination. Letters of recommendation, therefore, would not appear to be of any particular use or advantage. If, however, it should be desired to send in such letters of recommendation, they might properly be addressed to the Civil Service Commission.

2 and 3. These questions are sufficiently answered by the reply given to No. 1.

MAJOR J. T. N. L'HEUREUX.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Is Major J. T. N. L'Heureux, who has been on active service overseas, still attached to the Canadian Militia?

2. If not, for what reasons has he been retired?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No.

2. Major J. T. N. l'Heureux was retired in consequence of an investigation into matters connected with the 167th Overseas Battalion that showed that this officer's conduct had not been such as to justify his being continued as an officer of the militia.

HERMAN J. DAGER.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Is there a person named Herman J. Dager, employed in the Preventive Service of the Inland Revenue Department?

2. If so, when was he appointed, and by whom recommended?

3. What are his duties?

4. Is he holding any other position, and what are his salaries?

5. Where was his birthplace?

6. Is he a British citizen (a) by birth; (b) by naturalization?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. We have one officer of that name appointed as Food Inspector and Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue.

[Mr. Sifton.]

2. (a) Appointed D'y Collector class "B" October 6, 1898. Nothing on record to show who recommended him as Deputy Collector. (b) as Food Inspector May 6, 1907, recommended by H. R. Frankland, Collector of Inland Revenue, Toronto division.

3. Assigned to Food and Preventive work for the last three years.

4. Nothing on record in this department to show that he is holding any other position outside of Deputy Collector, class "B" and Food Inspector as D'y Col. class "B" $1,000. As Food Inspector $500.

5. Nothing on record.

6. "Canadian by adoption" is the information given by the return to the department dated October 7, 1898.

THE GRAND TRUNK—HON. CLIFFORD SIFTON.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has Sir Clifford Sifton any authority to act in any capacity in England for the Government, or for any member thereof?

2. Have any communications of any kind been exchanged between the Government, or any member thereof, and Sir Clifford Sifton relative to the acquisition by the Government of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railways? If so, will they be produced?

3. Has the Government or any member thereof had any communication with any banker, brokers or other financiers in London or New-York relative to the purchase or sale of the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railways or of the stock or securities of these railroads? If so, will the correspondence be produced?

4. Is the Government aware that at the recent annual meeting of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in London, the Canadian Government was denounced for its intended confiscation of the Grand Trunk Railway? If so, what steps have been taken by the Government to correct this misapprehension?

5. Has the Government any knowledge of the sale or purchase of Grand Trunk stock or securities prior to or since the date of the said annual meeting of shareholders? If so, was there a depreciation in price after the said meeting?

6. With whom is the Government carrying on negotiations for taking over the Grand Trunk Railway System?

7. Is it the intention of the Government to settle the terms of taking over the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific railroads during the visit of the ministers to London this summer? If so, who are the ministers by whom these terms are to be settled?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Members of the Government have observed in the press despatches respecting the meeting of the shareholders alluded to.

It is considered that any supposed misapprehension would be sufficiently corrected by statements that have already been made in this House, particularly the statement made by the Prime Minister a few days ago.

5. No. The Government has no information as to the alleged depreciation in price.

6. Negotiations have been carried on with Mr. A. W. Smithers, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and with president Kelley, of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

7. It is probable that the subject will be discussed during the visit of ministers to London. It is not probable that the negotiations will then be concluded. An announcement as to the ministers will be made in due course.

Mr. PHILIPPE FUROIS.

Mr. PARENT:

1. Does Mr. Philippe Furois, of the city of Quebec, occupy a position with or under the Canada Food Board or any other department and if so—
   (a) Since when?
   (b) What are his duties?
   (c) What salary is attached to the position?
2. Is the said Mr. Furois the one who was a Government candidate at the last election for the county of Bonaventure?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes. (a) April 12, 1918. (b) Secretary and organizer for increased conservation in the province of Quebec. (c) $250 per month.
2. Yes.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Is private custom work done at the Portsmouth Penitentiary by skilled convict workmen? If so, is any allowance made to said convicts for such work?
2. Were walnut chairs repaired and upholstered for P. Devlin, Immigration Agent at Kingston? If so, what was the cost to Mr. Devlin?
3. Were several articles of furniture made for and shipped to Mr. Dillon, Purchasing Agent for Penitentiaries? If so, what articles were shipped to Montreal and Ottawa for him, what was their cost, and by whom was it paid?
4. What articles were made or repaired and shipped to persons in Toronto, Renfrew, Ottawa, Kingston and New York, by whose order, to whom sent, and the amount paid in each case?
5. What articles have been repaired or made for the Rev. McDonald and for the Roman Catholic Church at Portsmouth, what amount was paid for such work, by whom paid and when?
6. What articles of furniture have been made and repaired during the past two years (a) for officials of the penitentiary, (b) for persons other than officials, with the name and cost in each case?
7. Were some statistics copied by one of the convicts for the United States authorities? If so, how much was paid by the United States for said work, and what amount was placed to the credit of the convict who did the work?
8. Have convicts been ordered to make articles patented in the United States, the sole right for the manufacture of which had been sold to a firm in Canada, and were convicts ordered to make working drawings of the same for future use?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has any person been appointed to the position, under the Minister of Labour, which was vacated recently by the resignation of Mr. O'Connor?
2. What is the new appointee's name, age, ordinary occupation, and has he been engaged on Active Military Service?
3. What experience has the new appointee had as (a) barrister, (b) accountant, (c) in retail business, (d) in wholesale business, (e) in manufacturing business or other lines of commerce?
4. What experience had Mr. O'Connor along the lines mentioned in Question No. 3?
5. Was Mr. O'Connor's selection to perform the duties of the position mentioned because of his qualifications as lawyer, accountant or former business man? If so, and if the qualifications of the new appointee are different, what is the object or intention of the Government in replacing him by one of different qualifications?
6. Was the Government satisfied with Mr. O'Connor's performance of the duties of the position mentioned? If not, will it indicate the particular causes of dissatisfaction? If satisfied with his services, has it made any, and what efforts to retain his services or to obtain them again under conditions more satisfactory to him? Does the Government know whether Mr. O'Connor would consent to resume performance of his former duties under any conditions whatever?
7. Is the statement in the Toronto Saturday Night, of date May 18, 1918, that "Dr. R. J. McFall has been loaned to the Food Control Organization to continue the work originated by Mr. O'Connor," correct?
8. Has any Order in Council been passed appointing Dr. R. J. McFall to perform in the same manner under the same circumstances, and under the same conditions the work which Mr. O'Connor previous to his resignation performed for the Minister of Labour? If not, how has the appointment of Dr. McFall been made, if made, and under what authority?
9. What salary and living allowance, or either, will the new appointee receive, and out of what fund and through what department of Government or under what Commission will he act?
10. Has the new appointee commenced services under the Minister of Labour, or at all, and when?
11. Will the new appointee act under direction of the Minister of Labour alone, and if not, under what other arrangement?
12. What will be the title of the office to be held by the new appointee?
13. Does the Government intend to merge any, and what, of the operations previously con-

ducted by Mr. O'Connor with the same or similar operations of the Canada Food Board or of any other Board or Department of Government, and if so, for what reason?

Mr. SAVARD:

1. For how long was General Sir Sam Hughes Minister of Militia?
2. What were his total expenses, as charged to the country, for the time covering this period?
3. How many trips did he make to England or Continental Europe while Minister of Militia?
4. What was the total expense to the country for each trip?

Mr. SAVARD:

1. While in England did the Rev. Father Burke go on a trip to Rome at Government expense?
2. If so, what was the cost to the country?
3. Did the Rev. Father Burke, while in England, go to Salonica or Cairo at Government expense?
4. If so, what was the cost to the country?
5. Was Father Burke advised by General Sir Sam Hughes when making up his expense account for a trip to Rome, to eliminate the word Rome and place in its stead the words Salonica or Cairo?
6. If so, why was the then Minister of Militia anxious to suppress the fact that Father Burke had made an official governmental visit to Rome?
7. Was Father Burke granted leave of absence for the purpose of making a visit to Rome or elsewhere?

*Mr. KENNEDY:

1. How many returns have been made to the Minister under the provisions of Section 10 of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916?
2. What is the total capitalization covered by these returns?
3. How many of these returns have been dealt with and assessments made therein as provided by Section 13 of the said Act?
4. What is the total amount of the capital so assessed, and the total amount of the assessment made therein for the first, second and third accounting period respectively?
5. How much of the amount assessed for the first and second accounting periods has been collected to date?
6. What is the number of tax payers who have paid this assessment?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How many survivors are there of the First Canadian Division?
2. How many of those survivors have come to Canada on furlough since December 17, 1917?

Mr. FAFARD:

1. How many farmers have enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. How many farmers have enlisted from each province in the Dominion?
3. How many farmers have enlisted from the Conuty of Durham, Ontario?

[Mr. Stevens.]

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, vouchers, accounts and all documents in any way referring to the expenditure of money in repairs on the Margaree Breakwater, by the Department of Public Works, during the years 1916-17 and 1917-18.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all accounts, vouchers, receipts, telegrams, particulars and correspondence of all kinds in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government at Friar Siding, under the foremanship of P. Doucette, during the months of October, November and December, 1917.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence generally exchanged between the Government and Mr. Justice Duff, Central Appeal Judge, during the last election campaign concerning the application and the administration of the Military Service Act in conjunction with the Order in Council passed on December 3, 1917.

Mr. STEVENS:

For a return giving a copy of all letters, telegrams, vouchers, evidence and all other documents relating to an inquiry into the wages, conditions of labour, etc., of the shipbuilding industry in British Columbia and conducted by a Commission of which Hon. Justice Murphy was chairman, also copy of findings of said Commission.

THE ZINC BOUNTIES ACT, 1916.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the proposed resolution respecting The Zinc Bounties Act, 1916:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Without the slightest intention of finding fault, I wish to point out that members do not hear one-third of what is said. While the seats are fairly comfortable, it is very unpleasant not to know what is going on.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the case of formal motions of this kind, hon. members will hear the resolutions as read from the Chair.

Motion agreed to.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Prime Minister said, in answer to a question put by the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault), that a statement with regard to the Imperial Conference would be made in due course. May we know in advance when that statement will be made, whether any of the correspondence will be

brought down, and whether we shall be informed as to the objects for which the conference is called?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will bring my right hon. friend's request to the attention of the Prime Minister.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT ACT, 1918.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 81, to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907, was read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS PROFITS WAR TAX ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 84, to amend the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, was read the third time and passed.

INCOME WAR TAX AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN moved the third reading of Bill No. 85, to amend The Income War Tax Act, 1917.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Many business men and others affected by the Income Tax Act of last year experienced some difficulty in preparing the return which they were required to furnish to the Government. Some weeks ago I handed to Mr. Boville, Deputy Minister of Finance, a primer prepared by the Treasury Department in the United States, which furnishes all information arising out of the administration and application of their Income Tax Act. Quite unwittingly, many people have made errors in their returns, and if the department would prepare a primer similar to that sent out by the United States Treasury Department, those affected by the Act would be considerably assisted in the preparation of returns. Mr. Boville was struck with the necessity of such an official publication, the cost of which would not be very large. Last year some of the financial and trust companies and banks prepared publications of this kind for the benefit of their own patrons. I saw three or four of them, but they did not appear to be very complete. I think it would be good policy on the part of the department to have such a primer issued during the present fiscal year.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that a publication of that nature is now in course of preparation. At any rate, my hon. friend's suggestion is a very timely one, and I shall convey it to the Minister of Finance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I suggest that the department issue also a table showing the amounts paid under different incomes according to the new provisions.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: That is, for circulation outside of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. T. A. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 108, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Fruit, fruit marks and potatoes), was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—definitions:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Has this Bill been distributed? I do not have it on my file.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has been printed.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this part of the amendments that have been brought up by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as regards the Inspection and Sale Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. BUREAU: This is new legislation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Entirely.

Mr. BUREAU: Who is the minister who has charge of this legislation?

Mr. CRERAR: Part IX of the Inspection and Sale Act, relating to fruit, fruit marks and fruit packages, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and these amendments refer only to that particular portion of the Act. They do not relate to the other matters that the Minister of Trade and Commerce submitted to the House.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know how long this Bill has been printed, but it has not yet come to my notice. I have often heard the remark thrown across the floor of this House: Such and such legislation was submitted to the House and was concurred in by you. Why did you not raise an objection when it was brought before the House? The first reading of this Bill took place on the 18th of May, (that is Saturday last), and as we are supposed to observe Sunday, very little time has been given to us to look into the matter. I do not know anything about the importance of the legislation. I do not know whether it affects fruit growing, or fruit classification, or the marking of fruit, or the preservation of fruit. I am not an expert in regard to these matters,

but I should like to have an opportunity of looking into the Bill. It is only fair that hon. members should have an opportunity of doing so, unless the minister makes a statement, giving us the details, and telling us what precautions have been taken to justify hon. members in letting the Bill go through without any further investigation on their part.

Mr. CRERAR: Legislation of this kind has been under consideration for two or three years.

Mr. BUREAU: How long has this Bill been submitted to the House for consideration?

Mr. CRERAR: The resolution has been on the Order Paper since the first of May.

Mr. BUREAU: When was the Bill distributed?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know when it was distributed. I have had a printed copy for a considerable length of time. During the winter there was held here a convention of representative fruit growers, some consumers, and also dealers in fruit. The result of the work of that convention is embodied in this Bill.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Where do the people come in?

Mr. CRERAR: The consumers were represented at the convention. In respect to section 319, the only important change is that which relates to the definition of the word "culls." In the section as it previously stood, the definition of "culls" was as follows:

"Culls" shall include fruit that is either very small for the variety or immature, or the skin of which is broken so as to expose the tissue beneath, or that is so injured by insects, fungi, abnormal growths, or other causes, as to render it unmerchantable.

The difficulty was this, that, no matter how scabby or deformed fruit was, it could not be classed as unmerchantable, and consequently there was a very wide range in the character of fruit that was classed as "culls." The amendment seeks to make that more specific, and provides, in later sections, for closer definitions of the grades. This is the section as amended:

(c) "culls" means fruit that is either very small for the variety, is seriously deformed, or has fifteen per cent or more of its surface affected by any of or by the combined injuries caused by apple scab (venturia pomi), insects, cuts, bruises or other causes, or the flesh of which is not in an edible condition, or the skin of which is broken so as to expose the tissue beneath.

[Mr. Bureau.]

It will thus be apparent that the purport of the amendment is more clearly to define what is a cull in the designation of this particular class of fruit.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the word "bruises" cover a case where the flesh would be partially uneatable, but where the fruit would otherwise be good? Sometimes

12 noon

you see part of a pear, say at the bottom end, if it has been standing, as big as a twenty-five cent piece or a fifty cent piece, uneatable, although the rest of the pear is perfectly good. The section states that the whole of the flesh should be uneatable. Would a case like the one I have cited by covered by the word "bruises?"

Mr. CRERAR: I should think it would.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The Minister of Agriculture is deserving of every credit for bringing forward this legislation. The matters pertaining to this Bill have been under consideration by Ministers of Agriculture for some years past. Within the last few months there were brought here from different provinces representatives who were in touch with fruit conditions in those provinces; consumers were also brought here, and this Bill was framed under the supervision of all those parties.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What consumers were brought here?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I understand from the Department of Agriculture that representative consumers from different parts of the country were consulted in regard to this measure. Moreover, this legislation is in the public interest. Nova Scotia fruit growers, for instance, were unable to sell their apples in the United States owing to the standard size of their barrels not conforming with the regulations enforced in the United States. The standard barrel will be the same throughout the Dominion of Canada. The sizes of the different packages the same. In our western provinces over one thousand cars of apples put up in packages were disposed of last year at various prices.

The goods have to be packed in containers of uniform size, and in this way not only is the consumer protected, but the producer benefits from being able to sell his goods as up to a certain standard. With regard to peaches, plums, pears and other fruits, the baskets in which they are to be sold are standardized, and the consumer is protected, whereas in days gone by all kinds of packages have been sold at different

prices, and it is the consumer that has been fleeced at every turn.

Mr. BUREAU: I did not wish to be understood as objecting to the Bill, and the very fact that I said I knew nothing about fruit growing should have convinced any one I was not taking exception to it. What I was objecting to was that we have not had time to look into the Bill, and I wanted to make inquiries and hear from those who understood this business before forming an opinion. I am perfectly in accord with the purpose of the Bill, but if I were a little wickeder I would say that the manner of bringing the Bill before the House looks like an attempt to railroad it through.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I see that all packages not branded according to the Act shall be forfeited. I think this would be unfair to the small dealers. For instance, a farmer who sells to his neighbour might be liable to a penalty under the law.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not think there need be any misapprehension on that point. It is a simple matter for the grower of fruit to stamp his name on the container. As I understand it, the small growers of fruit bring their produce to the market, where it is bought by dealers and shipped perhaps to other parts of the country. It is a simple matter to put one's name on a box by means of a rubber stamp, and I would repeat, this legislation has been asked for by the fruit growers themselves more insistently than by any other class.

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose a farmer with a small orchard of fifty trees and twenty barrels of apples, disposes of his fruit to a consumer at home. Has he to go to the trouble of branding the barrels?

Mr. CRERAR: I am of the opinion the Act would not apply in the case of one farmer selling to another right across the road.

Mr. MORPHY: Or to a man in town?

Mr. CRERAR: Not if he was selling direct to the consumer. I think the law would be reasonably interpreted in cases of that kind. The Bill is designed to cover more particularly the export of fruit from one district to another district.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not think the Bill is very plain on that point, and it may cause a great deal of inconvenience to the farmer and loss to the consumer also.

Mr. PEDLOW: The definition of fruit is: "Fruit shall not include wild fruit, nor cranberries, whether wild or cultivated." Why is wild fruit excluded?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know the precise reason why wild fruit was excluded, but I take it that it is because very little wild fruit is sold.

Mr. PEDLOW: Quite the contrary. Lots of raspberries, blackberries, blueberries and other kinds of wild fruits are traded in very extensively in Ontario.

Mr. CRERAR: The main provisions of the Bill aim at correcting the abuses that have existed in the past in connection with the sale of apples, pears and the larger varieties of fruit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: But the Bill does not cover retail transactions. That was the point I raised a moment ago.

Mr. PEDLOW: I should like to have the minister's definition of tomatoes. Are they a fruit or a vegetable?

Mr. CRERAR: The question is rather a poser, but I would call a tomato a vegetable rather than a fruit.

Mr. PEDLOW: Webster's dictionary defines fruit thus:

> Whatever is produced for the enjoyment of man or animals by the processes of vegetable growth; that part of plants, which contains the seed.

Tomatoes contain the seed, and therefore I contend they are a fruit, and not a vegetable, according to this definition.

Mr. SHEARD: What about a pumpkin?

Mr. MORPHY: And cucumbers?

Mr. McMASTER: I think the definition of "immature fruit" is so vague that it may cause no end of trouble to the department in administering the Act. The definition reads:

> "Immature fruit" means fruit not ripe enough for dessert purposes and which will not attain such condition after being picked from the tree, bush, plant or vine.

Now what are dessert purposes for one may not be dessert purposes for another. I presume that what the minister had in mind in framing this section was fruit so immature as to be unhealthy for consumption, and I would suggest the advisability of describing immature fruit as fruit unfit for human consumption or something of that sort, and then if the question arose in the application of the Act the testimony of a medical man could be given as to the fruit's fitness for human consumption. But as it is, one housewife might condemn a

certain fruit for dessert purposes which another housewife would put on her table for dessert. I think the present definition is altogether too vague.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall have to standardize tastes.

Mr. McMASTER: That might be a very difficult matter.

Mr. CRERAR: We should get ourselves into a hopeless tangle if we endeavoured to get the consumers to agree on a definition of immature fruit. Immature fruit means fruit that will not attain, after packing, that perfection of ripeness that will permit it to be used for dessert purposes. I am not an expert in fruit, but I put the very question that my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) raises to the officials of my department, who, I believe, are very good officials, and who have a thorough knowledge of the business, and they gave the reasons I have just given here. Fruit may be picked before it is entirely ripe and will attain a mature condition after it has been picked. Such fruit as that is covered by this section. On the other hand, you could pick fruit that might be half green and that would under no condition attain maturity. This is the definition that fruit dealers who have studied the problem have made, and it is proposed as a means of preventing the sale of immature fruit.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not doubt the ability of the officials in the hon. gentleman's department to judge as to the different qualities of fruit, but whether they are qualified to give a considered opinion as to the effect of a statute is quite another matter. I would suggest to my hon. friend that if he substituted for the words, "for dessert purposes," the words "to be eaten raw without danger to health," he would be setting up a standard or criterion which would be possible of establishment. If it should be made to read:

> "Immature fruit" means fruit not ripe enough to be eaten raw without danger to health and which will not attain such condition after being picked from the tree, bush, plant or vine.

it would better serve the purpose.

Mr. MORPHY: If the minister agrees to that we will be getting into a worse muddle than ever. What is one man's meat may be another man's poison. I know lots of people who like to eat fruit on the raw side, which would be considered unfit by others. I do not see any better form than that in which the minister has put it. Let everybody judge for himself.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The object of this clause is to put a stop to the sale of immature fruit on the market, such as plums and other fruit brought in possibly from the United States at an early period, which is certainly immature and not fit for consumption. Without some such provision as this, fruit of that description could be brought in.

Mr. BUREAU: Would my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) tell us if this description "fruit not ripe enough for dessert purposes" applies to cooked or raw fruit? Somebody might buy fruit to make preserves or with the idea of using it after cooking. The question of quality, or standard of maturity, would depend on whether the fruit was to be eaten cooked or in its natural condition. I think that if we were to put in the words "for home consumption, whether cooked or otherwise," that would cover the case.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The word "dessert" does not quite convey the idea that the minister attributes to it. Fruit, in its natural state, is uncooked. Sometimes it is called "green." Green fruit is ripe fruit in the opinion of some people. If you were to use the words "fruit in its natural state" I think it would better meet the case. The word "dessert" is usually applied to fruit which follows dinner, whereas, this should apply to the fruit that you eat as a first course at breakfast. You would not call it "dessert" fruit if you used it in this way. It surely is intended to apply to fruit that you can eat without any bad effect upon the stomach. I would suggest to the minister that the words "fruit in its natural state" should be adopted because that will cover fruit whether it is green or cooked.

Mr. BUREAU: I would like to hear from our learned, scientific men who have the health of the people in their keeping and who look after all hygenic conditions.

Mr. SHEARD: I think the clause is all right. "Dessert" means ordinary fruit served after a meal in its raw, unprepared or uncooked state. I think that the gentlemen in the department who drew the clause drew it with a knowledge of what they were doing and with that interpretation in view. We do not ordinarily partake of dessert fruit in a cooked condition. This is raw fruit and cooked fruit is prepared or preserved fruit. It is preserved by boiling and under ordinary conditions it could

not be served otherwise. In the cooking process you reduce the immature acids in the green, or partially ripe fruit, to an innocuous condition. When you take up the question as to whether it is unripe or not you open the door to enormous degrees of difference as between ripeness and unripeness. People could pick up the windfalls in the orchard or under the plum trees and sell them as fruit. I think the proper definition has been selected by those who understand the conditions and it is used to describe fruit abundantly ripened and as it is ordinarily served after a meal for dessert purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think it can mean that. It might be applied to fruit offered for sale for cooking. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard) believes that after the fruit is cooked all danger from eating it is gone, I suppose we must accept his opinion on that subject.

Mr. HENDERSON: The clause gives a classification to immature fruit, and consequently it is all right. The difficulty in shipping fruit a distance has been that there is a temptation to pull the fruit before it is sufficiently mature. After it is picked it will develop such a degree of flavour and maturity as will indicate that it is suitable for dessert purposes. We have found in shipping early apples to the West that people pull them before they have reached sufficient growth to continue developing until they have reached a state of maturity. This provision is to meet cases of that kind, and it does it, I think, very fully.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The fruit growers are well organized in different provinces. In the province from which I come, the fruit growers, for a number of years past, have been enforcing regulations as to the grading and marking of fruit. Has this Bill been submitted to the fruit growers, and have any objections been expressed to bringing it into force?

Mr. CRERAR: It was submitted to the fruit growers. I believe I stated earlier in the discussion that a conference of fruit growers coming from all over Canada, from Nova Scotia to British Columbia, was held in the month of February. They considered this matter for two days, and this Bill is the outcome of their deliberations. I believe that at that conference there were also present a few representatives of the consumers, particularly large companies of western farmers, handling fruits along with other commodities.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood the hon. member for East Lambton to say that one of the objects of this Bill was to prevent fruit from the United States being distributed in an unfit condition. I see that every package is going to be marked with letters three-quarters of an inch in height before it is taken from the premises in which it is packed. Suppose fruit comes from the other side of the line and is packed in an immature condition, I do not see this is any protection to the Canadian consumer. I do not see any protection so far for the Canadian consumer.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The fruit to which I refer has been coming in from the United States, and this practice has been followed for years back. Carloads of immature fruit have been brought in year after year from the United States and forced upon the Canadian market and it is a most unwise position for us to be placed in as a people.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How will this Bill prevent that practice?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Because the American exporters of immature fruit will not be allowed to dispose of it in Canada except they conform with the regulations prescribed by this Bill. Not only has the practice to which I have referred been common, but some of our own fruit farmers, in order to get the advantage of the high prices, have been in the habit of shipping immature fruit from their trees and selling it as wholesome fruit when it is certainly anything but that.

Mr. BUREAU: My question had reference to fruit coming across the border in packages. I understood this Bill was designed to protect the Canadian consumer.

Mr. CURRIE: There is a law in the United States prohibiting the sale of immature fruit, but when the market over there is denied to the American exporters they ship the immature fruit to this country, just as they do with unmarketable veal and tubercular sheep and hogs.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the United States law prevent the exportation of immature fruit?

Mr. CURRIE: No.

Mr. BUREAU: Then where is there any protection for Canada?

Mr. CURRIE: The fruit grown in the United States is subject to inspection there.

When that fruit is rejected, it is shipped to Canada although some of it is unfit for hogs let alone human beings. In the same way they ship to Canada the carcasses of tubercular sheep and hogs that have been rejected over there. They are allowed to do that because the United States will not carry on an inspection for us or for any other outside country—their inspection is intended for the protection of their own people. The clause in the Bill is aimed at importations into Canada of that class of stuff.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that perfectly, but is there nothing in the present Bill against the shipment of immature, or any other kind of improper fruit, from the United States into Canada?

Mr. CURRIE: That is the object of the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: Not the section I have just read because it presupposes that the fruit has been shipped in bulk and packed again in Canada. The language of the section is:

> Every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person, repacks fruit—

And so on. I do not think there is anything in the Bill to create the presumption that if a man receives a package of immature fruit from the United States that he is creating an agency.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I see your point; how in practice is immature fruit from the United States to be held up?

Mr. CRERAR: I may point out to the committee that the purpose of this definition is to prevent the sale of immature fruit.

Mr. BUREAU: Fruit that is packed?

Mr. CRERAR: It is to insure that fruit that is immature shall be so stamped and marked so that the purchaser shall know what he is buying. Immature fruit is used very largely for making jams—it has a definite, specific use—but it has happened in the past that immature fruit, for instance, plums and grapes, have been shipped to remote points and actually sold as good fruit when it was not. The purpose of this definition is merely to make it quite clear that the shipper of fruit,if it is immature, must stamp his basket or package with a label so that the purchaser will know what it is he is buying.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Whether it is Canadian or American fruit?

Mr. CRERAR: I think it would apply to American fruit as well, but as to that point I am not absolutely sure.

Mr. MARSHALL: There are hundreds of cars of fruit shipped into this country from the United States, which fruit has to be picked on the green side or it would not be in the proper condition to use when it gets here. If the fruit is not picked until it is ripe, when it is shipped any distance it cannot be handled at all after reaching its destination. Our company have brought in a great many cars of different kinds of fruit for the simple reason that we cannot get it here—this country is not producing sufficient fruit. The fruit that we bring into this country, as I say, is picked on the green side, and by the time it reaches its destination in this country it is in a nice condition to handle. If we wait until the fruit has ripened on the tree and then have it shipped, when it reaches here it is in such a condition that we cannot handle it.

Mr. McMASTER: I draw the minister's attention to the fact that the word "Christian" is spelled with a small c throughout the section. That is not as it should be, and I suppose the minister will correct it.

Mr. McKENZIE: If it has any reference to the fruit dealers, I would object to the use of the word altogether.

Section agreed to.

On section 321 (3)—Package marks:

Mr. McMASTER: The paragraph refers to specimens of fruit "of not less than nearly medium size and some colour for the variety," etc. Should that not be "same colour."

Mr. CRERAR: "Some" is right.

On paragraph 321—subsection 7—Fruit unfit for use:

Mr. McKENZIE: This section provides that no persons shall sell or expose for sale any fruit in any "package" that is diseased, wormy or otherwise depreciated. Would it not be just as bad if the dealer had this diseased fruit in bulk, and not in a package? It would seem that he could have it in as bad a condition as he likes if it is not in a package, but that it is only when it is in a package that the law applies.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me that this section will affect the sale of fruit which is quite general at certain times of the year in certain sections of Eastern Canada. For instance, take the blueberry season: Young folks go out and gather blueberries, bring

them in in pails, and sell them. The same thing is done in the raspberry season. Apparently "no person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit in any package"—even in an open package—intended for sale unless marked as required by this section. I do not think the minister intends that the village children who pick strawberries, raspberries or blueberries have to mark the package to dispose of them among their friends in the village.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: If the hon. member will look at paragraph (b) of section 319, he will note that it is provided that " 'fruit' shall not include wild fruit, nor cranberries, whether wild or cultivated."

Mr. McMASTER: That provision will protect the sale I have mentioned.

Mr. J. A. ARMSTRONG: This Bill does not refer to that.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 325—Fruit packages:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I observe that this Bill provides that all these fruits shall be sold in packages of a certain size, a made-to-order package, of specified length, width and depth, taper, etc. To my mind it is difficult to comply with that law. Why should these fruits not also be sold by the pail or by the bag, unless for wholesale or export purposes, when there would be some object in making a fixed size of package in which a commodity should be sold? For instance, in the following section I notice that currants shall be sold in containers of four-fifths of a quart, and that a pint box shall be four and three-eighths by four and three-eighths at top and bottom and one and seven-eighths inches deep, and so on. It will take a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret what all this means. We have been in the habit of selling these fruits in pails, baskets, bags, or barrels. I do not see the gain in this legislation, or the possibility of dealing with it. It is absolutely impossible for a small dealer throughout the country to sell his fruits in accordance with this Bill.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. What we want is standard size baskets.

Sir SAM HUGHES: You are a wholesale dealer, and I am not.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am a large buyer.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not selling to large buyers, and you are selling to me.

Mr. MARSHALL: Your neighbour wants to know what he is getting. If he is buying a standard basket, then he will know. I quite agree that this clause is a move in the right direction. I am a canner, and we are trying to standardize our cans all the way through, jam can, fruit can and vegetable can; we are doing that now, and I can see a great advantage by doing so. I do not see why the same thing should not apply to these fruits.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Let me give the hon. gentleman a concrete instance. Take a farmer living outside of Aylmer, who does not want to sell to large wholesale organizations, but to the retail merchant. By this Bill he is supposed to sell fruits in packages of specified dimensions. How will he get the baskets? Why should he not sell the fruit as he does now, in pails, or sell his apples by the bag, as he has been doing?

Mr. MARSHALL: I can tell you why. I think it is the small buyer we are looking after. The large buyer can take care of himself better than the small buyer. This is a protection to the boy, or the girl, or the housewife who buys one package of fruit. I cannot get away from that. I think it is a splendid move, and one in the right direction.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is a move that these multi-millionaires invariably have against the poor, downtrodden boy and girl in the country. It is almost impossible for every farmer to have a package or measure of this kind at his disposal at all times. Time and again we have provided that bags of certain capacity shall be used and that certain products shall be sold in certain kinds of measures. This limiting the size and shape of every measure that articles are sold in is all piffle. For the wholesale trade, let the requirements be up to a certain standard; let the measure be described as a bushel, peck, quart, or pint. But under this provision, a farmer is violating the law if he sells fruit in a bushel which is an inch too long and a corresponding inch too narrow.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This clause is in the interests of consumers. We have standard size barrels in Ontario. The people of Nova Scotia have the same, and they are unable to sell apples in the United States because their barrel is of such a size that it does not conform with the regulations in the United States. The small boxes in which cherries and berries and smaller fruits are packed are supplied by

large manufacturers. It is very easy for the farmers to conform to certain regulations respecting the size of the packages. Fruit men throughout the country are anxious that these standard boxes should be in universal use.

Mr. FRASER: I take exception to this clause respecting the baskets. In the Niagara Falls district we have had for the past two years a basket manufactured of paper; it has no tacks in it. A large order has been received for the supplying of baskets of this kind to the British trade. It is one of the best baskets on the market. As long as the basket is of a standard size and of strong construction, I do not see that it makes any difference what shape it is.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Is the hon. gentleman referring to packages of fruit for export?

Mr. FRASER: No, to packages to be sold in our own markets.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: What is the objection to conforming with these regulations?

Mr. FRASER: Because this basket has no tacks in it; you cannot put tacks in the bottom of it.

Mr. HENDERS: Take the case of a village of 300 or 500 inhabitants around which there is a farming community. The farmers have small quantities of strawberries and apples to sell and it is a great convenience to them to be able to bring this fruit to town and sell it by the pint, quart or gallon. There is also an advantage to the purchaser, because he knows what he is getting; besides, he gets the fruit in convenient form. For shipping purposes it is all right to provide such a standard as is specified in the Bill, but some provision should be made to meet cases of the kind to which I refer.

Mr. CURRIE: Does not most of the trouble arise because in Canada we use an Imperial measure, while in the United States they use what is known as the wine measure? In the United States the strawberry box contains, say, a wine quart—we call it wine measure in this country—while in Canada we have the Imperial quart, which is one fifth larger. That places the Canadian dealer at a disadvantage, because in the United States they will not give him credit for the additional amount contained in his package. Are the measures spoken of in this provision with reference to pears, crab apples, plums, and so on, based on the number of cubic inches contained in a quart or in a peck as the case may be; or are they simply arbitrary measurements?

Mr. CRERAR: The Fruit Growers' Association have recommended the measurements here specified. Their aim has been to make the standards of Canada conform with those of the United States.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I think that the following provision of section 327 covers the objection of the member for Welland (Mr. Fraser):

> Every basket of fruit packed in Canada, for sale in Canada, and every basket manufactured and offered for sale in Canada, of other material than wood veneer shall be of such dimensions as may be specified by the Minister of Agriculture, and shall contain, when level full, as nearly as practicable, one or other of the following quantities.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is all right for the large dealers, but we are legislating not for the large dealers, but for the ordinary farmers. Half the fruit sold in Canada is disposed of by small farmers, who peddle it around in the villages and small towns. Under this provision, if a farmer sells a pail of cherries, that does not comply with the law, he is a criminal. That should not be, because the transaction is absolutely straight and square and fair. It is all right to provide that fruit for export shall be put in a package of a certain size, but when a man is selling in small quantities direct to the consumer, let him sell it in the most convenient way and for whatever he can get.

Mr. BALL: Fruit for export or for shipment to a point some considerable distance away ought to be put in packages, boxes or barrels, but when it is locally disposed of it is quite unnecessary to adopt the method suggested by this provision. Moreover, the added expense is unnecessary. The measurement, Imperial gallon, or any other measurement, is not, as I understand it, a consideration. The size of the boxes is defined. But for local consumption, it is unnecessary to go to the expense of putting up fruit in boxes or barrels, unless people wish to have it put up in that manner.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: If the hon. member will refer to section 326, he will see that it mentions the word "bushels." Subsection 2 says:

> Every wood veneer basket of fruit packed in Canada for sale in Canada, or manufactured

and offered for sale in Canada, shall contain, when level full, as nearly as practicable, one or other of the following quantities:—

(a) one bushel;

(b) eleven quarts.

And so on.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The ordinary farmer who has, say, ten quarts of fruit knows that in the fruit season farmers and their wives come into the market with a pail of cherries, a pail of plums, a pail of apples, and so on. That is the half-basket. Why should such people be penalized because that is the custom they have always followed? They have only a small quantity of fruit. They are not wholesale dealers or multi-millionaires. I do not know that anybody will enforce this law with regard to them, but why should they be made liable to a penalty, made criminals according to the law, for selling in small quantities, as their ancestors have done for generations? If their pail does not conform with the exact measurements of the bushel measure as set forth in this legislation, such people would be liable.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: They are allowed to sell in that way.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not as I read the section.

Mr. CRERAR: I realize that there is some force in the point raised by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). Possibly an exception might be considered in the case of a farmer or fruit grower who brings fruit into the market and sells direct to the consumer.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: That point, as I interpret this section, is not covered. On the other hand, if a fruit grower, no matter whether he be doing business in a large or a small way, is selling to a retailer who resells to the consumer, he should be obliged to sell in baskets or packages.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Or the retailer should be obliged to put the fruit into baskets or packages.

Mr. CRERAR: I think we should have to start a little further back than the retailer. I would suggest that this section stand, and I shall look into that point and bring it up again later on.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am very much obliged. The man whom I have in mind is not the fruit grower as such. I do not know what the definition of the term "fruit grower" is. But I mean the man who has a farm, behind which he has an orchard with some plum, apple and cherry trees, and who makes a few hundred dollars a year out of his fruit. There are thousands of such farmers throughout Ontario and the Maritime Provinces. Those farmers could not possibly comply with this legislation, and I want them to be protected from being made criminals under it.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. CRERAR: I beg to move to amend section 326 by striking out the words "issue permits" and substituting therefor the words "make regulations." This will cover the point raised by my hon. friend from Victoria.

Mr. SHEARD: Would it not be better to leave the section just as it is and add the words "make regulations?" That would enable the minister to cover any cases that came up.

Mr. CRERAR: I think my amendment is better.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to hold up the Bill at all, but there is danger in rushing through legislation in the last days of the session. This Bill, for instance, in my opinion will cause any amount of trouble to local sellers, and they will not put up with being inconvenienced in this way. What is the bushel mentioned here? Is it the same as the grain bushel?

Mr. CRERAR: Imperial measure.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is our standard grain bushel the Imperial measure?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It must be the same.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I mention that just to illustrate the difficulties the minister will be up against all over the country. If the two bushels are not the same, people will be selling wheat by one bushel and fruit by another, and it will cause any amount of confusion. I would suggest that the local men might dispose of their fruit to the retailer without having to comply with these provisions. What is to prevent my hon. friend from Elgin, for instance, buying all the stuff that comes along in pails, half-pails or quarter-pails, and having his men put it into packages? Let that be the business of the man who sells to the general public. I fully endorse the idea of having packages, but it will lead to all sorts of trouble to men who sell locally.

Mr. CRERAR: I would point out that wild fruit is excluded from the application of these provisions by the definition of the word fruit, and I think the amendment I have moved will cover the point raised by my hon. friend. I do not know whether he intends that those people in the Niagara district, for instance, who are growing fruit as a business and selling it as part of their regular farm product should be permitted to sell their fruit in packages to suit themselves.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, I do not.

Mr. CRERAR: Then we have to meet the requirement of the farmer who raises a little fruit and may take it into the local town to sell it direct to the consumer. There is a provision in the latter part of this section:

That the said Minister may issue permits allowing any person or persons to use packages of other sizes than those specified in the foregoing section.

I have proposed an amendment to that, so that we may frame regulations to cover these particular cases.

Sir SAM HUGHES: All right.

Mr. BURNHAM: One remark made by the hon. member for Victoria strikes me as singularly appropriate, and that is that legislation like this, which is extremely desirable and brings this whole matter out of chaos into order, should be considered very carefully. For my part I venture to say this House should do as it did last year, adjourn to meet again in the summer. The men are sweating in the trenches; let us do some sweating here. Why should we try to get rid of our duties at the earliest possible moment and clear out of here as soon as we possibly can? For my part, I am not a farmer, and may not be doing very much here, but I would say, let us stay right here and do our duty fully.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Go and work on your farm.

Section agreed to.

On section 331—penalty for destroying or pilfering fruit:

Mr. McMASTER: This section says:

Every person who carelessly handles, wilfully destroys or pilfers any fruit packed in any of the packages prescribed in this Part shall be guilty of an offence and liable upon summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

It seems to me to be wrong to put careless handling on the same basis as thieving, for pilfering is thieving.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It says, "not exceeding twenty-five dollars." A magistrate could fine lightly or up to the limit.

Section agreed to.

On section 337A—potato grades:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there anything in this section to prevent a man selling potatoes and letting the buyer grade them?

Mr. CRERAR: No.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 19, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (vegetables, eggs, food containers, firewood and cement)—Sir George Foster.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3 (360b)—Portland cement, net weight:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That clause 360b be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

On section 4—Act not to apply to articles now in stock; date of coming into force:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not necessary now, as it is included in the new clause 358 (d). I therefore beg to move that it be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

On section 5—Date of coming into force:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move that there shall be substituted for that section the following:

This Act shall come into force in one year from the date upon which this Bill receives the Royal Assent.

Motion agreed to.

On section 2 (358 a)—Packages of food and containers to be marked:

On motion of St. George Foster, the Committee reverted to section 358a.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be remembered that when we were discussing packing or labelling of milk in bottles it seemed as though we ought to amend that clause otherwise it would be necessary for some permanent stamp to be affixed to or blown into the bottle. I propose to make that clear in the same manner as has been done

in Acts of this kind in the United States. I therefore move:

That at the end of the 25th line, after the word "branded" there be added the words "or otherwise indicated on the outside or top or on a label or tag attached thereto."

This will make it easy to affix the label to the bottle or to attach an independent label thereto.

Mr. DECHENE: According to the amendment made by the minister to section 5, this Act will not come into force until one year after it has received the Royal Assent. But before that another clause was amended to provide that stock on hand would not be affected by the provisions of the Act. What is the use of amending the two clauses in this way if the Act is to come into force within one year after it has received the Royal Assent? His amendment would be useless, as far as I can see if it does not cover all the stock.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The amendment of which I gave notice to section 358 D provides that:

This Act does not apply to any articles held in stock by wholesale or retail dealers prior to the coming into force of the Act.

If, when the Act comes into force, he shall have a stock on hand, this Act shall not apply to it. That gives a wide privilege and at the same time it takes away any reason for discontent as to his having to remark articles which he may have in stock. Then the amendment proceeds to state other exceptions from the operation of the Act:

The provisions of this Act shall not apply.—
(e) To packages containing two avoirdupois ounces, or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of weight;
(f) To packages containing one fluid ounce, or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of measure.

These are very small articles, and it is not considered worth while to bother with them, or to insist on their being labelled with measurements, weights, or names.

(g) to any article the sale of which as regards the weight or marking thereof is already provided for under other statutes.

We do not want to duplicate the legislation.

(h) those food commodities which may at the time this Act comes into force, or which thereafter may be subject to any regulation or order of the Canada Food Control Board as respects the weight of such commodity or the weight or proportion of ingredients used in the manufacture of such commodity.

We do not wish to interfere with the work of the Food Board in making these changes and regulations from time to time. These are extraordinary regulations adopted by the Food Board and they are called for by the necessities and circumstances of war conditions. We do not bind them down by the letter of this enactment. But while the war continues and while the work of the Food Board is going on, this clause is necessary.

(i) those food commodities held in stock at the time that such regulations of the Canada Food Board referred to in paragraph (h) become inoperative.

That avoids the confusion and expense of relabelling, remarking, reweighing, and remeasuring the stock that may be on hand at that particular time.

Mr. DECHENE: This part of the Act applying to imported goods will interfere with the importation of food.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, it does not interfere with the importation of food.

Mr. DECHENE: It does interfere with it if we set up a standard in this country which is not the standard in the United States.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We must have our own standard.

Mr. DECHENE: The packers in the United States will pack in accordance with their standard and not in accordance with our standard, and there will be trouble in connection with the importation of goods packed in that way.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The importer will have the advantage of a whole year to order his imports and to see that they are packed according to these regulations. It is not necessary to wait for a year to put in the order.

Mr. DECHENE: This will have the effect of increasing prices if we do not have the same standard as they have in the United States. The packers in the United States will have to pack goods specially for our trade, they will have to charge for that, and it will mean higher prices to our consumers. All food products are high enough now. We are anxious to keep down prices and to reduce the cost of living, but by this legislation we are putting prices up.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think that myself. The object of the legislation is to make it sure that the consumer when he buys shall know what he is getting and what he is paying for. It would be unfair, as my hon. friend will see, to have a lesser measure put up in bottles or packages

in another country, say the United States, and have those bottles and packages come here and compete, on the same outward appearances, with a larger measure which our own packers and our makers put up. We simply guard ourselves in the interest of the Canadian consumer, that is all.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. KAY: When this Bill was previously under consideration in committee, the Minister of Trade and Commerce promised that he would exempt bottles filled with milk by the milk dealers, from its operation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: An amendment relating to such bottles has been added to the Bill, and the amendment has been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment to 358a which has just been adopted, adds after the word "branded" on line 25, the following words, "or otherwise indicated on the outside or top or on a label or tag attached thereto."

Amendment agreed to, and clause as amended agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move

To amend clause 358 (d) by adding after sub-paragraph (c) the following words:

"(d) to any articles held in stock by a wholesale or retail dealer prior to the coming into force of this Act.

(e) to packages containing two avoirdupois ounces or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of weight.

(f) to packages containing one fluid ounce, or less, which packages shall be exempt from marking in terms of measure.

(g) to any article the sale of which as regards the weight or marking thereof is already provided for under other statutes.

(h) those food commodities which may at the time this Act comes into force, or which thereafter may be subject to any regulation or order of the Canada Food Control Board as respects the weight of such commodity or the weight or proportion of ingredients used in the manufacture of such commodity.

(i) those food commodities held in stock at the time that such regulations of the Canada Food Board referred to in paragraph (h) become inoperative."

Section as amended agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move to strike out clause 2 dealing with the weight of eggs.

An hon. MEMBER: Who will take care of the eggs?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hens will take care of them.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported and read the third time.

[Sir George Foster.]

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Burrell Bill No. 106 (from the Senate) to amend the Companies Act in various particulars was read a second time and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is the object in adding the last three words to the title "in various particulars"? It seems to me altogether unnecessary. Will the minister explain the object of the addition.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think that I can offer any further explanation beyond the fact that there was another Bill put through the Senate recently which provided for an amendment to the Government Act. This is a Senate Bill.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

THE TAKING OF THE SOLDIERS' VOTE AT LAST ELECTION.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): On Saturday last, I notified the Prime Minister that I intended to discuss on the first convenient opportunity a matter I considered of some importance, and as I have not heard from him, I presume it is satisfactory to him to proceed this afternoon. The matter, Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of Parliament is in reference to the taking of the soldiers' votes in the elections held on December 17 last.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will excuse me, it is stated that there was an understanding that this matter should not come up until to-morrow. The Prime Minister, especially, wished to be present. I am not sure whether my hon. friend expected, or understood, that he should receive word with reference to it. He says he has not, and, of course, that goes without saying. But if he has not, it was from a misunderstanding or some little neglect. The Prime Minister is engaged this afternoon on a very important matter with high authorities in connection with our defence. Under the circumstances, if my hon. friend would allow it to go over until to-morrow he would consult very much the convenience of the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Prime Minister asked me to confer with him regarding the business of the House, and going over the various matters I informed him that we intended to bring up the

matter of the soldiers' votes, about which my hon. friend from Westmorland had notified him. The Prime Minister told me that perhaps it would be more convenient for him to have the discussion to-morrow. I understand that the Prime Minister did not intend to take part in the discussion. I immediately notified my hon. friend (Mr. Copp) that he might be called upon to postpone his motion until to-morrow. Under the circumstances, we cannot refuse to accede to the request that the discussion of this matter be postponed, but in view of the fact that the time of the House may be well taken up to-morrow with the debate on titles, and possibly other matters. I suggest that if this motion be not proceeded with to-morrow afternoon, it be taken up on Wednesday morning.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am much obliged to my right hon. friend.

Mr. COPP: As I have said, I communicated with the Prime Minister regarding my intention to make this motion, and as I did not hear from him, I supposed that it was all right to go on with it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is understood, then, that if it is too late to take this matter up to-morrow afternoon, we shall proceed with it the first thing Wednesday morning?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Trade and Commerce—Trade commissioners and commercial agents, including expenses in connection with negotiations of treaties or in extension of commercial relations; miscellaneous advertising and printing, or other expenditure connected with the extension of Canadian trade, $160,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has anything been done to implement the report made by the commission sent to France?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Since the commission made their report, congestion in France as well as on the seas has increased rather than diminished. The facilities which in normal times are used for the exchange of commercial products have been devoted to the transport of food, munitions and other war necessities. Trade has been entirely stopped in a great many lines and greatly interrupted in all. The commission made a thorough investigation and published their information in a very instructive way. Under the circumstances, it has not been possible to do more than that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The report is a splendid one.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has been distributed broadcast amongst our traders, businessmen and producers. It is impossible to push trade with warring countries at this time, if we except trade in such commodities and articles as are necessary for the war. As these things are largely bought by the governments themselves, private business transactions between the inhabitants of all countries have been disarranged.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose the same applies to our Russian business.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Worse.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A very interesting report was published by the department some time ago with regard to the possibilities of Canadian trade with Russia and Siberia. The other day I inquired whether the Government were aware of the denunciation by France of the Franco-Canadian Treaty. I have seen in the press that France has denounced all her trade treaties. In the British House of Commons the other day Mr. Bonar Law or Mr. Balfour said that as a result of the Paris Economic Conference, France had denounced all her treaties. The Prime Minister said, in reply to my inquiry, that he was not aware of any such denunciation. I wish now to renew my question. Our trade with France during the existence of the Franco-Canadian treaty was particularly extensive in connection with the importation to Canada of French wines.

Now that we have established prohibition in Canada, the French trade will thereby suffer to a large extent, although we can do business with the French people in other ways. It seems to me that, after the visit of that commission on the other side and by the report of that commission, we can, after the war, establish much closer trade relations with France. We should have, as they have in the United Kingdom, commercial agents not only in Paris, but in other large French cities, such as Bordeaux, Nantes, Marseilles, Lyons, and possibly Rouen. The war will have brought France and England so close to one another that this country should, by reason of its national traditions, help in maintaining the entente cordiale between France and England, and although sentiment and business are two different things, yet I believe a good commercial treaty and sound business relations will help to maintain the happy friendship that exists between the Mother Country and France.

I do not know if my right hon. friend has the latest figures as regards the trade between France and Canada, but the present large trade is, of course, due to war conditions. At the same time, one must admit that France has, during the present war, been an extraordinarily good customer of Canada. Our trade statistics will show that very plainly. Before the war the total trade, exports and imports, between the two countries was relatively small, but since 1914 we have become one of the great allies of France from the commercial standpoint alone, not to speak of other standpoints. We are now selling to France in the millions, whilst we ourselves continue to buy from France at a much lower figure. I do not expect that, in the years to come, our imports from France will equal our exports, neither do the French people expect that. But from my conversation with some of the French consuls in this country, I am led to believe that if the Government, in particular the Minister of Trade and Commerce, will help in this connection we may establish a buoyant, permanent trade with France.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When the question with reference to the denunciation of treaties was put to the House by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) a week or so ago, no official information had reached the Government of the action that had been taken. Since that time official information has reached the Government, and France has given notice of the termination of all her treaties with all countries. With reference to Canada, as I suppose is the case with reference to other countries, the notice runs "from the 15th of May." One year after the 15th of May, the treaties will be denounced. But the statement is also made that in the denunciation of the treaties, it is not the intention of France to terminate favoured arrangements with those nations with whom she has had relations before, but that the denunciation of the treaties takes place in order to put France, under the altered conditions, in the position of making new arrangements with the different countries. France is not alone in respect to that action. Great Britain is following the same course, and so I imagine are most of the other nations.

4 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about Japan?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would, however, prefer not to give the reason for the denunciation of the treaties to be the basis which was laid down in the resolutions adopted by the Economic Conference at Paris; rather the resolutions adopted in that conference and the denunciation of those treaties arise from the very same circumstances—the necessity for our grading and rearranging commercial relations owing to the world-wide dislocation of trade brought about by the war.

We had commenced an excellent propaganda in Russia. We had one of our most expert trade commissioners at Petrograd, and a very bright and capable young man at Omsk. Both of those gentlemen had about a year or a year and a half of work in their respective localities, but the collapse of the Russian government in so far as carrying on the war was concerned, and the widespread confusion which took place thereafter, the utter congestion of trade transport inland and the almost utter lack of ocean transport, have made it necessary that both those gentlemen should be recalled from their positions. Mr. Just has lately arrived, fortunately safely, in England, and Mr. Wilgress is now at work for the department in the southern part of China, with his headquarters at Hong Kong. He will probably remain there until matters settle down in Russia sufficiently to enable him to take up his work again from anything like an advantageous position. All our trade commissioners have been interfered with in their work largely by the confusion of transport and of trade conditions.

At the same time they have been diligently at work gathering information and preparing reports, which are being distributed, and endeavouring in every possible way to prepare for the coming better period by keeping the relations between business men here and business men in those other countries as far as possible intact.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about my suggestion that after the war more commercial agents be appointed in those large centres? I do not mean that my hon. friend is not doing the needful as far as Paris is concerned, although everybody who has travelled in Europe knows that the commissioners in Paris and London are not able to look after the trade of Canada, because Canadians abroad simply overwhelm their offices with requests for information of all kinds. It seems to me we should have—we had them in Germany before the war—agents on the continent and especially in France, at such places as Rouen, Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux, whose special business would be to develop the trade between

Canada and France. One agent in Paris is not sufficient for the whole of France.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite agree, but the only thing that can be done at the moment is for the department to keep a watchful eye on what happens. One thing is quite certain, and that is that methods and opportunities for interchange will be very largely altered by reason of the war, and agencies in France may be taken advantage of which have not been available heretofore; such, for instance, as the Lyons' fair, which takes place every year and which will open up an excellent opportunity, when times become more normal, for representation of our wares to the representative business men of France, leading up to business connections. It is true that France is buying largely from us at the present time and selling comparatively little to us, but the balance of trade, while in our favour at the present time, is largely a fictitious one and does not represent anything permanent. In peace times the balance of trade was very largely in favour of France who sent us many millions of dollars' worth of goods more than we sent to her, so the balance is now righting itself. What will happen after the war will depend very largely upon the basic needs of France in relation to our sources of large supply. For instance, France ought to take from Canada a great amount of lumber and other material for reconstruction purposes. That is all being noted as carefully as possible by the department, and when the proper time comes these matters will all be taken up. In the meantime nothing can be done in the way of negotiations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would ask the minister, if he attends the Imperial Conference, or if he does not, his colleagues, to look especially after the interests of Canadian trade. It is true that a Canadian business man abroad can always rely on the British consulates to protect him and give all the information he requires in his trade. But England is a nation of shopkeepers, be it said without derogation, and looks after her own business through her consulates. The question has been brought up on several occasions in the House. Perhaps it would be possible for this Government to have in those British consulates on the continent, and especially in France, Canadian attachés who would especially represent the interests of Canadian trade. Let my hon. friend understand me well; I do not wish to break the tie between the Mother Country and Canada, but this is a cold-blooded business proposition, and it seems to me that with all our natural and industrial resources we should do more in the after-the-war period to advertise our wares and our business than we have done heretofore. If we had Canadian attachés in the British consulates on the continent, I think our trade would certainly be the gainer. My hon. friend is quite correct in saying that in view of the world revolution going on our trade at the present time is largely fictitious, but even during this revolutionary period, by taking the tide which leads on to fortune, Canada can build up a trade in connection with reconstructing the devastated areas in France, for instance, which I think would be of lasting advantage to this country. Look at what the Americans have done. Two years ago a conference of American business men and capitalists was called in the city of Boston, and all American business and industrial concerns were invited to unite in an effort to capture all the trade that would develop in reconstructing the devastated areas of France. I do not know whether my hon. friend followed that matter very closely, but a copy of the programme issued by the association came into my hands last year. I cannot see why the Americans should get preference over the Canadians in this line of business. I do not know why our business men from Toronto, Montreal, and other large industrial centres should not reap the benefits American business men are enjoying. They are rebuilding the cities and towns and villages in France which have been recaptured from the Germans by the Allied armies. Only the other day I read a very interesting article to the effect that the Quakers, whose tenets will not allow them to take part with the combatant armies, are going to help the Red Cross and help reconstruct the devastated villages and towns.

(Sir THOMAS WHITE, Minister of Finance, having entered the House after a prolonged absence through illness, and being warmly greeted by hon. members),

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope I express the feeling of the House in welcoming back our hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to take note of the few remarks I have made. They are made in earnest. It seems to me that with pluck and with true sturdy Canadianism we should at least equal the Americans in capturing war trade. I call it war trade because it is trade that has developed

as a consequence of the war, but it will be lasting, because the reconstruction period will extend over a number of years. When once the Canadians have reached these markets it will be seen that they are the equals, if not the superiors, of others. My right hon. friend said a moment ago that some business men had already, by their own efforts, done a great deal towards capturing that trade. That is quite true, as I have found out myself. I have travelled all around the globe, and I have found that the Massey-Harris firm, for instance, have sold their implements in every part of the world. In Australia, Asia, Japan, France, Russia, all over the world, that Toronto firm have been able to secure permanent customers. It is for us, during the present war, to extend the ramifications of our trade as far as possible. I said a moment ago that business and sentiment were different things. But sentiment helps to foster business, and what I am asking the Minister of Trade and Commerce to do is to foster the business of Canada during the present war.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, may I remind the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lemieux) that the Massey-Harris firm do almost their entire export trade from the city of Brantford, which I have the honour to represent, and not from the city of Toronto. Brantford has been the exporting centre of the Massey-Harris Company for many years. That is the place where the Harris firm originally was founded and carried on its business for many years before being amalgamated with the Massey Company. The export trade remains at the city of Brantford up to the present time.

I want to know if the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has any information to give us as to how we can get along with our present trade rather than taking up the problem, which my hon. friend from Maisonneuve has so ably discussed, of trade after the war. I would like to know if the minister can give us any encouragement in regard to the shipping facilities that we may expect to take care of the little bit of foreign trade that is left? It is well known that the foreign trade we had with various countries apart from Great Britain, France, and Italy, has fallen away to very small proportions and for the little which is offering it is almost impossible to get shipping. Goods have been piled up in New York, Boston, and other American ports awaiting ships, that do not come to the Canadian ports for the most part at all, to carry these goods to such countries as South America, South Africa, Australia, and other outlying parts of the world which have been in the habit of trading with Canada. I know that until very recently shipping has been almost entirely unobtainable and that many firms which had taken orders with a view of having the goods delivered at any given time have found it almost impossible to carry out their contracts by reason of the uncertainty in regard to the supply of shipping that is offered. In some cases no shipping has been offered at all to carry these goods. We know the difficulties of the shipping situation. The war has caused a tremendous loss in tonnage, probably 6,000,000 tons last year, and naturally there will be a shortage both at the present time and in the immediate future. But I understand the minister has his hand from time to time on a little shipping that is available for carrying goods to different parts of the earth. I would like to ask him if he can give us any encouragement as to the outlook for the present season in regard to the carrying of any orders that may be on hand to the distant corners of the earth and particularly to Great Britain.

We know that munitions and foodstuffs must have the right of way but there are other very essential articles for the development of those wasted lands that should receive careful consideration and I trust that the minister is using his every endeavour to get as ample shipping in competition as it is possible to procure in these strenuous times in order that the trade of Canada may not develop entirely in a lopsided way with our neighbours to the south. We have been buying enormous quantities of goods in the United States, much more than we have been selling, and unfortunately there is a very serious discrepancy in the rate of exchange on that account. On the other hand, many countries of Europe would be only too glad to get those things that we have available for export, both foodstuffs and manufactured goods as well as products of the forests, mines and fisheries. I deem it essential that the minister shall endeavour, to the utmost of his ability, to provide the necessary shipping and to find transportation so that Canadian products may be delivered at their destination within a fairly reasonable time. I hope the minister will be able to give us some encouragement along that line.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could give a larger measure of en-

couragement than it is possible for me to do. Taking our great lines of shipping, the efforts of the department have almost entirely been used to preserve what we had at the commencement of the war. Although it might appear to be only a sort of negative success, yet it is really a substantial one when you are able to keep the routes manned somewhere up to the capacity of pre-war times. But the necessities of the war are inexorable, and when it comes to a showdown as to whether commercial goods shall be carried or the necessities of the war, there is no ground but one that can be taken, and the war necessities prevail.

Take the communications on the eastern side between Canada and Australia. We had our monthly service carried on with regularity for a number of years, and a large trade developed along that line. For the last four or five months it has not been possible to get a single vessel, either sailing ship or steam vessel, for that route; and although the most persistent efforts have been made both by the company interested and by the department, there do not appear to be any more encouraging features now than three or four months ago.

On the western side we had a good service between Victoria and Vancouver and New Zealand and Australia, including some excellent freight boats. The Niagara and the Makura were vessels which would be an honour and pride to any steamship line or service, and the company's freight boats were good serviceable boats. One by one the freight boats have been taken away, and just within the last fortnight, although I have been able to keep to date the two vessels referred to on the route, in conjunction with efforts from New Zealand and Australia, they have been commandeered by the British Admiralty; and the best assurance the British Admiralty could give in return was to hold out a hope that two slower vessels would, as soon as possible, be placed on the route; so that there is not much encouragement in that direction at the present time. We may get those two vessels again, and we may not.

As to the China and Japan service, the big Empresses were taken off early in the war, and we had a maimed service for some time. Afterwards two of the Empresses were allowed to come back, and for the last year the four vessels have been plying regularly. Within the last three weeks two Empresses have again been taken for war purposes, and this morning I received word that a smaller, but yet a serviceable, vessel had been allocated to take the place of one of the Empresses, so that we shall have three boats on that service, according to present indications, for the remainder of the season.

With reference to the Trans-Atlantic South African Service, we have had the same ups and downs. The Elder-Dempster Company, as I stated here, have had more than eighty-five per cent of their vessels commandeered by the British Government, and they have lost a certain number outside of that. The company have done the very best they could to keep up the South African connection, but we have had months of intermission in the service, getting a vessel whenever possible. For the last three months there has been no vessel in this route, but within a fortnight I have received word that one has been allocated, and will sail in June for South Africa. This encouraging feature was somewhat modified, when the announcement was made that the vessel would not be able to take nearly all the freight which was offering—which is stored up in fact and offering—but the promise is given that as often as possible we shall get boats intermittently between South Africa and Canada. The South African Government is as strongly in favour of that as we are, and the efforts of both Governments are being used to that end.

As to South America, the situation is a pretty difficult one. We have no vessels running on that route from Canada and the arrangements which have been made owing to the war have combed out everything that is serviceable. We do get vessels going from New York occasionally, and have to make ourselves satisfied with what small freights we can get on those.

As to the West Indies, we had an excellent service of four vessels, but for the last two years it has been, I think I may say good naturedly, a real war to keep those vessels on. I have succeeded in keeping them on with the good-will of the Admiralty until the last month, when two of them have been commandeered, with a sort of indefinite promise that if any vessel, a slower one, can be allocated it will be—but there you are.

With regard to the Atlantic service, my hon. friend knows the circumstances as well as I do. Now here is the situation: There are ships building in Great Britain and the United States, to mention no other countries. Large tonnage is being put into construction in the United States as well as in Great Britain, but we must not hold our hopes too high on the reparation of the

losses in tonnage by new building in the United States. The new building and the new launchings in the United States have in view the building up of an army which may go to five millions, or seven millions, or even to ten millions, every mouth of which has to be fed practically by transported grain and other foodstuffs from this side, and all the munitions of war necessary to go with the transport of those troops have to be provided for. That makes the man who thinks come to the conclusion that there will not be much alleviation for commercial freights in that respect, in so far as the coming year is concerned.

Now I have made a candid statement to the House. Everybody, I think, sees the difficulty and when you are right up against the statement of the Admiralty: is it the war or is it commerce, you have to give way to the absolute necessities.

Mr. DECHENE: I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the explanations made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce but there is one point that comes to my mind and to which I would like to invite the attention of the House. A very able report has been made to the Government with respect to an international or imperial bank that would look after the interests of Canada with other countries. I would like to know from the minister what has been done by the Government towards furthering the idea of incorporating a big bank that will take charge of international banking interests in connection with Canadian industries; a bank that will be posted on the commercial condition of every nation. For such an undertaking we would require a bulletin which will contain information of a more extensive character than those of the present weekly bulletin. I read the weekly bulletin published by the department with a great deal of interest, and I think it has already shown the way to increase our commercial interests. But we need more information relating to financial conditions and inter-exchange, to make matters easier for purposes of commerce. To-day I think we have only two banks to take care of our bills outside of this country, the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Bank, and possibly the Canadian Bank of Commerce. I would like to ask the minister if he knows what has been done towards adopting the report of Senator Nicholls and creating a bank of that kind?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend is on good ground when he says that the extension of trade and banking facilities must go hand in hand. Probably we have suffered in that respect as a young country. Our banks have been taking charge of our commercial affairs and ministering to them in this country, and in our rapid development I think our banks have had pretty nearly all they could do, and they have done their work on the whole excellently well. An example of where banking extension helps trade is shown in a small way in the West India Islands, where our commercial subsidies provide transportation and our banks undertake work of a financial nature. In fact, they are now, I think, the dominant banks in those islands. They have also made the beginning of a push into the South American continent. These matters, of course, must be left, both as to trade and financial facilities, with the people themselves very largely. It is unwise to ask the Government to attempt to do what financial and business men and manufacturers and traders have the first interest in doing, and can do much better than any other agency. The Government's work is to prepare the way by gathering and distributing information of the best and most reliable kind, and by doing what it can in the way of commercial subsidies, and in all ways to stimulate a knowledge and interest between our own and other countries. But the Government cannot start banks and cannot build commercial lines and put them on these routes. The business and the financial men of the country must co-operate if we are to be successful. And the Government will aid in every possible way that a Government can. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) cited the fact of an aggregation of United States business men for securing trade in France, and he might have said in other neutral and foreign countries. But it was the business men who aggregated themselves together, made the organization and adopted the methods. The operation was assisted and aided by the consular system and trade intelligence system of the United States Government. But the United States Government, having paved the way, and added its customary forces, the business men and the bankers themselves must go the rest of the gait. So it is with reference to our own people here. Just now I think my hon. friend will quite agree with me that our banks have about all they can do to carry the load upon their shoulders in Canada at the present time. Even if they had a little leisure time, and a little more strength, conditions are

so confused in other countries that they do not lend themselves to the propagation of branch banks, or the establishment of parent banks. These things will have to wait, as so many others, until the war period is over and settled conditions begin to appear again. With reference to the allusion to the report and speech of a member of the other House, I am quite cognizant of the senator's good speeches and good work, and hope that it will bear fruit in an aggregation of capital which will tend towards the desired end, the same as is being done in Great Britain, but which is being done by the financial interests and business men themselves. At the present time the difficulties are so great for launching anything of that kind that our men may well pause before undertaking it.

Mr. BUREAU: I notice that this item reads: "Trade commissioners and commercial agents, including expenses in connection with negotiations of treaties or in extension of commercial relations." May I ask what treaty the minister has in contemplation to negotiate during the coming year? How much of this money will be used in negotiating treaties?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: None that one knows; yet as my hon. friend will see, the moment the war ceases these matters have to be taken up, and a portion of this vote is intended for any expenses which may be necessary with reference to possible negotiations. At the present time there are none in contemplation and none under way.

Mr. BUREAU: Does this vote cover the commercial agents located in various countries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All of the agents.

Mr. BUREAU: It covers their salaries as well?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: If the minister can tell us how much will be required for salaries, we will know what margin is left for the negotiation of treaties, so that we will have an idea of the importance to be attached to the negotiations.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Probably about $20,000 of that vote would be available for that purpose. Maybe less. But a good deal depends upon how things turn out and how our trade commissioners are able to work.

Bounties on lead and crude petroleum. To cover expenditure in connection with the administration of the Acts, $4,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These are for the bounties on lead and oil, the usual vote.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a decrease of $1,000. Has production decreased?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bounties on lead, as my hon. friend knows, if he has the Act in mind, depend as to whether or not the price of lead in the markets of the world falls below a certain amount. If it falls below a certain amount there is a bounty paid; if it keeps above that amount none is paid. The vote was not all spent last year. One cannot tell how the prices on lead will go. So we have to take a sufficient amount to carry us through if the lead price—I do not believe it will happen this year— should go down lower than the sum at which bounties would accrue.

Salaries, rent, wages and contingencies under the Canada Grain Act, $1,050,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will let this item stand.

Mr. BUREAU: When will it be taken up?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To-morrow, I hope.

Mr. BUREAU: I have received a pamphlet entitled, "Should the Canada Grain Act be Enforced." I suppose the minister has received a copy of it. I wish to put some questions with regard to this item.

Mr. ROBB: When the minister takes this item up, will he be prepared to give a statement of the expenses of operating and the revenue received from the terminal elevators?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will give all the information.

Item stands.

To provide for the construction, acquisition, leasing or expropriation of terminal elevators, $50,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This item follows the wording of the vote under which we built our terminal and interior elevators in the Northwest from the head of the Lakes to Vancouver, including the preliminary work with respect to the proposed elevator at Hudson bay. All these elevators have been finished except the one at Hudson bay. It is not proposed to do any work there during the present year, and no amount

has been put in the Estimates for that purpose. This vote is to make provision for such expenditures as may be necessary to provide new machinery and equipment in the elevators that we already have. Last year $25,262 was spent under that head. You never can tell what may happen in the way of the breaking down of machinery in these elevators or the necessity for new machinery, and you have to have some money on hand to defray such expenses.

Mr. BUREAU: Do the grain elevators which are part of a railway system come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, in part.

Mr. BUREAU: Are the elevators at Fort William under the jurisdiction of the minister?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Are they not part of the Canadian Northern system?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, not ours.

Mr. BUREAU: What distinction do you make between elevators inherited by this country through the Canadian Northern system and those inherited from the persons who constructed them?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Those inherited elevators of which my hon. friend has so happily spoken become the inheritance of the department which took over the railways and which has jurisdiction over the system of which the newly acquired lines form a part.

Mr. BUREAU: Would it not be better and more economical to put all these elevators under one management? I do not see why they should not all be under the authority of one department.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There may be two opinions on that point. In one sense it would be better if all grain-handling elevators were under one control and management. But circumstances arise which make it difficult to carry that principle into operation. I do not know that the expense is any greater in either case. For instance, the elevator in Quebec is operated by the Quebec Harbour Commission, a body which, in a sense, is an appointee of and gets its money under loan from the Government. The same applies to Montreal. The harbour commissioners operate their elevators in connection with the harbours over which they have jurisdiction. These elevators, however, come under certain regulations; in many of their relations they are not operated by the Canada Grain Board. The railway companies, in some way work their elevators on the general line of their traffic and consequently do what the Grain Board cannot possibly do. These elevators also are subject to the general regulations respecting warehousing, inspection and the like.

Mr. BUREAU: The inland elevators are fed by the railroads and the terminal elevators, such as those at Montreal and Quebec, transfer the grain from the cars to the steamers. Uniform regulations must be established respecting transhipment, shortages or leakages in the elevators, and so on. Why not have the whole system controlled by one department? These elevators are closely connected with the transportation question; they are practically intermediate between the railway systems and the steamship services so far as grain is concerned.

Why not let the Railway Department, which has under its control the transportation facilities of the country, have the management, control and oversight of all those elevators? I do not find fault with the minister, but I have had occasion before to make this criticism in the House, that there is some duplication or overlapping.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not necessarily.

Mr. BUREAU: There are two authorities over those elevators. Those elevators can serve but one purpose, namely, to store the country's produce which is bought for export, and then to turn it over to the steamer that is to take it overseas, or the freight cars that are to take it elsewhere. The operations of those elevators should be uniform, and you cannot obtain the same degree of efficiency so far as uniformity is concerned, by having two departments controlling them, as by having only one.

Census and statistics, $100,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this for the new and famous department that has been inaugurated this session?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is, as I explained to my hon. friend when the Bill went through, not new and not altogether the same as the old one. It is the old, improved, reinvigorated and made more effective.

Mr. McMASTER: The mouldering branches are cut away.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There never were any mouldering branches, but new shoots

have been put in. Just watch the new shoots shooting forth.

Dominions Royal Commission, $5,000.

Mr. BUREAU: What is this Dominions Royal Commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In 1912 there was issued by the British Government a Royal Commission, consisting of representatives from the self-governing Dominions and the United Kingdom.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the Imperial Trade Commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The name of it is the Dominions Royal Commission. It is a Royal Commission, the Dominions and the United Kingdom together. It has been pursuing its investigations in all the self-governing Dominions and in Great Britain It has finished its operations and handed in its final report. By the way, some of those reports have been distributed. They are voluminous, because the subjects are wide, but they contain a mine of information that any man who desires to get a broad grasp of the trade resources and possibilities of the Dominion and of the United Kingdom together, would find invaluable. I have had a circular sent to the members and senators in connection with that report. It is folly to send such a voluminous report to a man who does not want it; but if any one feels interested in it and would like to have a set of the volumes, or, as there is a tabulation of them, if he would like to have any particular volume of the set, we shall be very glad to give it to him. This sum is for winding up what little expenses may remain.

5 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Could the minister give, in a few terse sentences, a statement as to the action of the Government as regards the conclusions contained in that report? I had the privilege of receiving two of those blue-books, one concerning the trade with the Dominions and another containing the final conclusions of the commission. As the minister stated, no man who wishes to get a grasp of the world-wide conditions which that report embraces, can be without at least with the last volume in his library. This commission completed its work about two years ago. I met some of the delegates who passed through Canada at the time. Has the Department of Trade and Commerce taken any action whatsoever based on the conclusions contained in that report?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member mentions one of the volumes. There is another volume, which, I think, is equally important. There is not extant to-day a statistical statement with the same modernity, the same grasp and scope, as the statistics compiled and issued in that volume. Not only does it contain the best of the published statistics of each country, but it has those supplemented by actual investigations made by the commissioners themselves in all those countries, and special statistical tables with reference to different lines of production, resources and such things, which information does not exist in any other statistics.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And about the ports?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, about all those things. Besides that, there are in the addenda, most valuable and exhaustive reports upon most of the great lines of activity, given by eminent engineers and other eminent authorities, which reports lie there as a veritable thesaurus, a treasure-house of fact, which you could not get anywhere else. I make that statement here so that hon. members, who take an interest in those things, may have their attention directed to the report. That commission arose, as the committee knows, out of the deliberations and conclusions of an Imperial Conference.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In 1911?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Whatever was the purpose of the conference, whether it was to avoid a difficulty or whether it was to have a difficulty solved by a better medium than the simple cogitations of the members of the commission sitting in London for a few days or a few weeks, that commission started on a recommendation of the Imperial Conference of 1911. That report goes back to the British Government, and it will be submitted to the Imperial Conference when it next meets. Some of the suggestions of the Dominions Royal Commission have already been embodied, in whole or in part, in action which has already been taken by the British Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To what extent?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But here again you come to a time of flux. For the reconstruction period, you have, in those statistics and in that information, the best and the only large fundamental basis of information which will be so valuable for reconstruction purposes. Everything is brought up to the commencement of the war when things became confused, and since when statistics are not of very great

value so far as permanent and normal conditions are concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When the time comes to take action on the recommendations of that commission and on the very valuable information contained in that report, the only difficulty that the minister will have to contend with will be the traditional quarrel between the English free-trader and the new protectionist school in England. That is very apparent in the deliberations of the commission. However, my hon. friend probably gave the only reason why no action has been taken when he said that as long as the war lasts it is difficult to take any action at all. Still, I might tell him that some very active industrial interests are at present at work in order to promote the ideas which at the time of the deliberations of that commission were mooted in favour of inter-imperial protection. I see that an association recently started in Toronto, under the name of the Reconstruction Industrial Association, has issued a circular the names on which are the best evidence that it is a protective association, or, to put it more clearly, an association for the advancement of protectionist principles during the period following the war. This Association, of course, has been very active during the war because it is due to the activities of these same men that the tariff has been increased by seven and one-half per cent.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Come off.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not going to deliver a budget speech, but we are discussing trade and my hon. friend is evading the issue as much as possible. I am going to state that the Laurier Government had appointed in 1910 or 1911 to take part in the deliberations of that commission a man of the very highest qualifications, Mr. P. C. Larkin of Toronto, one of the most brilliant business men in the Dominion. Was it because Mr. Larkin entertained free trade ideas that his name was removed as soon as this Government came into office? He was replaced, I think, by my hon. friend himself.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, by a good free trader.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know my hon. friend started as a free trader in New Brunswick and became a protectionist later; in the same way, perhaps, that he started as a good Canadian and ended as a strong Imperialist. Is it not possible to have from the minister a clear enunciation of the policy of the Government, as to the conclusions of that commission's report?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend, unwittingly I am bound to believe, conveyed an impression which I should not like to see left permanently on the minds of the committee. That commission was appointed and did its work with the idea and under instructions that neither free trade nor protection should enter into its work, and that idea was absolutely carried out in all the investigations and work of that commission. There were men on it who held different views with regard to tariffs and trade, but they never obtruded their opinions in the work of the commission, nor were other people allowed to discuss the merits of these subjects when any investigations were being carried on and the information was being gathered; and I think any hon. gentleman who peruses that report will find abundant evidence to support my statement. I am not going to take up the time of the House in any disquisitions upon past or future trade policies. We shall come to that by-and-by. I know that some of our friends opposite are burning hot for such a discussion, but let them bottle up their enthusiasm and come back perhaps a year after the war is over, when we will interchange views with regard to the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has perhaps read what the chief organ of the Government in the city of Toronto, the Toronto Globe, published on Saturday with regard to that association.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend having supreme control of one organ of the Opposition, is running away with the idea that other sensible men have organs. The Government has no organ; each member of the Government is his own organ, and all the members of the Government together is the Government organ, and if my hon. friend will pay due attention to that organ and not fritter away his time on what he considers to be Government organs, he will get along better.

West India cable, $38,933.33.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this a subsidy?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is a subsidy payment under the agreement entered into by Great Britain, Canada and the West Indian Islands, each paying one-third, with the object of cheapening and improving telegraphic communication with the Islands.

To provide for the development and extension of Canadian trade $150,000

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask what is the difference between the extension of commercial relations, for which we have just voted $160,000, and the extension of Canadian trade, for which we are now asked to vote $150,000?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The first vote has to do entirely with the maintenance and operation of the trade commissions. Although there is an item in that vote for commercial treaties, it has never amounted to very much in the way of expense up to the present time. The service of the trade commissioners is what is sustained by that vote. The latter vote, for the extension and development of Canadian trade by other means than the sustentation of the service of the trade commissions has been taken for two or three years. There was expended under this vote in 1916-17, $46,685; and in 1917-18, up to February 28th of this year, $40,431.95.

The committee will see that the vote is much greater than the amount expended in preceding years. I desire to keep the vote there, because of the agencies which at present can be used along the line of expansion of trade and commerce, and particularly as we do not know at what moment the war will end and peace will come, I want to have a sufficient vote to give the department the money necessary to enter vigorously into such methods and means as may be considered best to extend our trade when once normal conditions begin to come back.

I want to give the committee an idea of how the money was spent last year. I have inaugurated what I consider is a very important adjunct towards the development of Canadian trade, and that is the advertising of Canada through film work. A little while ago I issued an invitation to the members of Parliament to view an exhibition of films to give an idea of the kind of work in this line which is being done by the department. Those who were fortunate enough to see that exhibition will bear testimony to its excellence. The idea is to utilize these films for the purpose of advertising Canada. Whether the war is on or not that advertising work goes on. The film business was never more extensive than at the present time. The idea is to have films prepared of the processes of production and of scenery, which is a very large adjunct to the development of this country, and such productive facilities as lend themselves best to presentation on films and which catch most definitely and grip most effectively the attention of the man who is looking at the film. Last year we spent on films about $18,000. These deal with the following subjects and I am going to ask the committee to follow what I have to say in this particular. We have secured first-class films of the water-powers of Canada; of the water-powers tributary to Vancouver, two reels, the screening time of which is thirty minutes; those tributary to Calgary, one reel, screening time fifteen minutes; those tributary to Winnipeg, two reels, screening time thirty minutes; those tributary to Montreal, two reels, screening time thirty minutes; the hydro-electric system in Ontario, three reels, screening time forty-five minutes, and reels which present on the screen the harvesting, inspection, transportation and embarkation of grain in Canada. It carries you from the fields in the Northwest to the port of embarkation, showing the operations on the farm, in transit, through the elevators, into the steamships, across the lakes, into port, and unloading at the port. These are very realistic reels, and they represent one of the greatest industries in Canada, bringing before the eye a realistic picture and making an indelible impression as to the greatness and richness of the grain producing area of Canada. As to the water-powers, these are the great source of our future activity in Canada. Coal may be exhausted; our water-powers will not exhaust. You burn a ton of coal and it is gone. You use a volume of water for the production of water-power and your volume continues; there is no diminution of it. All these resources are shown. As a matter of fact one of these films has been in England this year. Dr. McLennan, who is engaged under the British Government in the production of nitrates in the Old Country at the present time, has had one of these films, and he has shown it to the most representative audiences in Great Britain, accompanied by a lecture of explanation. The object of it is to impress upon capitalists a realization of the magnitude of the water-power facilities and resources of Canada. It is an inducement to capital to come to this country, and is an exhibition of the splendid facilities and water-powers that Canada possesses.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister is enumerating the water-powers of Canada and speaking of the advantage of advertising these water-powers. I absolutely agree as to the wisdom of advertising them, but in the enumeration of those water-powers which are being shown he started with the

West, came east, and then reverted to the hydro-electric system. What Montreal adjuncts did you refer to?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The powers tributary to Montreal.

Mr. BUREAU: What are they?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Those big powers that you have on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BUREAU: Those alone?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, we grouped them by cities, taking those tributary to Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg and Montreal.

Mr. BUREAU: If you desire to show the best water-powers in Canada, they are not shown.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The best water-powers are shown. We have made a selection of the best in Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: Where is the St. Maurice river?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We cannot show them all.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the best in Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have shown Shawinigan.

Mr. BUREAU: Then you have the St. Maurice.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then again, with a view to making the films interesting, we have introduced other features, and have prepared films for distribution throughout most of the countries in the world.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the name of the professor?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Dr. McLennan. He is a member of the Advisory Board of Scientific Research, has been lent to the British Government this year and is engaged over there with assistants from Toronto in a very important investigation.

Then we have arranged for what you might call the lighter, but still important, points in the representation of Canada. We have twenty-six copies of the "Banff National Park"; twenty-six copies of "The Great Natural Industries of Canada"; twenty-six of the Lake Louise region; twenty-six of the "Water-Powers of Western Canada," and I have given those already; twenty-six of "Through Canada from Coast to Coast" which affords the onlooker an idea of the journey from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast, showing the scenery, the big cities, the method of travel and so on. Others are "How Canada and the Farmers co-operate in the Great West" and "The Agricultural Opportunities of Western Canada." We have also been able to purchase of Mr. Byron Harmon, of Banff, six thousand feet of negatives. It is a fine negative of the finest bit of scenery that there is in Canada, and I think in the world, and we have bought it outright. Now what are we doing with those? We are circulating them through the theatres and film establishments of Canada, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, Great Britain, China and Japan to a certain extent, and there are some other countries where they would have been exhibited had it not been for operations being interfered with by the war. I want to read the first report that we have received with reference to those exhibitions. We have made a contract for the showing of them with a company, which company exhibits them through all the countries which I have mentioned.

The reports from our branch offices are beginning to come in week by week, showing the number of theatres in which your series appeared. We are very much pleased at the reception these films are getting by the theatre owners and bookings are very favourable. I am sure you will be pleased with them. The first nine weeks that Lake Louise was in service it appeared in 315 theatres. The first eight weeks that Banff was in service it appeared in 241 theatres. The first seven weeks that Natural Industries was in service it appeared in 227 theatres. The first six weeks that Western Water-Powers was in service it appeared in 199 theatres. The first five weeks that Coast to Coast was in service it appeared in 173 theatres. The first four weeks that Grain Raising was in service it appeared in 146 theatres. The first three weeks that Agriculture was in service it appeared in 94 theatres. The first two weeks that Eastern Water-Powers was in service it appeared in 60 theatres. When these are averaged up for the number of weeks that they have been in service, the averages will vary from thirty theatres to thirty-six and a half theatres per subject per week. This is not including the Dominion of Canada. We have not as yet received any reports from our Dominion offices. Of course it is entirely too early for reports from our England office and for the Australian reports considerable additional time is required. At the lowest possible estimate the first picture, Lake Louise, which has been in service for nine weeks, has been seen by 572,400 people. I think that three-quarters of a million would be more nearly correct but I would rather be a little more conservative.

There is every indication that these reports will continue favourable in the future. As soon as we get additional reports in any volume I will forward them to you.

I thought it well that the committee should know what is being done at a time

when the war keeps us from doing almost anything else. The people crowd to these places, they look and they see, and they hear lectures delivered, of either longer or shorter duration, and they get an impression in a wonderfully vivid and comprehensive way, and at a minimum cost, which remains with them, and will, I think, inure to the very great advantage of the Dominion in the future.

Mr. DECHENE: Is it the intention to have any films taken of water-powers that are unharnessed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We already have in our pictures unharnessed waters.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many years will be necessary to take observations of water-powers in order to give a reliable estimate of the horse-power available? For example, there may be a dry season when the observations are taken, and the following year the season may be such that the report would be altogether different.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That point is easily met. The waters are always there, and in your picture you have those waters —you cannot get away from that. There may be a little less water at one time than another, but the great volume of power is there. Then there is the legend which accompanies the film, and on that appears the statement in large letters of the extent of the water-power—the quantity which is being used, the development which is possible, and with regard to any unharnessed water-powers, the estimate, so far as one can possibly be made, of what those powers are capable of producing when harnessed. The difficulty that my hon. friend sees does not therefore exist.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My question had reference to the unharnessed water--powers. I do not think it would be safe to base your calculations on the volume of water one year, because the following year the season might be different in character, and in consequence the volume of water very much less.

Bureau of Industrial and Scientific Research: —Salaries and Expenses, including printing and stationery, and the collection and distribution of information and for studentships, fellowships, special problems and forestry studies, $120,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose the item has no reference to the hon. member for Three Rivers, who is a "Bureau" of industrial and scientific research every day?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That Bureau is unique.

Mr. BUREAU: The only thing on record in the House is that the member for Three Rivers was not a bureau of information, and that is on the authority of the late member for Dauphin, Mr. Glen Campbell.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If we had that "Bureau" in the Estimates I should think we would have to pay about $500,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Let the item be carried. I cannot do anything less after that. I was going to ask if the sum of $28,000 increase is in connection with sending young men on exploration for study every year? If so it is for a good purpose.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is for that purpose.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to know what these scholarships and fellowships are.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A report was laid on the table of the House the other day which contains a full exposition of all that has been done. That report deals with the fellowships and the work of the students.

Department of Immigration and Colonization: —Civil Government salaries, $123,117.50—Contingencies, $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN: When these Estimates were first brought before the Committee, it was found that they were incorrect as printed on page 18, and an amended page was printed and distributed to members through the Post Office. If any hon. gentleman has not this page, there are some typewritten sheets here for the convenience of members.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister explain the increase?

Mr. CALDER: There is an increase of $13,175—

Mr. McMASTER: I am sorry to have to tell the minister that we are unable to hear a single word he said.

Mr. CALDER: I was stating that there is an increase in the vote of $13,175. That increase is made up by an increase in the staff of two, the deputy minister and the minister's private secretary. These are the only increases in the staff. As was explained to the House previously, the officers in this department came over entirely from the Interior Department. These two extra officers receive a salary of $8,100. In addition to that, there are statutory increases of $4,625, and some small items amounting to about $400, which make up the total increase of $13,175.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Who is the deputy minister of the department?

Mr. CALDER: At the present time, Mr. Cory is acting as deputy minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A good man.

Mr. CALDER: He is the Deputy Minister of the Department of the Interior. When the Immigration Department undertakes the new work, which I hope it will some time in the not far distant future, I think it will be necessary then to have another deputy in charge. But until we work out the new policies that are to be brought into operation, I felt that it was just as well to let the department continue very much as it has in the past.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I suppose he is not drawing two salaries?

Mr. CALDER: No.

Salaries of Agents and Employees in Canada, Great Britain and Foreign Countries, $550,000.

Mr. EULER: I would like to ask the minister whether this vote includes the salary of immigration officials in the United States, for example, in the city of Philadelphia. I think there is a branch of the immigration service there. I would like to know what is the nature of the duties of such branches. For example, in Philadelphia, what does the man do in that particular branch?

Mr. CALDER: All of our agents, I understand, in the United States carry out very much the same work. We have agents located at something like eighteen points in the United States. The offices are established for the purpose of disseminating information with respect to the possibilities of Canada as a field of emigration. In addition to that, there are at all of our agencies a great many inquiries made with respect to many matters relating to Canada, and our officials are there for the purpose of furnishing persons seeking information with any information which it is possible for them to give. These offices are only established for the purpose of disseminating information regarding Canada.

Mr. EULER: It occurred to me that possibly at this time, when there is very little immigration, some of these offices might be discontinued. I am free to admit that it is quite possible that they may be doing effective work. But I would like to draw to the attention of the minister one instance at least, of an immigration officer who is, I think, rather exceeding his duties, that is the case of the officer at Philadelphia about whom I had a question on the order paper this morning, a man who took a most active and offensive part in the conduct of the elections, writing partisan articles in a paper of which he was formerly the editor. It seems to me that it would be the duty of the department to curb actions of that kind on the part of any official of the Government. I refer to Mr. Jaffray of Philadelphia.

Mr. CALDER: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I thoroughly agree with what the hon. member has said. It is only recently that that matter was brought to my attention. I think it is very unfortunate that any officer in the position which Mr. Jaffray occupies should undertake to write articles to the press of the nature complained of in this House, and I certainly disapprove of any such conduct on the part of any official of the department. I have the matter under consideration and am endeavouring to get the exact facts.

With reference to the general statement that there is no work being done in the United States at the present time in the way of securing immigrants for Canada, I can assure the hon. gentleman that that is not correct. As a matter of fact, someting like 75,000 people came to Canada from the United States last year, and that is a very large number. And there is a possibility from the outlook at the present time that we will have even a larger immigration from the United States this year. As a matter of fact, our agencies are quite busy and doing good work there. Our work in the Old Country and in Europe has, of course, practically ceased. I might also say that, as regards our work in the United States, it is my intention during the year to have all of our agencies thoroughly inspected with a view to seeing what economies can be effected. I feel we can effect a good many economies in that direction, just as we will be able to do in Canada itself. We have a very large staff. A good many duties have been added to the immigration staff in Canada during the course of the last two years. Nevertheless I feel that if the matter is carefully inquired into we can utilize the staff as a whole on a much more efficient basis, and effect a good many economies. In so far as our agencies in the United States are concerned they will all be very carefully reviewed during the present season.

Mr. McMASTER: May I ask the minister whether any statistics are kept in his department which would enable him to advise the committee as to the number of immigrants which originate in the territory served by the different offices, and the

cost of operating the offices from which the immigrants in question originate? If such statistics could be kept it would be of great assistance to the House in deciding whether these very considerable sums of money are really justified. Take the case of this Philadelphian agent, who writes offensive partisan articles for a paper in western Ontario; it would be interesting to know what his salary was and how many Philadelphians through his eloquence and persuasive powers were induced to come to Canada. And that principle, if followed in all the offices, would enable the minister to advise the House, and enable the House to judge, as to whether the country was really getting value for this money.

Mr. CALDER: I hardly think that these offices as at present constituted would be able to furnish that information. However, I shall take my hon. friend's suggestion into consideration.

Mr. McMASTER: We should have some check on these immigrants with a view to finding out where they come from. For instance, if we spent $10,000 on an agency in Pennsylvania and for three or four years no immigrants come to Canada from that state, the office in that state would not be worth the amount expended.

Mr. EULER: The suggestion that offices of that kind might be dispensed with arose from the fact that the gentleman spoken of, an official of the department, apparently does not devote all his time to promoting immigration and colonization for Canada. I am glad to know that the minister intends to look into this matter.

Mr. MURPHY: When was Mr. Jaffray appointed in Philadelphia?

Mr. CALDER: Within the last two or three years, I think.

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, $550,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: How much of that is spent in Europe?

Mr. CALDER: I have not that information before me, but if the hon. gentleman is anxious to have it I will bring it down.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In a general way, what are these contingencies?

Mr. CALDER: The large items include: advertising, $240,000; printing, $45,000; expenses of our agencies in the United States, $100,000; expenses of our agencies in Great Britain, $50,000; location of settlers, $25,000; boundary expenses, $35,000; deportation expenses, $10,000, a total of $505,000. The balance is made up by a great variety of small items.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this advertising in Canadian newspapers?

Mr. CALDER: In the papers of United States, Great Britain and, to some extent, Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We are getting no immigrants from Europe; why should we spend so much money on advertising in Great Britain?

Mr. CALDER: Only a small amount of advertising is done there at present. Two or three years ago the expenditure on immigration work was about $1,900,000. A reduction of $800,000 was effected and this year we are cutting the expenditure down by a further $100,000. If we wish to undertake immigration work in Great Britain after the war it is necessary that we maintain our organization there, and that a limited amount of advertising be done in order to keep Canada's possibilities before the people of that country. During the present year I hope to be able to go to England with a view to finding out what the actual conditions are. I am advised New Zealand, Australia and the other dominions are carrying on a very active propaganda, and we may have to spend more money if we wish to secure the results after the war that every person in the country is looking for.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What staffs have you in Great Britain and in foreign countries?

Mr. CALDER: We have twelve offices in the British Islands. The total staff numbers about sixty, thirty-five of whom are in London. Most of these offices were opened many years ago. The staffs of all the offices have been cut down to a minimum. Our offices in United Kingdom—this applies particularly to the office in London—have been exceedingly busy during the last two years.

One can understand that, with the large number of Canadians overseas, there are a great many who frequent those offices The officers have charge of all the booking arrangements for those, apart from soldiers, who are coming to Canada, and at times they have been exceedingly busy and have had to add to their staffs in order to cope with the work which they are undertaking. As an illustration, I might mention a case that occurred not long ago. The British Admiralty sent word to the commissioner that they had a boat available for two or

three thousand Canadians who might be anxious to return to Canada. Word had to be sent to all those people by wire. A very few hours after he had notified them the boat was cancelled, and he had to notify all those people that they could not get away. Later on another wire was received saying that another boat was ready, and that boat was also cancelled. That sort of thing is going on all the time, and as a result all our officers are kept exceedingly busy during these trying times.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I ask the minister if, in addition to endeavouring to secure immigration from the British Isles, the United States and some other countries, he will endeavour to bring Belgians to Canada? Only yesterday I received, from a gentleman at present in France, a letter stating that many of the Belgian refugees in France contemplated taking up land in Canada if land were available. I need not tell my hon. friend that the Belgian is a very desirable settler, not only for the prairies but as a market gardener. Wherever you find a Belgian around a city, you will find a splendid garden and a hard-working man, intelligently cultivating the land and supplying the market with garden produce. We have an opportunity of inducing many of those refugees, both in France and in England, to come to Canada, and I would advise the minister to look after that Belgian immigration. We know that Belgium is small in area and can hardly maintain the large population which it had before the war, and with all the patriotism that honours the Belgians, it is to be expected that thousands of them will prefer to come to the United States or to Canada to returning to their own country. I would advise my hon. friend to appoint a special agent to interview those people in England and France in order to capture our share of that most desirable class of immigration.

Mr. CALDER: The matter to which my hon. friend alludes will receive attention.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Administration of Chinese Immigration—salaries, $24,000, contingencies, $5,000.

Mr. BUREAU: I should like to know where the men are located for whom we are voting $24,000, and what their duties are.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. CALDER: The officials are located at Victoria, Vancouver, Union Bay, Powell River, and Chemainus, in British Columbia, and at Montreal in the province of Quebec. The total number of officials employed is twenty, and their duties are in connection with Chinese immigrants entering or attempting to enter Canada. It is their duty to see that the regulations and restrictions on Chinese immigration are complied with. There are seven officials in Victoria and eleven in Vancouver, including clerks and stenographers.

Mr. BUREAU: After what happened last year does the minister expect there will be a greater Chinese immigration this year than last? Is a patrol maintained on the border to prevent the smuggling into Canada of Chinese, and what officials are guarding against this smuggling? I understand there is an organization of detectives or other employees engaged in this work.

Mr. CALDER: We have about 200 or 250 inspectors along the boundary, and it is their duty to prevent any person, whether Chinese or not, entering Canada who is not entitled to come in under the law. Speaking offhand, I think last year there were about 16,000 rejections of intending immigrants to Canada, who were not permitted to come in under the law. I would imagine that all our boundary inspectors have been instructed to see that no Chinese come in who are not entitled to do so.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was told by an official of the department that after a certain date Chinamen were not allowed to enter this country. Are they still coming in?

Mr. CALDER: Yes. Some five hundred or so came in last year.

Mr. ROBB: Referring to the item of general immigration expenses, is it still the policy of the department to distribute among the schools of foreign countries, more particularly of Great Britain, the atlas that has been sent out a number of years showing the size and resources of the different provinces of Canada? I am told it was a very useful method of advertising our country.

Mr. CALDER: The policy is still being carried out in Great Britain, and to a lesser extent in the United States. After the war broke out we cut down our expenses in Great Britain, and as a result the distribution has not been as large as in former years. I intend during the present year to review carefully the whole question of the preparation and distribution of literature not only in Great Britain but in the United

States as well. We have spent large sums of money in that direction, and I think every effort should be made to get as much value as we can from this class of expenditure.

Supplementary estimates 1917-18—Department of Immigration and Colonization—to provide for the salary of the Private Secretary from October 12, 1917, at the rate of $2,500 per annum, $1,176.06.

Mr. BUREAU: Will this private secretary be appointed under the new Civil Service Act? Under the old Act one who was already in the Civil Service could act as private secretary to the minister and be paid an additional salary not exceeding the sum of $600 per year. I see this man is to get $2,500. Will he follow the fate of the minister or be kept in the service when the minister goes out?

Mr. CALDER: His salary is included in the main estimates. He is in subdivision B of the first division.

Mr. BUREAU: Item No. 326 in the Supplementary Estimates is to provide for the private secretary at $2,500?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The secretary for whom we are voting this salary now has no other official position in the department? This is to provide for the secretary of the minister?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Civil Government—Privy Council Office—salaries, $44,900, contingencies, $10,000.

Mr. BUREAU: I see.

1st division, sub-division A: Assistant clerk of Privy Council at $4,000.

Who is the Assistant Clerk of the Privy Council and when was he appointed?

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Bennetts, who has been in the Privy Council office for over thirty years, and is one of the oldest officials in the office.

Mr. BUREAU: When was he appointed?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know, but he was appointed long before I became President of the Privy Council.

Mr. BUREAU: There is the assistant clerk at $4,000, and another at $3,925. To whom does the latter item refer?

Mr. ROWELL: That refers to one of the clerks in the department, Mr. Mackenzie, who has been there for a great many years.

Mr. BUREAU: Then I see:

2nd division, sub-division A: one at $2,100; one at $1,850; one at $1.625.

I would like to know who these clerks are. Are they old clerks who are being increased, or are they new appointments? Take, for instance, four at $2,600 in the First Division subdivision B.

Mr. ROWELL: These four are old clerks in the department, and it is proposed to advance one, Mr. Belanger, a translator, from 2A to 1B.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that translator at $2,100?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: And the other clerks are at $2,600?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the particular work that the gentlemen at $2,600 have to do that makes their salary larger than that of the translator, who is a technical man and requires special and greater knowledge than an ordinary clerk, in that he must know two languages to be able to be a translator?

Mr. ROWELL: The only reason I can give is that these clerks have been there a great many years, and have been advanced by the usual statutory increases until their salaries have reached this figure. The translator has been in 2A and because of the large amount of work he is called upon to do and the excellence of his work, I am advancing him from 2A to 1B. In the second division, subdivision 2, there is one clerk on the list at $1,150. That is an error. There are just four altogether and the details should only be given as to four.

Mr. BUREAU: Taking the second division, subdivision B, I find two at $1,300, one at $1,225, one at $1,175, one at $1,150, one at $1,100. Are there any new appointments among these?

Mr. ROWELL: There are no new appointments except one of the messengers. When we come to the Supplementary Estimates there will be another item in the first division of subdivision B, to provide for the salary of my private secretary, which was omitted by mistake in the Main Estimates.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the salary?

Mr. ROWELL: It is $2,800.

Mr. COPP: I would like to understand what is proposed in regard to that. I see

in the Main Estimates, under Civil Government, an item:

Allowance for private secretary, $600.

I see a similar item in the estimates of all the other departments. Why is there a salary and an allowance provided? Why is it not all put under the heading of salary instead of having one vote under the head of salary and another under the head of allowance?

Mr. ROWELL: That appears to have been the custom for many years in all the departments of the Government, and it has been done here the same as in other departments.

Mr. COPP: We have a new man now at the head of this department, and we might very well change the old order of things and not continue to put in two items, one for salary and one for allowance. Why do you not put the item in at $3,400, so that we will know what the private secretary is really getting? When you find one item here for one amount and another item some place else for another amount it looks as if you were trying to smuggle it through. Why not put it all in one sum, so that everybody will understand what the private secretaries of the ministers are getting?

Mr. McMASTER: I would say that this is an excellent time to change the order which has hitherto obtained. I see that the minister bows his head; but as he was for some time associated with the reform party in Ontario I imagine he might make this reform in his department with propriety.

Mr. ROWELL: I will take it into consideration between now and next session.

Mr. BUREAU: I suppose I may be allowed without being called to order, to refer to the provision made in the estimates for the minister's private secretary. In the supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1919, a sum of $361 appears and in the main estimates there is another sum for this gentleman. Now I ask the minister if his private secretary is a new appointment?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, a new appointment.

Mr. BUREAU: What position has he in the Privy Council Department?

Mr. ROWELL: He is my private secretary.

Mr. BUREAU: In the law that we have just passed we have laid it down that a private secretary shall occupy that position only. But the minister is establishing a new rule according to the statement that he makes. This gentleman not only acts as private secretary but holds another official position in the department.

Mr. ROWELL: He is not performing any other duties. He is a clerk in the department; the same as any other officer, and draws the salary fixed in the Estimates the same as the private secretaries of all the other ministers.

Mr E. LAPOINTE: Then he does not come under the new rule laid down in the Bill which has just been passed?

Mr. ROWELL: He comes under the law as it stood at the time of his appointment.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask what particular duties he is performing under the law as it stands now, because after all the Civil Service Bill has not yet been assented to and has not yet the force of law. He must be holding some position beyond that of private secretary, because he is described as a clerk in the first division subdivision B. Such being the case, may I ask, what work does he perform?

Mr. ROWELL: He performs work as my private secretary.

Mr. BUREAU: The practice hitherto has been that when a private secretary has been taken on he received an official position in the department. When the minister for whom he acted went out the private secretary reverted to that position and dropped the secretarial salary of $600 allowed to him. In this case I see that the private secretary is also a clerk in the First Division, Subdivision B although there is no work for him in the department. He was apparently appointed as private secretary to the minister and has nothing else to do; his services were not required until the minister entered the Cabinet and then only as private secretary. There is also a vote in the Estimates of $600 which brings this gentleman's salary up to $3,400. I cannot understand how that can be. If we were under the new regime as far as the appointment of private secretary is concerned I would say well and good, but the fact of putting an additional man in a certain grade, who is only required to act as private secretary to the minister, with the privilege of occupying the same clerkship after the minister retires or ceases to enjoy a seat in the Cabinet, when no need exists for such clerkship is not right and ought not to be entertained. I can quite understand under the old law appointing a man when a vacancy occurred to which he could

revert when the minister withdrew from the Cabinet, but I cannot understand creating a position for one for whose services there is no need except as private secretary.

Mr. ROWELL: Let me say to my hon. friend that my private secretary takes the place of the Prime Minister's secretary who was in the Privy Council previously but who now goes to another department.

Mr. BUREAU: Where does he go?

Mr. ROWELL: The Prime Minister's secretary goes to the Department of State for External Affairs.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I understand the private secretary was appointed by Order in Council?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The minister says that this gentleman is to act as private secretary. I suppose we may assume that his duties are in connection with the business of the department?

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: He is paid a salary to act as private secretary to the minister but in connection with that hon. gentleman's public business?

Mr. ROWELL: Wholly in connection with his public business.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: So it would not be part of the gentleman's work to write political literature for the Toronto Globe and other newspapers, as rumour has it he does.

Mr. ROWELL: That is no part of his duties.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: And he is not paid a salary for that purpose?

Mr. ROWELL: Nothing whatever.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I must admit that I have read very well-written articles in the Globe under the signature of "Donald Hunt" and I was told that Donald Hunt was in reality the private secretary of my hon. friend. I do not know whether the report is true, perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us as to that. I may add that the articles are very eulogistic of the hon. minister; he would blush if I were to read them to the committee to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. BUREAU: No, we want an explanation from the minister. A question has been asked whether the private secretary to the minister is the man who writes under the pseudonym of "Donald Hunt."

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot furnish any information as to what my private secretary does out of office hours. He is responsible to me for the work he does in office hours. They are very lengthy hours and he serves very faithfully during that time. I make no inquiry as to his work outside of those hours.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a very nice way of shifting the question and I have been told that the hon. gentleman was rather shifty when he was cornered. The question is a very plain one: is "Donald Hunt" the man who is now secretary to the President of the Privy Council? That is a direct question, but I must put the question directly because I see the witness does not want to answer very readily. The committee will pardon me if the question is rather suggestive in its form.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BUREAU: No it is not carried.

Mr. ROWELL: I can answer my hon. friend that I am not considering, nor is my department, who are the correspondents of papers throughout the country, or who the writers for those papers are and the names under which they write, I do not think it is pertinent to the particular matter under consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: I think the question is pertinent and that the hon. minister is not answering it. I think we are entitled to more courtesy than the minister has vouchsafed. The question is plain and direct enough and we ought to know, when we are paying the minister's private secretary $3,400 whether he is the man who writes in the Globe or any other newspaper. The minister can answer: "I do not know whether he is the same man or not." I do not ask the hon. gentleman if he is concerned in the matter, but I ask him if his private secretary is the same man. If so, I think we have something to say about it no matter whether this gentleman writes outside of his office hours or during his office hours. I think if there is solidarity amongst the members of the Government, there is also solidarity between the minister and his private secretary. The private secretary is so close to the minister that he knows exactly what is going on. The private secretary is inspired by the minister and anything that goes out

to the press, when it is known that it is written by the secretary of the minister must have its weight and effect. When we ask the hon. President of the Privy Council whether "Donald Hunt" is the name under which his private secretary writes, I think it is not treating the committee as he ought to treat it for him to reply that he is not concerned in what the gentleman does outside of his office hours. The private secretary may do this work during his office hours and the hon. gentleman may not know it. He may be doing this writing while the hon. gentleman is sitting here performing his parliamentary duties, and I would not blame him for not knowing it. But if the private secretary and "Donald Hunt" are one and the same person we may have suggestions to make, so that the public will be satisfied that what goes out from "Donald Hunt" is the inspiration of a gentleman called in private life "Mr. Rowell" and who is called in this House "President of the Privy Council." We are voting money to this private secretary, and if that gentleman has a double mandate or a double position in the Government we want to know it. If he is writing articles in newspapers favouring a party or a man we are entitled to know it. And we want to know also whether or not he writes during office hours, and if it is during office hours the point is debatable whether or not he who gets the benefit of it, or the party that gets the benefit of it, should not bear part of the burden and unburden the country with so much of it as should be paid by the parties in whose special service this man employs so many hours a day. Either the minister knows or does not know, and we are entitled to an answer, yes or no.

Mr. ROWELL: Let me say first in reply to my hon. friend that I have never, directly or indirectly, inspired any article that has appeared under the name of "Donald Hunt" or any other, with reference to the work of my department or any branch of work. I have not the least objection, if the Chairman thinks that the matter is relevant to the item under consideration, to answer my hon. friend's question. I can say this: so far as my secretary is concerned, never to my knowledge has he written any articles during office hours, and I know he keeps very long office hours, often until midnight, in connection with the work of my department, the public work of the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: It is the right of any member of this House to ask questions of a minister putting through his Estimates. And as to the relevancy, when you ask us to vote $600 for a private secretary we are entitled to know, when we have any suspicion about the matter, the nature of the work that private secretary is doing. Whether or not the minister has inspired articles I do not care. Whether or not he knows about the articles being written, is not the question now. It may come later. We have asked the minister if the man who wrote in the Toronto Globe under the name of "Donald Hunt" was his secretary or not. The answer is very plain, because the question is very direct. The answer may be "yes" or "no," or "I ignore." Any of those three terms will give us satisfaction. And if the minister does not see fit to give the answer, we shall try to find some way to get it.

Mr. ROWELL: If the Chairman thinks it is a proper question, I shall be very glad to answer it.

Mr. BUREAU: What is that?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister has asked for my ruling. It is this: In voting a salary to a Government official, any member of the House certainly has a right to ascertain what are the duties performed by that Government official. On the other hand, I do think that every hon. member of the House should accept the answer given by the minister. I understood the minister to say that he did not know what the secretary did outside of office hours, but that he had not written these articles during office hours. That answer should be considered satisfactory.

Mr. BUREAU: Do you hold that when a member puts a question he is entitled to an answer?

The CHAIRMAN: He is entitled to such answer as any member of the Government may give.

Mr. BUREAU: Therefore, a member of the Opposition must stand here and be at the mercy or whim or caprice of the gentlemen who sit on the other side and have the administration in hand. Now, I have asked the President of the Council—I will change my question. I have asked him if he knows whether this man who writes under the name of "Donald Hunt" is the same man who is the private secretary to the hon. minister. I will ask him what is the real name of his private secretary.

Mr. ROWELL: My private secretary's name is Mr. Main Johnson.

Mr. BUREAU: Main Johnson. Has Mr. Main Johnson written in the Globe, to the knowledge of the hon. gentleman?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. BUREAU: Why "Order"? I am putting a new question. The Chairman has ruled that I am entitled to an answer when I put a question. Does the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Main Johnson writes in the Globe under the name of "Donald Hunt"? If he knows it, or if he does not know it, why not say so?

Mr. ROWELL: I understood from the Chairman's ruling that my answer already covered the question.

Mr. BUREAU: This is a new question.

Mr. ROWELL: Then I should say that it is a question for the Chairman to rule whether or not it is pertinent to these matters. It is for the Chairman to say.

Mr. McMASTER: I think that the question proposed by the hon. member for Three Rivers is a proper question, and I would suggest this: Suppose the gentleman in question, instead of writing from time to time, was turning out a series of popular novels, would it not be pertinent for this House to inquire whether it was compatible with the duty of the private secretary of a cabinet minister to spend his time also in literary effort? I think that would be a proper question. The difference between the question asked by the hon. member for Three Rivers and the hypothetical question put by me is merely a question of degree. And I would humbly submit that we would like the President of the Council, if his secretary, Mr. Main Johnson, is also this Mr. Donald Hunt, to state so frankly, and then it will be for us, if we think that there is any public interest prejudicially affected by the literary activities of Mr. Donald Hunt or Mr. Johnson to ask any other question. But before we proceed along this line it does appear to me that we are entitled to have a frank answer from the minister as to whether this literary character, "Donald Hunt," is the same gentleman who is in private life his most amiable secretary, Mr. Main Johnson.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. gentleman wish to say anything on the point of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS: What is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: I have been asked whether the question just put by the hon. member for Trois Rivières (Mr. Bureau) is a proper question. I have heard the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Is there any other hon. gentleman desiring to say anything on the point of order?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I submit that it is none of the hon. minister's business what his private secretary does when he is not employed by the Government. He has the same right to employ his leisure time in the way he chooses, as the private secretary of either the member for Brome or the member for Three Rivers would have. Because the private secretary of the President of the Council is employed by the Government is no reason why he is to become a serf, and must spend his leisure time in the way some member may dictate.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for East Algoma has just said that the secretary of the President of the Council is no more responsible to this House than the private secretary to the hon. member for Brome. That cannot be taken seriously, and it is not correct. A private servant is not in any way whatsoever responsible to this House, and that would be the position of the private secretary of the hon. member for Brome. The private secretary of the President of the Council is not only the servant of that minister, but he is the servant of this House and of the Canadian people. The Canadian people are paying him. The minister himself is a public servant, and those who wait upon him in connection with the duties of his office are public servants. It is the right of every man in Canada who helps to pay the salary of a public servant to know everything about him, what he does, what he publishes. If he publishes something that we consider to be prejudicial to the interests of Canada, we have a right to know about it and to bring him to account for it. The head of any department should not stand as a shield between any officer of the department and the public. The President of the Council must answer all questions put to him with regard to his own office; he must also answer on behalf of any public servants in his employ. In a word, we have a right to know everything about the services of any man who is in the service of the country.

Mr. SHEARD: It appears to me that the situation is this: the gentleman in question is employed as secretary to the President of the Council, to do certain work at certain hours and to the satisfaction of the minister. For that he is paid a salary out

of the public funds and for that he is accountable to the President of the Council as a minister of the Crown, and to this House. We are at liberty to question his actions in his office as much as we desire, but we do not own him body and soul. Gentlemen opposite are trying to make a little political capital by asserting that some officials in the public service occasionally contribute to the public press, and that this gentleman is one. I am not familiar with his articles or with the trend of his writing, but I say this: as a broad principle, if we are to have first-class men in the public service, we as members of Parliament must not act as Paul Prys in connection with the private lives of such gentlemen. We have to extend to them broad liberties. We have to permit them to express their opinions in the public press in a free and unbiased manner. Unless we can show that they have used facts with which they have become familiar in the discharge of their public service, we have no right whatever to raise a question as to what they do after office hours, what they write, for whom they write, how they write, or to what journals they contribute. I agree with the view expressed by the member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson) that it is simply not our business. It is not the business of this House to inquire into the private actions, even in connection with newspapers, of public servants. It is beneath the dignity of this House to make these investigations with the view, apparently, to attacking the President of the Council in respect of some newspaper clippings that hon. gentlemen have secured from the Toronto Globe or some other source. Let us get on with the business of the House and not waste time with the discussion of these trivialities.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard). The party that he follows took a very different view only a few years ago regarding the duties of public officials. Some 25,000 men were dismissed in Canada for partisanship—turned out of office simply because they said two or three words in favour of the Liberal party.

Mr. SHEARD: Are the articles complained of partisan articles? Is this a case of partisanship? So far as I know, that has not been shown.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend said that it made no difference what a public official did after hours; that he could do as he pleased. That is a new doctrine on the other side of the House.

Mr. BUTTS: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has the floor and is entitled to retain it unless he himself gives the member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Butts) permission to interrupt him by putting a question.

Mr. BUTTS: Will the member for Antigonish allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Certainly.

Mr. BUTTS: These 25,000 officials were dismissed by Blomfield Douglas under the Laurier Government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member must not take advantage of the rules by rising to ask a question and then making a statement.

Mr. BUTTS: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I was pointing out to my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard) that the doctrine that he expounded has not been accepted by the party which he now supports. On the contrary, they accept a very different doctrine; that a public official must not take part in politics; that he must not be a partisan, and that if he breaks that rule he is subject to dismissal. If that applies to ordinary officials of the Government, why should it not apply to a private secretary? If a private secretary chooses to write political articles after hours and to take a partisan position concerning any political matter, it is open to members of the House to question his right to do so. Gentlemen on the other side must agree with this—or else the Government have entirely changed their views with regard to the matter. I repeat that that doctrine has been laid down by the Government; that it has been held by them; that some have suffered under it. Has this doctrine now been abolished? Has a public official now no responsibility except during office hours? If the President of the Council says that an official of the Government has the right, after office hours, to engage in any partisan activity that he wishes to engage in, of course that is a different matter; but that is not the view that has been held hitherto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Years ago it was discovered that the managing editor of the Toronto Globe was receiving half his pay—

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion is now confined to the point of order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was going to draw a parallel between this case and that one. It was regarded as all right then for the—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that would be quite in order. The hon. member may discuss the question after the point of order has been decided. The President of the Council was asked by the member for Trois Rivières if his private secretary had written certain articles in the Toronto Globe under a certain "nom de plume." The hon. minister replied that no articles had been written during office hours. The question was repeated covering generally the entire time of the said private secretary, both during and after office hours. The President of the Council required a ruling concerning the propriety of the question. I invited hon. members on both sides for their opinions and advice upon the point of order, and they have given very much assistance to the Chair.

The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) who is leading the Opposition, gave it as his opinion that it was the right of any member of this House to probe the conduct of any official both in office hours and outside of office hours if that official did or published anything prejudicial to the interests of Canada. I took down the words at the time. The hon. gentleman went on to say that in that event it would be perfectly competent for the House to know exactly where and when such articles were written. The question of political partisanship was also introduced in the point of order. My opinion is that the conduct of any employee of the Government, in so far as his conduct outside of office hours is concerned, cannot be inquired into by a member of this House, unless, to use the words of the hon. member for Cape Breton, that employee is alleged to have done or published something prejudicial to the public interest. If that be the case, it is competent for the House to get all the details. I, therefore, rule that if the articles complained of are prejudicial to the public interest, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is in order. If the articles are prejudicial to the public interest the hon. member for Three Rivers should read the articles, and then ask the minister if they were written by his private secretary. Otherwise, all remarks and questions concerning the conduct of a servant of the State must be restricted to his official conduct.

Mr. BUREAU: I bow, Sir, to your ruling, and I shall not take exception to it because I do not intend to appeal. But I have another question to ask the minister. Perhaps this will throw some light on the situation. I see on page 12 of the Estimates, under second division, subdivision B, a total amount of $3,125 for 1917-18, and for 1918-19, $6,100, or almost double. Will the minister please explain the reason for that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: You told me, Sir, I might ask my question after the point of order was settled. Might I ask this question? Your decision practically resolves itself into this, that the Parliament of Canada may pay part of the salary of writers for the Toronto Globe. A number of years ago it was proved before the people of Canada that the editor in chief of the Toronto Globe was receiving one-half of his salary from the Peace Society of the United States which was found afterwards to be supported from German sources, and the other half from the Toronto Globe. I do not know whether it is now the custom of the Toronto Globe to have part of the salaries of its writers paid by the Government, as were formerly paid by the pro-German United States peace societies, but whatever the facts are, we should know them.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member for Three Rivers asked about the item being $6,100 this year as compared with $3,125 last year. The difference is this. There were two clerks in the Third Division, Subdivision A, last year, and the hon. member will notice there are none this year. The change means that those two clerks have been transferred to the other division. The clerks transferred are Mr. Miller and Mr. Olivier, who have been in the department for a very long time, and it is proposed that they be transferred from the Third to the Second Division.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: On page 595 of the unrevised Hansard appears the following question which I put to the minister:

Is Mr. Main Johnson employed in the Privy Council office or in some other Government department?

The answer was:

Yes. In the Privy Council as Private Secretary to the President of the Privy Council.

My second question was:

If so, was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission after competitive examination?

The answer was:

Is a graduate of University of Toronto and his appointment was made in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

There was laid on the table of the House to-day a copy of an Order in Council reading thus:

21st December, 1917.

The Board recommend that under the provisions of the War Measures Act, 1914, Mr. Main Johnson be employed as a temporary clerk in the Privy Council Office as Private Secretary to the Hon. the President of the Privy Council for a period of one year from the 12th of October, 1917, with salary at the rate of $2,800 per annum, chargeable to the War Appropriation.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: God save the King.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: There was another Order in Council:

The Board recommend that Mr. Main Johnson, private secretary to the Honourable the President of the Privy Council be, from the 12th of October, 1917, paid an additional allowance of $600 per annum for his services as such private secretary.

I would like to be enlightened on the subject, as the statement of the President of the Privy Council appears contradictory to the Order in Council which I have just read.

Mr. ROWELL: The Order in Council which my hon. friend has just read is the order under which Mr. Johnson was appointed as my private secretary, but the Civil Service Act to which my hon. friend has referred makes provision for such appointment. My hon. friend will 9 p.m. have in the answer to his question the reference to the section in the Civil Service Act. The form of the order is prepared by the Clerk of the Privy Council (Mr. Boudreau), who has charge of such matters, and it has been put through in the form he suggested.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will my hon. friend explain by what process of logic or reasoning he can join together the War Measures Act and the appointment of his private secretary?

Mr. ROWELL: I suppose the same reasoning as applies to the private secretaries of the other new members of the Union Government would apply to mine. The formation of the Union Government was a war measure, and in the necessary provision for the organization of the Union Government, and for the appointment of the secretaries it was proper to use the powers given by the War Measures Act.

[Mr. Archambault.]

Mr. McMASTER: I understood your ruling, Sir, to be that if it were shown that the articles written by "Donald Hunt," who, I presume, is admitted to be the same gentleman as Mr. Main Johnson, were prejudicial to the public interest, they would be a proper subject of inquiry by this committee. A similar matter has already come up in the British House of Commons. A member of that House, Mr. J. W. Pratt, had occupied a subordinate position—

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member wishes to discuss the ruling given by the Chair he is not in order. He can only appeal from the ruling; he cannot discuss it.

Mr. McMASTER: I am not appealing from the ruling of the Chair; I am not discussing it; I am conforming with the ruling of the Chair. I wish to show that by British precedent, which should always be listened to in this House, articles such as this young gentleman has written are regarded in the Mother of Parliaments as prejudicial to the public interest, and this is the instance I wish to put before the committee. A certain Mr. J. W. Pratt was a member of the British House of Commons. He was also a Liberal Whip. He was a henchman and a strong party follower of Mr. Lloyd George, and he occupied part of his time in writing to the Liberal papers of Scotland letters in which Mr. Asquith was decried and Mr. Lloyd George was greatly eulogized. The matter came before the British House, where it was decided that it was an improper thing for a member of Parliament to write such letters. Now if it was an improper thing for a member of Parliament to write such letters it is a fortiori and in a greater degree, a more improper thing for the private secretary of a minister to write letters to the papers eulogizing that minister. I say that is a proper subject for inquiry by this Committee under the ruling which you, Mr. Chairman, have just given.

Mr. BUREAU: We are entitled to know what this gentleman does during his office hours anyway. I see by the Order in Council that this man is paid out of the War Fund, and I ask what special duties he performs for the President of the Council which have special reference to the war, outside, of course, of the great help the presence of the hon. gentleman, as President of the Privy Council, gives to the cause of winning the war by scaring the Kaiser. Is he paid out of the War Appropriation Fund for writing these articles, and will he cease writing them or did he cease writing them on the 1st of April, the date

on which the money we are asked to vote begins to apply? From that date will his war functions cease, and he become just a civil servant as private secretary to the President of the Council? We voted $500,000,000 for the War Appropriation Fund, out of which this man's salary was taken, and we are entitled to know just what special work he has performed in connection with the war, and how long he has performed it.

Mr. ROWELL: The salary paid to my secretary up to the first of April of the present year will be paid out of last year's War Appropriation, the payment being under the War Measures Act. The salary which will be paid during the coming year will be paid under this vote, the same as the salary of any other civil servant occupying a corresponding position.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not answer my question. If he was paid out of the War Appropriation he must have been performing some duties in connection with the war. The minister surely is not going to lay down the principle that anything at all can be charged up to the War Appropriation Fund, whether it has reference to the war or not. I do not think that is a proper principle; there are grave objections to it. I repeat my question: What special duties was he performing in connection with the war, to be paid out of the War Appropriation Fund?

Mr. ROWELL: Up to April 1 of the present year he was performing the regular duties of private secretary to the President of the Privy Council. The matters dealt with by him are largely incidental to and out of the war. The bulk of my correspondence deals with war matters, but I frankly say that my secretary should now be paid out of the regular appropriation of this House and that is the reason his name appears in the estimates. He is in exactly the same position as the other private secretaries who, following the formation of the Union Government, were paid out of the war appropriation, as that was the only fund available and it was the proper fund at the time the Union Government was formed.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Some time ago the President of the Privy Council notified the House that he was sending out some weekly bulletins to assist clergymen in their afternoon sermons in the rural districts. Probably this young gentleman is engaged in furnishing that data.

Mr. ROWELL: No, my private secretary is kept busy with the work of the office, and has not time to aid in the work that interests my hon. friend so much.

Mr. COPP: I had always understood that when the Estimates were under discussion the head of the department whose estimates were being considered took the opportunity to give full information to the House in regard to the work of his department. Apparently the President of the Privy Council takes the opposite course, and feels it his duty to withhold information from the House.

Mr. ROWELL: I think I must challenge that remark. On any matter connected with the Privy Council office on which my hon. friend desires information I shall be pleased to give it in the fullest possible way, and if any information is asked for that I have not here I shall be glad to get it.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend may be willing to give the fullest possible information, but certainly he has not done so. Instead of showing a willingness to give information, he has shown a willingness to withhold it.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is quite proper for the hon. member to impute motives to another hon. member.

Mr. COPP: I was stating the fact that he had not shown a willingness to give information. The minister has said that the Union Government was formed as a war measure, and that that accounted for the Order in Council under which his private secretary was appointed and paid his salary. If it was correct for the minister to pay his private secretary as a war measure up to 1st April, he has given no sufficient reason why he should not continue to pay him as a war measure. Is it right and proper for every member of the Government to pay his secretary and staff under the War Measures Act? If it was right then, it must be right now. Then why ask for this vote?

Mr. BUREAU: We are asked to vote $44,000, and for the first time in my experience in this House we are refused information by a minister of the Crown, who hedges himself around with the rules of the House and the protection of the chairman in order not to answer pertinent questions relating to his department. Since the beginning of the session the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) has been asked question after question, has been cross-

examined and re-examined, and has always answered willingly. He had nothing to hide, and not only answered all questions that were asked, but volunteered to give further information. He said he was there to show what his department had done, and he was quite willing and glad to do it. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), and every other minister has shown the same willingness. So why should the President of the Privy Council shroud himself in silence which our questions cannot penetrate? Is he ashamed of what is done in his department? Is he afraid to acknowledge the truth? Or what is the reason? This is the first time in eighteen years that I have seen the House get behind the minister, as my hon. friend from Toronto did, who says that this is a disgrace and that we ought to go on with something else. If there is any disgrace in this matter it is not upon our side, but it is that a minister of the Crown should hide behind the rules of the House to avoid answering a plain and courteous question. I say no minister of the Crown has a right to ask us to vote $44,000 and then dismiss our questions in a half-contemptuous manner by saying, "Oh, ask the chairman." If I ask questions about the minister's private secretary, it is because that official has been writing in the newspapers. The minister by his silence acquiesces in the statement that his private secretary was writing to the newspapers to boost him.

Are civil servants outside of office hours to be allowed to do anything they want to? We have, by his silent acquiescence, the admission of the minister that his private secretary, Main Johnson, is the Donald Hunt who is writing in the papers puffing my hon. friend. I am not willing to pass this item without registering my protest against such conduct.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to know from the President of the Privy Council what the salary of Mr. Main Johnson is? I see an item in the Main Estimates:

Allowance for private secretary, $600.

Surely that is not all the salary that Mr. Johnson receives? We would like to know what his salary is.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend had been in the House a little earlier he would have heard the answer that I gave. In the Supplementary Estimates there is a vote for the private secretary's salary, omitted from the Main Estimates by mistake, of

[Mr. Bureau.]

$2,800 and there is in the Main Estimates an allowance of $600, making $3,400 in all.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to know how this salary compares with the salaries of other private secretaries. Is it smaller or larger than the salaries of other secretaries?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know how it compares with the salaries of others but it is less than he was getting before he came here.

Mr. JACOBS: Every one has to sacrifice something during the war.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so.

Mr. JACOBS: Do I understand the minister to say that there are salaries larger than $3,400 per annum paid to the private secretaries of Cabinet ministers? In what departments do the private secretaries receive more than $3,400 per annum?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know but my impression was that the Prime Minister's secretary got more than that and that the private secretaries of some other ministers got the same. I have not inquired as to what other minister's secretaries are getting.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand this is the first year Mr. Johnson has been employed as private secretary to a Cabinet minister. Does the minister consider that he should receive such a large salary the first year of his employment?

Mr. ROWELL: His work fully justifies the salary he is getting and he got more before he came here. The salary he is getting now is less than he was getting before and I consider that in the public interest his work as secretary of the President of the Privy Council is worth the payment that he is getting.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not conversant with the details of this writing in the Globe, but any one who takes up the papers can see that there is a puffery bureau somewhere in connection with certain gentlemen in this Government. I do not mean to say that it is a puffery bureau only because you can see at a glance that it is a knocking bureau as well. I would like to know if these articles are censored by the minister before they go out and if only those are allowed to go out that are puffing up the President of the Privy Council and certain other favoured ministers and gentlemen, the Chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, for instance, and knocking certain other gentlemen.

Mr. ROWELL: I have never seen any such articles.

Mr. JACOBS: I am interested in the literary efforts of Mr. Main Johnson; in fact, we in the House all enjoy them and we should be the last people to complain of them. I always look forward to reading Mr. Johnson's prose—also his poetry. It has been the custom to give employment to literary men in the public departments of the Government. We know that in England Anthony Trollope, the great novelist, was employed in the Post Office Department. Edmund Yates was also in the public service in England. The late Archibald Lampman was employed in one of the departments here as a civil servant. William Wilfrid Campbell and a number of others similarly occupied positions in the public service. I might point out that the English gentlemen to whom I have referred were noted novelists and when we read their fiction we know that it was written with no ulterior purpose. Their works were merely imaginative, whereas the secretary of the minister, I understand, assumes to publish articles as if they were actually truthful, and that is the difference between the English novelist and this Canadian writer.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I do not object to giving a preference to literary men in the Civil Service, as my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) suggests, but I do not think the War Measures Act should be used in that way. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Johnson has been appointed as his private secretary. It is not only as private secretary, but he has been appointed to the Civil Service at a very large salary, and that under the War Measures Act, I believe that if the services of the gentleman were necessary to the minister for the winning of the war he ought to be paid under the War Appropriations vote and not placed over the heads of other good and faithful servants who have worked all their lives in the Privy Council office and who see this gentleman coming from Toronto and getting a large salary when their promotion is postponed because of his entry into the service. I do not think this is fair. There are many other things which have been done under the War Measures Act. My hon. friend says that Union Government is a product of the War Measures Act. Many other things are products of the War Measures Act. We all hope that peace will be restored. Then, these things will disappear, but because of the manner in which Mr. Johnson has been appointed to the Civil Service, while the war will be over, while there will be peace in the world, Mr. Main Johnson, although a product of the war, will still be retained in the Civil Service and will be paid a large salary when other faithful civil servants are not getting the promotion they deserve. Certainly I think this way of using the War Measures Act, using the legislation which this Parliament enacted to promote war work, is open to strong criticism. I believe Mr. Johnson should be paid under the War Appropriation Act and not under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. ROBB: Just after eight o'clock tonight a member of the Government came over to this side and suggested to us that we might get the business through fairly early and that certain resolutions would be put through so as to enable members of the Government, who wished to go, to absent themselves from the House. The President of the Privy Council has set an example of hurrying on the work by raising points of order. I would tell the minister in all frankness that he would make considerably more progress with his Estimates if he followed the example of those other members of the Government who have preceded him with their Estimates. I think the record shows that we on this side have not been unreasonable, but we are entitled to fair treatment and when a fair question is asked we are entitled to an answer.

The minister himself has acknowledged that part of his staff is paid from the War Appropriation Fund, and that raises another question. I understand that the publicity campaign throughout the country is under the charge of the President of the Privy Council. I would like to know in this connection how much money was paid for advertising the famous Order in Council, exempting farmers' sons from military service, just prior to the last general election. We are told that that Order was put through about 3rd December last and that, under the direction of the President of the Privy Council, a considerable sum of money, running from $7,000 to $10,000, was spent. And we would like to know the exact amount so spent. The minister himself has introduced this question, and if we cannot get satisfactory information we will probe it to the bottom if it takes all night.

Mr. ROWELL: Might I say to my hon. friend that I have not refused to give information on any matter connected with the administration of my department. I

shall be delighted to afford the committee the fullest possible information at my disposal in connection with the whole of the work of that department, and if I have not got it here I will try and obtain it. With reference to what my hon. friend mentions, the matter came up when the War Appropriation was before the House. I speak subject to correction, because matters arose while I was away during the election campaign, but my recollection is that it was not the Order in Council to which he refers that was advertised, but the judgment of Mr. Justice Duff on a test case, granting exemptions to farmers under certain conditions.

Mr. ROBB: The minister admits there was such an Order in Council?

Mr. ROWELL: There was an Order in Council, which has been before the House for weeks, dealing with the question of exempting agriculturists. Either the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Militia, laid that Order in Council upon the Table at the opening of the session, but I am quite sure that it was not advertised, or anything done in connection with it, by the Director of Public Information. That officer did, however, advertise in the papers of the country the judgment of Mr. Justice Duff in a test case, and I think the cost was about $7,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Is it part of the duties of the minister's private secretary to write partisan articles, and has he received instructions to do so?

Mr. ROWELL: No, it is not part of his duties, and he has never received any such instructions.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the President of the Privy Council require two private secretaries to do his work?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. He has a secretary and an assistant secretary, and it requires all their time to answer the correspondence that comes in, as well as to perform the necessary routine work of the office.

Mr. JACOBS: A double shift.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was the assistant secretary appointed by Order in Council under the War Measures Act?

Mr. ROWELL: For the time being I do not recall the form of procedure followed in connection with the appointment. I know it was made through the Civil Service Commission, and it went through the Treasury Board in the regular way, but I do not recall the details. It is the Clerk of the Privy Council, Mr. Boudreau, who looks after these matters, and it went through in the regular way.

Mr. PELLETIER: If both the minister's secretaries are employed all the time in the work of the department, how do they enjoy the opportunity to write articles and poetry for the Toronto Globe?

Mr. ROWELL: I think my hon. friend could not have been listening when I told the committee early in the evening that no articles were written by my secretaries, or either of them, to my knowledge, during office hours for any paper.

Mr. PEDLOW: Do they write after office hours?

Mr. PELLETIER: The minister said a few minutes ago that his secretaries were kept busy from the time they went into the office until two or three o'clock the next morning.

Mr. ROWELL: No, I did not say that.

Mr. PELLETIER: What time do they have to write articles and poetry?

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask what is the total amount required to be voted by this resolution? There is a vote of $54,900 and at the bottom of the page I see "printing and stationery, and sundries".

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does it include the salary of Mr. Nichols?

Mr. ROWELL: No, that was included in the War Appropriation that was voted the other day.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That has slipped through, has it?

Mr. BUREAU: I want to know what "the sundries" are. There are so many things that come under that head just now that we would be interested in learning what they are.

Mr. ROWELL: The sundries are the same as last year, and for the same purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think we inquired about them last year. Anyhow, the conditions are not the same this year, and we want to know the details.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think I can give my hon. friend the details now, but I shall be glad to furnish them when we take up the Supplementary Estimates. There is another item dealing with printing, stationery and all such supplies as are necessary for the carrying on of an office

such as the Privy Council Office. The money is spent under the direction of the Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I would like to know if the private secretaries of the other ministers are appointed by Order in Council, or if it only happens in the case of the secretary of the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. ROWELL: So far as I know the private secretaries of all the new ministers were appointed in that way. I know some of them were.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Then they did not have to pass a competitive examination under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROWELL: Under the terms of the Civil Service Act private secretaries are not compelled to pass a competitive examination before the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: I asked the minister to give me an explanation of the $7,000 for sundries. His answer was—and I took it down so that there would be no misunderstanding,—that it was for printing and stationery and other expenses of the office which is under the control of the Clerk of the Privy Council. Now I ask him, in that case, why is there an item of $3,000 for printing and stationery?

Mr. ROWELL: I was referring generally to the item of $10,000 for contingencies. The sum of $3,000 is expressly for printing and stationery. My hon. friend is quite correct in his statement, and the sum of $7,000 forms the balance of $10,000 for contingencies. All I can say is that it covers the usual expenses in carrying on an office of that kind. However, I shall get the details from the Clerk of the Privy Council and will give them when we take up the Supplementary Estimates.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—salaries, $22,300; contingencies, $1,700.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Does this item include the salary of the controller, Mr. McLean?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: What position does Mr. McLean occupy?

Mr. ROWELL: Deputy minister and controller.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Are any of the mounted police employed in connection with the Military Service Act?

Mr. ROWELL: There are some of the mounted police employed in that service in Western Canada; some of them are assisting the Dominion police out there; and there are a few assisting the Dominion police, I think, in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that so?

Mr. ROWELL: Some five or six. They are assisting in the West.

Mr. BUREAU: Would the minister tell us the present strength of the force? I understand that in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan many of the services heretofore rendered by the mounted police have ceased, on the ground and for the reason that provincial constables now perform the duties undertaken by the mounted police before the erection into provinces. Many of the men, I understand, have been released. How many now remain on the force, and what are the special duties now performed by those remaining? Are they kept near the Indian reservations?

Mr. ROWELL: I am very glad to answer my hon. friend. Some time after the war broke out, in view of the importance of carefully guarding the international border against possible crossing by hostile parties inspired by pro-German propaganda, and also to look after conditions in the Northwest, an arrangement was made with the Provincial Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta whereby each of these Governments took over the work of providing their own police protection, in order that the mounted police might be released for this special and important work of patrolling the border and of keeping in touch with all elements of the population in Western Canada. At the same time quite a number of the force enlisted for service overseas. The number of the force, until this recent movement for enlistment as cavalry to reinforce our cavalry brigade in France, was about six hundred. The authorized strength is something over a thousand. When the request came from the overseas authorities that we should provide cavalry reinforcements for our cavalry brigade which has been operating in France, and which did such magnificent service during the great struggle commencing in March, we communicated with the Commissioner of the Mounted Police, intimating to him that this request had come for cavalry reinforcements, and the suggestion was made that if the Mounted Police cared to enlist as reinforcements for the cavalry they might go overseas at once.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As a body?

Mr. ROWELL: As cavalry reinforcements.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They were not to be allowed to go as a unit?

Mr. ROWELL: Not as a unit. It was the desire of the Police and the desire of the Government that they should go over as a unit, but the Government was not able to arrange with the overseas authorities that they should go over and go to the front as a unit. The Government did succeed in arranging that one squadron would go as a unit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I may tell the hon. gentleman, what he probably knows, that the Government has everything to do with sending them over as a unit, and to the front as a unit. All they want is backbone.

Mr. ROWELL: In that branch of the service the Minister of Militia is the one who determines, subject to the approval of the Council, what shall be done on this side, and the overseas military authorities decide what shall be done overseas. The request that came to us was for cavalry reinforcements for the existing brigade, the ranks of which had been seriously depleted in the great March offensive, and that is what was immediately required. We have succeeded, however, in getting the authorities to accept one squadron of cavalry composed of men of the Northwest Mounted Police. The other men going over are going as cavalry reinforcements to reinforce the existing brigade in France.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that why Colonel Perry resigned?

Mr. ROWELL: He resigned because they were not authorized to go over to the front as a unit. My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) asked the number of men in the force. We are transferring to the overseas draft 15 officers and 238 men. The Northwest Mounted Police has enlisted for cavalry recruits to go overseas 530 men, making a total of all ranks of 783 men who are now passing out of the hands of the Mounted Police to the military authorities to go overseas as cavalry reinforcements. I am under the impression that they will pass through Ottawa, and I hope they will detrain here. If they should do so before the House prorogues hon. members will be glad to see so splendid a force as they will present. It is a fine tribute to the courage and patriotism of the men in that force that when the suggestion was made that they should enlist as cavalry recruits every man in the force volunteered. Large numbers could not go because they were over age or otherwise not physically fit. That leaves on hand a force of 336 officers and men at the present time.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: May I inquire if the position of controller is a new position created this year, or an old position?

Mr. ROWELL: It is an old position.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is there both a deputy minister and a controller?

Mr. ROWELL: That officer is the same man; he is deputy and controller.

Mr. BUREAU: Does this vote of $22,300 include the salaries of the 336 men?

Mr. ROWELL: No. This is for Civil Government; this is the salary list of the office here. We will come to the salaries of the Mounted Police in another item.

Mr. BUREAU: Why should it take $22,300 for officials in Ottawa to direct 336 men who have their own officers? I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Mounted Police are very good men. There are no words of praise the minister can utter in favour of the Mounted Police that I do not at once endorse. I have had occasion to know them and meet them. It is on account of the high character of the force that it strikes me that having to pay, in addition to the salary of the minister who presides over them, $22,300 to look after 336 well trained, well disciplined, gentlemanly men, who are employed to enforce the laws of the country, is rather a large sum, especially when the officials are a couple of thousand miles away from the field of operations.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend must bear in mind that this is the staff that has been looking after 1,200 men. We are down to 336 men at the present time simply because we are sending overseas over 700 men.

Mr. BUREAU: Yet in spite of this dwindling, I notice that the appropriation is increasing instead of decreasing.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does this item include recruiting charges?

Mr. ROWELL: This is simply the expense of the staff in Ottawa, and as I recollect the details the only differences are statutory increases to two or three clerks in the office.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police, $1,127,777.57.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: How many members of the force are employed in connection with the Military Service Act?

Mr. ROWELL: Less than ten in the East, I believe. I am not sure of the number, because some have enlisted and are going overseas with the cavalry reinforcements. In the West I should think that the number is less than fifty, but it varies from time to time as circumstances require.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Are they paid any additional moneys on account of that service?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. BUREAU: I notice that there is a decrease this year in the amount to defray the expenses of pay, subsistence, billeting, forage, etc. Is the decrease in proportion per capita to the decrease in the force?

Mr. ROWELL: The decrease is to some extent in proportion per capita. These estimates were made on the basis of approximately 600 men,—subject to this qualification; the cost of living has so vastly increased that the cost of maintaining the Mounted Police in the West is somewhat higher than it was last year. But the main difference between the estimates of last year and those of this year is the difference in the number of men.

Mr. McKENZIE: I assume that when these estimates were prepared it was not known that so many men were going overseas. Was this estimate made to provide for a larger number of men than are now on the force?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. If the number does not increase, we shall not require the whole of this money, and it will not be spent. We shall spend only such amount as is absolutely required for the force engaged. When this estimate was prepared we did not know about the men going overseas.

Office of the Conservation Commission—salaries, $40,500.

Mr. BUREAU: We have several commissions whose duties seem to be similar to those of the Conservation Commission. We have a commission on natural resources, we have another commission to inquire into such resources as ores, etc., which might be manufactured into munitions. In fact, there is such a multiplicity of commissions that the ordinary public, if they want information, do not know which one to apply to. The Conservation Commission may be looked upon as the mother of commissions, if we leave out of consideration the Railway Commission. I suggest that the Government charge the Conservation Commission with the duty of studying the other commissions and ascertaining whether some of them could not be dispensed with or merged with others. Most of the information, if we except some minute details, supplied by the commission mentioned yesterday could be obtained from the various departments of Government. I do not make these remarks by way of criticism; I admit that the Government have had a good deal to do all at once. But now that we have Union Government—

Sir SAM HUGHES: And Union Opposition.

Mr. BUREAU: We have always had a Union Liberal party, anyway. It is about time that we had a union of these commissions. We ought to take the Commission of Conservation as our guide; we ought to ask that commission to see that the information which we obtain through these commissions is not duplicated.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Would not that be a combine in restraint of trade?

To provide for the expenses of the Conservation Commission, including $750 for C. Gordon Hewitt, as special adviser respecting conservation of game and wild life, $84,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I should like to have an answer from the minister regarding the question put by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau).

Mr. ROWELL: I can only say that I shall carry my hon. friend's suggestion with reference to the work of this commission to the Prime Minister. But this commission at present has its hands full of very valuable and important work. As my hon. friend knows, there are the various branches, with water-power, forestry lands, public health, housing and other problems —and the commission is fully occupied in looking after those branches of investigation.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not criticising the Commission of Conservation. I am in favour of it and I thought it ought to look after the others. I see that for the commission with all its staff, including Mr. White and Sir Clifford Sifton the amount of the item is only $40,500. The item, which we are now discussing, which is for the expenses of the Commission of Conservation amounts to $84,000. The commission must be doing a good deal of travelling, if it costs twice the amount we pay them for their services to pay their travelling expenses. I would like to have an explanation of the item.

Mr. ROWELL: The civil government item includes the chief officials in the office of the Conservation Commission. The present item covers the expenses of the outside work, including the general office expenses, expenses of investigations into forestry, town planning and housing, water-powers, public health, fishery and game, agriculture, mining, and fire prevention, and the travelling expenses of the commissioners.

Mr. BUREAU: I would like to know if the first amount of $40,500 covers all the salaries of the employees of the Conservation Commission, or whether in the second item there are more employees included, or whether it is only for technical work and reports. I understand it costs money to publish the weekly and monthly pamphlets which we get and which are very interesting and useful. It is on account of the useful and great work of this commission that I think there is very little use for some of the other commissions which have been created.

Mr. ROWELL: This item of $84,000 covers what might be called the outside staff plus the expenses of investigation. The first item covers what may be described as the directing staff of the head office.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is the item of $40,500 included in the $84,000?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is the Conservation Commission under the control of the Privy Council in any way?

Mr. ROWELL: No, it is under the Prime Minister. I am taking these Estimates tonight at his request.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What are the names of the men who compose the commission?

Mr. ROWELL: The commission consists of twenty members appointed by the Governor in Council, of whom one from each province must be a member of the faculty of a university within such province. There are a number of ex officio members, viz.: the minister of each Provincial
10 p.m. Government charged with the administration of the natural resources of the province, and the federal Ministers of the Interior, Agriculture and Mines. I cannot give the names of the twenty appointed by the Governor in Council, but I can secure them for my hon. friend and give them to him if he so desires.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: When do they meet?

Mr. ROWELL: They have an annual meeting, and they also have committee meetings.

Mr. SINCLAIR: They do not receive salaries?

Mr. ROWELL: No, they receive travelling expenses for attending the meetings.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Has the Chairman of the Commission of Conservation any control over the employees of that branch of the service, or is his position only honorary?

Mr. ROWELL: He is in control.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Who is the present chairman of the commission?

Mr. ROWELL: Sir Clifford Sifton.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is he using the personnel of the commission for his political activities? The other day I read, I think, in Saturday Night, that he was the father of the Union Government. I would like to know whether he uses in any way the personnel of the commission for his paternal or generating activities.

Mr. ROWELL: I have not heard it suggested that he has. I am sure that is not the case.

Mr. DECHENE: What salary does he receive?

Mr. ROWELL: None.

Mr. McKENZIE: Eighty-four thousand dollars is quite a sum of money. I would suggest to the minister that the details in the item are rather meagre. Who is the responsible head for this expenditure, and under whose control is the money disbursed?

Mr. ROWELL: The representative head is, of course, the chairman. Then there is the assistant to the chairman, Mr. James White, who directs in the absence of the chairman and who is subject to the chairman's direction. The item of $84,000 is made up as follows:

General office expenses, including salaries of temporary clerks and travelling expenses	$17,400
Forestry, including investigations into the pulpwood resources of Eastern Canada and publishing the forestry reports	10,650
Town planning and housing, including salaries, travelling expenses and publishing reports	12,800
Water-powers, including salary consulting engineer, publishing reports, and office expenses	12,500

Public health, including salary of medical adviser, publishing reports	5,000
Fisheries and Game, salaries and publishing reports	2,600
Agriculture, including field and travelling expenses and publishing reports	5,200
Mining, including salary of mining engineer, travelling expenses and publishing reports	6,400
Fire prevention, including salary and travelling expenses and publishing reports	5,800
Commissioners' expenses attending annual and committee meetings	4,000
Miscellaneous reports	1,650
Total	$84,000

Mr. McKENZIE: To me it is a discovery that the Commission of Conservation has anything to do with hygienic conditions in the country, or with medical activities of any kind. There is, of course, a Board of Health in connection with the Department of Agriculture that looks after health in a general way, and there are also organizations in the different provinces which look after general health conditions, but I had thought that they rather exhausted every branch of medical research on the part of governments in this country. Perhaps it would be well for the minister to explain what is really done in this connection.

Mr. ROWELL: There has been a public health branch of the Conservation Commission for some considerable time, and Dr. Hodgetts, who is now in England, has been medical advisor to that branch. I know from my general knowledge of the work of the commission that they have made important investigations into questions of public health as affecting the whole country, as part of the conservation of our human resources, and they have published some reports, I believe they have looked into the question of the effect of tuberculosis on the life of the nation, the housing of the people, and the relation of housing to public health. I believe it was a result of their investigations into questions of public health that the commission decided to look into the problem of housing and town planning and brought Mr. Thomas Adams, the town planning expert, from Great Britain to take up that question in Canada. I may say in that connection that I once heard Right Hon. John Burns say he thought the most acute problem in Canada was the housing of our working people, and a problem to which we should devote most earnest attention if we were not to repeat the mistakes of the old land and some mistakes the cities of the United States had made. Town planning on sound lines, he said, was one of the urgent needs of our country. The Commission of Conservation has taken up that problem and has attempted to deal with it through the branch of which Mr. Thomas Adams is the chief. It is quite true, as my hon. friend has said, that there is a Public Health Branch in the Department of Agriculture, but it is pretty limited in its scope, and strong representations have been made to the Government from all classes of organizations urging that there should be a real Federal department of public health and the question is now under consideration, but so far no action has been taken.

Mr. McKENZIE: They cannot go too far in conserving public health and doing anything that is necessary along that line for the benefit of our people. What I would object to would be the possible overlapping and want of co-operation, with resulting inefficiency and waste of public money. Otherwise, I have no objection to the expenditure of public money for the benefit of public health, and particularly for the better housing of our people.

Supplementary estimates 1917-18 — Privy Council Office—contingencies, further amount required, $1,000.

Mr. ROWELL: This additional amount is required by reason of the fact that expenses in connection with the office of the secretary of Hon. Mr. Maclean and the secretary of the Hon. Mr. Robertson are charged to Privy Council contingencies. These ministers are not at the head of separate departments for which there are specific appropriations.

Mr. McMASTER: Is this in connection with the Post Office Department, for example?

Mr. ROWELL: No. My hon. friend will remember that Hon. Mr. Maclean is chairman of the Committee on Reconstruction, which is a sub-committee of the Cabinet, and therefore the expenses incidental to the office of his secretary are charged under Privy Council Estimates and paid out of Privy Council contingencies.

Main estimates—Arts and Agriculture—Patent Record, $30,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: I might tell the minister we had this item under fire last year. This money is expended in the publication of that big book that issues once in a while. It was stated by a great many hon. members in this House last year that they had very little use for the book, and I join that brigade myself. I have never got any good out of it, and unless there is somebody

friendly to it I would suggest that $30,000 is too much to pay for it. Perhaps the minister would explain why such a big volume is issued at such a great expense?

Mr. CRERAR: I think there is some force in the criticism of my hon. friend. I have not so far got down to an examination of this particular expenditure, but it does seem to me that a reduction might possibly be made in it this year. I find that the cost of printing takes up practically the whole of this item, the distribution of the publication being free to members of Parliament and Senators, and to libraries in England, the United States and Canada. I would suggest that the item pass, and I will give it very careful consideration with a view to reduction before spending any money.

Experimental Farms—Maintenance of Central Farm, and establishment and maintaining of additional branch stations, $1,012,036.60.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I would like information about the station at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière. Last year the director of the farm had to rent adjoining land for the purpose of carrying on the operations of the farm. Is it the intention of the department to acquire additional land in order to make the operations of the farm successful?

Mr. CRERAR: I cannot say at the moment whether it is the intention to acquire additional land or not. We have found at several of the farms that it has been necessary to rent adjacent land mainly to secure feed for live stock that were being handled. There is an item in the Estimates to provide for additional land, and if more land is necessary at this particular place it is likely that more will be purchased.

Mr. VIEN: What is the reason of the increase in this vote?

Mr. CRERAR: The increase arises from practically three causes. An item of $40,000 for printing was omitted from the Main Estimates of last year and was included in the Supplementary Estimates. This year it appears in the Main Estimates. In addition, there is an item of $75,000 which we are expending in the growing of garden and field root seeds at the several experimental farms. Prior to the war practically all the garden and field root seeds used in Canada, which amounted to a very large quantity, were imported mainly from Belgium, Denmark and Holland. With the progress of the war the reserve supply has been cut off, and a year ago the director general of experimental farms, who had studied the situation, recommended that we should undertake in Canada to provide our own farms, as far as possible, with seed. It was difficult to get farmers throughout the country to undertake this work because they were not familiar with the methods of seed production and they lacked the necessary experience. It was decided to undertake this work at the experimental farms and stations throughout Canada. We have 350 acres under cultivation for this particular purpose and we hope to get enough seed to meet all our requirements next year. It is expected that the return from this will be greater than the expenditure involved when the proceeds from the sale of seed are realized.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is it the intention of the minister to bring the employees of the experimental farms under the provisions of the Civil Service Act? I am not speaking of the day labourer but of the director, the superintendents, the chiefs of the different branches and all permanent employees.

Mr. CRERAR: I understand they will be brought under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the minister carry out the policy which has been announced by other departments of the Government, that there shall be no political patronage in the appointment of the labourers on these farms? I would like to know if that will be done at St. Anne's because, if it is, it will be quite a new experience there.

Mr. CRERAR: I can assure the hon. gentleman that this will be the policy of the department, and has been since last November when I personally gave instructions to the Director General of Experimental Farms that hereafter in the engagement of all men for work on the farms he should have regard strictly to the qualifications of the man for the position and not to any other consideration.

Mr. McMASTER: Was that direction given in writing or verbally in the manner in which the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) gave directions?

Mr. CRERAR: It was given verbally, but there was no misunderstanding as to the character of the instructions.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It would be necessary to make a ruling and send it out to all the experimental farms in order

that it might reach the proper officers. I do not think a conversation with one man is sufficient. My hon. friend must remember that this question of political patronage has permeated the whole of the Administration for a long time and it cannot be expected that it will be changed by a simple conversation. There should be a ruling made by the minister and sent out to the experimental farms with instructions that it be posted up on the barn door, where any one can see it, so that everybody will know that that is the rule.

Mr. CRERAR: I will be very glad to do that if necessary. I gave the instruction to the Director General and he sent it out to all the superintendents of farms and farm stations, so he informed me, and I have no doubt he did so. I believe the superintendents of the various experimental farms will welcome the change and I have no doubt that policy will be carried out. If any hon. member has information that it is not being carried out I shall be very glad to have him inform me of the fact. As far as I am concerned I want efficiency to govern the operation of the farms. I am going as far as in my power lies to see that this policy is carried out.

Mr. McKENZIE: How many experimental farms are there in Canada, and where are they located?

Mr. CRERAR: There are experimental farms and stations at Charlottetown, P.E.I.; Kentville, N.S.; Nappan, N.S.; Fredericton, N.B.; Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Que.; Cap Rouge, Que.; Lennoxville, Que.; Spirit Lake, Que.; Kapuskasing, Ont.; Morden, Man.; Brandon, Man.; Indian Head, Sask.; Rosthern, Sask.; Scott, Sask.; Lethbridge, Alberta, Lacombe, Alberta, Summerland, B.C.; Invermere, B.C.; Agassiz, B.C.; Sydney, B.C.; and the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount of money has been expended at Kapuskasing?

Mr. CRERAR: The total estimate this year is $30,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are the Government Experimental Farms doing anything in the way of increased production?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes. Early in March instructions were sent to all the experimental farms throughout Canada that they were to pay particular attention to that object and direct their efforts as far as possible—while adhering, of course to the experimental farm work in which they are engaged—to the increasing of production, not only in cereals but in live-stock as well.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Can the minister state how many additional acres the experimental farms have under crop this year?

Mr. CRERAR: No, I have not that information. It would be impossible to secure it as yet because the seeding is not all done at these farms. I do not know that the increase along that line will be very great. I think that the increase probably will be greater in the raising of hogs and meat animals than cereals.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a very interesting and important subject, because the experimental farm is capable of rendering great service to the country, and for that reason I would like to get a few ideas from the minister about its work. The principal purpose of the experimental farm should be to show the ordinary farmer how things can be done—how certain grains, for instance, can be produced, and how the best kind of cattle can be raised, at an expense within the reach of the ordinary agriculturist. I am afraid that if the Minister of Agriculture were to investigate the Experimental Farm here, which looks beautiful and magnificent in all its parts, and were to figure out what it costs for every ton of hay and every bushel of potatoes that is grown there, he would find that it is a very expensive work. I would like him, as a new man and endowed with enthusiasm, energy and youth, to introduce some new life into this idea of experimental farming and try to demonstrate to the people what can be done. I am afraid that the Ottawa Experimental Farm is carried on at too great an expenditure and on too large a scale. I would suggest to the minister that it would be highly beneficial to establish a number of small experimental farms or stations in places not so far apart. The Dominion Experimental farm in Nova Scotia is not of so very much good for the whole province. It is of benefit within a certain radius, but only for the comparatively few people who can visit and see it. If there were quite a number of these stations, consisting, perhaps, of only fifty acres of land, where the farmers of the entire locality could go and inspect what is being done, and in that way benefit by the experiments the Government is carrying on, it would be of the greatest possible value. We in Nova Scotia get a great

deal of benefit from the Experimental Farm at Truro and the courses that it gives, and the farmers of the province are invited to go there and view what is being done. But if there were co-operation between the Federal department and the departments of agriculture of the several provinces so that these experimental farms, like the public schools, could be established all over the country, it would be much better.

Mr. BURRELL: I would like to say a word or two in answer to my hon. friend, but I do not want to detain the committee by any lengthy remarks at this late date of the session, although the subject is a very interesting and important one. The hon. gentleman seemed to imply that the system by which the experimental farms have been carried on was rather a mistaken one in that vast sums of money had been expended to very little purpose, and he hoped that my hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) would turn over a new leaf. I might say that I have very great confidence in the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), and I have no doubt at all that he will accomplish a great deal of good. If he accomplishes more than I did as Minister of Agriculture it will be a matter of very great satisfaction to me. But I would like to disabuse the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) of what I think is a serious misunderstanding as to the functions of an experimental farm. No experimental farm could possibly pay if it were to fulfil its functions as an experimental farm. I quite agree with my hon. friend that a most useful work can be done by having what we should not, perhaps, call experimental farms, but demonstration farms, to show to the farmers the best methods of carrying on the ordinary farm work. An experimental farm, such as the one at Ottawa, involves the carrying on of thousands of costly experiments in order, perhaps, to evolve some one thing that may be of immense service to the country. Although I admit that at the Ottawa Farm there must have been hundreds of experiments that have cost this country thousands of dollars without any effect except to eliminate useless processes, there will come as the result of that work one experiment sufficiently established to pay for the whole of the vast outlay. If I wanted to give the House a shining and conspicuous example of the truth of my arguments it would be the results achieved in connection with the reproduction of cereals by which the Marquis wheat was evolved on the Farm, here, the production and dissemination of which I am absolutely confident has saved the country untold millions of dollars and paid ten times over the entire cost of experimental farms in Canada. I hope my hon. friend will pardon me for saying that.

Mr. CAHILL: How is it that the Dominion Experimental Farms never seem to take any prizes for grain or anything of that kind?

Mr. BURRELL: The function of the experimental farms is not primarily to exhibit products or take prizes, but to carry out experiments.

Mr. CAHILL: Evolve the best varieties.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say that the moneys in question were expended to no purpose. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) could not have heard me.

Mr. BURRELL: I apologize if I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I did say was that if my hon. friend in charge of the department wants to figure out, as the ordinary farmer has to do, what it costs to raise a ton of hay or a bushel of potatoes on a farm, he could not stay in the business very long. However, he is able to draw on the moneys of the country and can afford to make these experiments. The idea I meant to convey was that perhaps demonstration farms would better enforce practical lessons in agriculture on the average farmer, and that if we had more of these farms all over the country where farmers could go and see what is being done and benefit by the experiments, it would be better than simply having one big farm at some one place.

Mr. DECHENE: The idea that my hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) has suggested has been carried out to a great extent in the province of Quebec during recent years. We now see along the highways in a great many parishes large placards indicating that a certain field is used as a demonstration farm by the Provincial Department of Agriculture. These demonstration farms have been of the greatest possible advantage to the farmers in the locality where they are established. Accurate records are kept showing how much it has cost to produce the crop that is being demonstrated, and this data as well as the crop itself is open to the inspection of the farmers in the neighbourhood. This system of demonstration farms which is carried on in the province of Quebec, and which has produced

such good results, should be given earnest thought and attention by the federal authorities at Ottawa. Reference to the statistics of the province of Quebec will show the Minister of Agriculture, I think, that the wheat production in that province has made a great jump during the last three years, and the same with other crops. I think, perhaps, that if less money were spent on the beautifying of the farm here, and a greater expenditure made on practical work in the interest of the farmers, far better results would be achieved. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will give due consideration to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Cape Breton, and that a good many more demonstration farms will be established where the farmers can go and find out for themselves the practical results that have been obtained.

Mr. VIEN: I would like to tell the minister that it would be a good policy to establish demonstration farms in every parish if possible. I think also it would be good policy to place them under the Director General of Experimental Farms. Mr. Grisdale is a splendid public servant, and has done much to improve the experimental farms, and under his able management demonstration farms in almost every parish would help immensely. I represent a rural riding, and have often heard farmers from my riding express a desire to have a demonstration farm in every parish. It would not be money lost, and we might possibly spend less on large experimental farms and more on demonstration farms, because agricultural knowledge would spread much more widely because it would be more accessible to the farmers. I think we should also have under the management of the Department of Agriculture lectures on agriculture, much along the line followed by the provincial departments. Probably the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture could cooperate, and the federal department might supplement the technical instruction given by these lecturers.

Mr. CRERAR: There is a great deal of force in the point advanced by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. It means, however, that there should be close cooperation between the federal and the Departments of Agriculture of all the provinces to accomplish the best results. I had it in mind to invite the provincial Ministers of Agriculture to a conference after the session to consider how the provincial and the federal departments can most effectively co-operate to get the best results from the moneys spent by both. Should that conference come about, the point raised by the hon. gentleman will doubtless be considered. I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of the small demonstration farm, located in the community, where the farmers learn by seeing what is being done. A farmer naturally and instinctively learns more readily through the sense of sight than he does through any other of his senses. The question is a large one of policy and will require a great deal of consideration by the department.

Mr. FAFARD: Is the minister aware that the crop from the experimental farm at Spirit Lake was $15,000 worth of pulpwood? It seems to me that it is folly that an experimental farm which cost over $20,000 should yield such a result. I know a little about this farm. The money was spent not for agricultural but for military purposes. Spirit Lake is a detention camp, yet this $20,000 is probably charged to the Department of Agriculture. There is only one family living on this farm. It seems to me that the money expended at Spirit Lake should be charged to the Militia Department, because it is not an experimental farm; it is a detention camp.

Mr. CRERAR: Of course, I have never visited the Spirit Lake experimental farm. I understand that considerable expense has been necessary to clear it up and make it suitable for cultivation, and I have no doubt that, after the land is cleared and the farm brought under cultivation a good many of the difficulties the hon. gentleman referred to will be overcome. This farm is located in a district which, I understand, is being settled, or is partially settled now, and its purpose is to supply information to the farmers in the district.

Mr. FAFARD: But the $15,000 received for pulpwood was turned over to the Militia Department and the money spent was for militia purposes. There are no farmers for miles around. A few years ago you could walk one hundred miles north, south, east and west and find no settlement. There are to-day only about forty families around there. I know the country very well.

Mr. COPP: I want to congratulate the Union Government upon having a practical agriculturist at the head of the department, if the minister is one, as I understand he is. I do not rise to oppose the appropriation, but I do want to make one or two suggestions. I do so hesitatingly, knowing

that he is a farmer of repute, while I do not profess to be in that class. But I have paid some attention to the working of some of the branch experimental farms through the eastern section of the Dominion, and while I do not want to apply my criticism to all of them, what money is spent on a number of these farms I can say to the minister is a criminal waste of public money. Not one dollar of benefit is derived by the agricultural population from the working and operation of these farms. I am not asking that an extra man be employed, but if there is one good practical man now in his department, I would advise the minister to make that man a general inspector or superintendent, whatever he pleases to term the office, and send him through the country to get a personal report in regard to these farms. I do not know about the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I have had the very great pleasure of visiting that farm several times. I spend Saturday afternoons there when the House is not sitting, and enjoy it immensely. I notice that a great many of the city people go out there and have a picnic.

I fail to see many farmers around there getting instruction. Of course, it is a great convenience to the people of Ottawa to be able to get green vegetables from the gardens, fresh bouquets from the greenhouses, and things of that kind; I am not finding fault about that. But it would be better to have a few small experimental stations in the different localities, which could more conveniently be visited by the people. In New Brunswick there is an experimental farm outside of Fredericton. It takes a man in my section of the province two days to get there and back. The purpose of an experimental farm is to give out practical information. I know some of the men who have charge of these farms. They are not practical farmers and never were; they simply have the job of superintendent at a fairly good salary. When I discussed this matter last year and the year before, the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Burrell) made reference to the splendid report that he had received from the superintendent of that experimental farm. Naturally, that gentleman would not make a report unfavourable to himself. We have deficits on these farms; we do not expect them to pay—indeed, the superintendents do not try to make them pay; they seem to think that the more money they can spend, the more expensive horses, harness and machinery they buy, the more the farmers will think of the experimental farm. Of course, the farmer does not know that at the end of the year there is a deficit of anywhere from $5,000 to $50,000 in the operation of that farm. I do not ask my hon. friend to reduce by one dollar the appropriation for the encouragement of agriculture, because if there is any industry or occupation that should be assisted in every possible way, it is agriculture. But I do suggest that my hon. friend make a study of the work done by these farms and see that money is not wasted. Very little good comes to the people from the operation of the Central Experimental Farm, or of the branch stations throughout the country. My hon. friend himself can visit these farms or send some one in whom he has confidence to inspect them and report to him as to the best method of making them really beneficial to people interested in agriculture. If he does so, I believe that he will get a report along the lines of the suggestion which I have made.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Coming as I do from one of the agricultural provinces of the West, I want to say to my hon. friend that my experience is quite different from his. We have an experimental farm in the town of Lacombe, Alberta. Under the management of a very able man, Mr. Hutton, that farm is doing a great deal of good to agriculture in my province. I have been there on many occasions. On one occasion I saw a colt only thirteen months old which weighed 1,300 pounds. I naturally conceived the desire to have colts of that size on my own farm, and others with me had the same feeling. Large excursions of farmers are made to this experimental farm station in order that they may see the very best work that can be done in agriculture as it is done on that farm. The Minister of Agriculture for that province, joining his forces with those of the Dominion Government, goes there frequently. Men well versed in many forms of agricultural pursuits go there and give addresses to large numbers of farmers and their female relatives. The farm sends out cultures for the production of certain kinds of clover and other things. I do not know about New Brunswick, but I do know that the people of Alberta generally value very much the experimental farm at Lacombe and that the farmers derive very great benefit from the various operations that are carried on there, and from the courteous replies that the superintendent of the farm will always make to inquiries sent to him about anything connected with agriculture. I am sure the member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) will

be glad to hear that in Alberta, at any rate, the experimental farm is doing good.

Mr. COPP: I am delighted that the superintendent of the farm to which my hon. friend (Mr. M. Clark) refers carries out his work along the lines mentioned. If all the stations were conducted in that way, possibly they would do a great deal of good. My experience is different from that of my hon. friend. Nobody encourages people interested in agriculture, to make excursions to these farms in the East to see the work that is done there. The minister will do well to see that every farm has a superintendent who will look after the work properly. I believe that it would be an advantage if farms were established in the smaller localities as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend's suggestion, which is a valuable one, must be worked out in co-operation with provincial departments of agriculture, I assure my hon. friend that the matter will receive close study during the interval between this session and the next, I do not concur with his view that these farms are of no practical value, I know that they are in the West; the member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) has given a striking illustration of that. I know, too, that such is the case in the other provinces. My predecessor in office gave an instance of the work done by the Central Experimental Farm in the development of Marquis wheat. With reference to the suggestion of the member for Westmorland as to the supervision of the farms, I had made up my mind to visit all these experimental farms during the coming summer. As I have never had the good fortune to travel east of Montreal, I shall certainly go the Maritime Provinces first and personally look into the suggestions that he has made.

Mr. PELLETIER: Has the Federal Government voted any subsidies to the Provincial Governments for the upkeep of some of the demonstration farms that have been opened?

Mr. CRERAR: Under the Agricultural Instruction Act a grant is given to the provinces, and I understand that part of that money is expended in carrying on this demonstration work and in the appointment of agricultural representatives in the various provinces.

Mr. PELLETIER: Some four years ago I wrote to my predecessor, Mr. Boulay, in regard to this matter, and as is well known, he and I did not altogether agree, and we do not yet. I asked him to endeavour to have a subsidy voted in the interest of the farmers, that is to say, in order to have demonstration farms opened up in different parts of the province. My riding is divided in two by a chain of mountains, and I asked him to have one in the vicinity of Matapedia and one along the river St. Lawrence. His first answer was that the climate and the soil along the St. Lawrence river were not good enough to establish a demonstration farm, so I wrote him stating that those were two reasons why we needed scientific farming. I had no answer to that last letter. I therefore wrote to
11 p.m. the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), and he replied that he was prepared to assist the Provincial Government in opening up such demonstration farms. If at any time the minister should make up his mind to take up this matter, and if he should wish to take a trip through my riding, to see whether the climate and soil are such that demonstration farms should be located there, I shall be delighted to take him from one end of my constituency to the other.

Mr. KAY: How much is being spent at Lennoxville station this year? Will the minister give an outline of the work being done there?

Mr. CRERAR: The Estimate for the Lennoxville station for the present year is $36,000.

Mr. KAY: Are the buildings on the farm finished yet?

Mr. CRERAR: No.

Mr. KAY: Will they be completed this year?

Mr. CRERAR: I am informed that the dairy building will be finished this year, but probably not the others.

Mr. KAY: How much of this item is for purchase of livestock?

Mr. CRERAR: Four thousand dollars.

Mr. KAY: Does that cover all experimental farms?

Mr. CRERAR: For Lennoxville alone.

Mr. KAY: How much for all the farms?

Mr. CRERAR: I have the information here for each farm separately. I have not it totalled.

Mr. KAY: Is it the policy of the department to have excursions run to all the farms every year?

Mr. CRERAR: It has been the policy in the past to have that carried out, and it was carried out as far as it was possible to arrange excursions with the railway companies. It has been the practice to a very large extent in the West and in the East also.

Mr. KAY: Is it the intention to have any excursions run this year? I understand the Railway War Board has prohibited the running of excursions.

Mr. CRERAR: I believe the Railway War Board some time ago took the attitude that excursions should not be run to summer fairs. They have already modified that attitude, and those excursions to summer fairs will be run as usual. I cannot say whether they will extend that to cover excursions to experimental farms or not. They will have to be guided by existing conditions.

Mr. KAY: If my hon. friend will put the matter strongly enough before the board, I am sure they will be pleased to allow excursions to experimental farms. The minister will understand that excursions to experimental farms are more important than excursions to summer fairs.

Mr. DECHENE: When the farmers' delegation was in town the other day, how many of those four or five thousand farmers visited the experimental farm here? I was out there one day with a few of my farmer constituents, and there seemed to be only a few there. If only a few farmers visited the experimental farm on that occasion, it would be pretty hard to get them to take advantage of excursions to visit those farms.

Mr. CRERAR: That delegation did not come primarily to visit experimental farms, but the director states that several hundred of them visited it.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Has the department taken any cognizance of the fox fur farming which is one of the most important of the new industries of the twentieth century? It is second only to agriculture. The fur farming industry is a new departure in human industry.

In the early period of our race, when the limit of subsistence was so narrow, when our antediluvian forefathers lived by the chase, not even communal life could exist. After a while it was discovered that they could domesticate the wild boar that they hunted, and gradually he became our modern pig. They domesticated the buffalo, she became the modern cow. They domesticated the epohiccos and he became the modern horse. They domesticated the mountain sheep and goat and gave us our modern animals of those species. The limit of subsistence was widened so as to permit of our antediluvian forefathers forming themselves into tribes, and then internecine warfare ceased, because it was discovered they could produce better results by domestication than by hunting the wild animals. This widened the limit of subsistence ten-fold. After a while, they discovered that the grains and the grasses on which these animals had been living could in many cases be used for human food. Then horticulture and agriculture was born. That widened the limit of subsistence twenty-fold and enabled the generations succeeding our antediluvian forefathers to develop into nations, and so the world moved along, gradually evolving, and developing the natural resources that lay open to mankind. The solution of the problem of increased population, which always presses against the limit of subsistence, was found, in a measure, by the discovery of America. Our forefathers came across here and relieved the congestion of western Europe, and what was the result? Art, science, literature, learning, civil government, as if by magic, followed; then democracy, the thing we are fighting for to-day. After a while our own great continent was being filled up, and the people who came to Canada moved into the United States because the climate there was warmer, living conditions were easier, and the struggle for existence was less. But before this war broke out the time had come when the great areas of land in the United States were becoming filled up, and people were migrating to Canada in thousands and tens of thousands. What occurred almost providentially, as it were, at that time? The people in my little province discovered or inaugurated, if you will, the art of fur-farming. If you will follow the progress of our race and the developments that have taken place with the widening of the limit of subsistence, you will find that fox-fur farming is a new cult, and one which the people of northern climates must take into consideration. If you will look at the map of Europe, of Asia and of North America, you will find that the bulk of the land area that is unpeopled to-day is in this great northland. What is necessary in this great northland is warm clothing and fuel, and this particular industry has come into being from the necessities of the case, and it is up to the Department of Agriculture to take hold of it and see that

it is developed still further. If we have a paternal Government let its paternalism be practical and along the lines of development. As I said in one of my discussions before in this House, overflowing population is largely the cause of the present war, and the great territory of North America and the immense territory of Canada can only be exploited by producing conditions that will enable the northern people to grow up in this land, and it is only in the northern lands that energy is developed, because in the southern climates enervation and all that sort of thing obtains. If we are going to produce a great race in this country, we have to produce conditions that will enable our people to take up these northern lands and live in northern latitudes and so develop.

Mr. CARVELL: Does my hon. friend think the Department of Agriculture could sell foxes for any better price than the farmers of Prince Edward Island can?

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The period of frenzied finance in the fox business is past, and the business is now on a commercial basis, and it ought never to have been on anything else. Originally the people who were interested in the fox business, like the people interested in western lands and British Columbia real estate, simply went after wildcats and went into a period of frenzied finance, but that is past and it is up to the Department of Agriculture to take up this question of fur farming and develop it to the end that our great country may be populated by a strong and virile population that will dominate the world with a glorious civilization.

Mr. PETER ROBERT McGIBBON: I had occasion a number of years ago to go on an excursion with a lot of other farmers to an experimental farm—I was a farmer then but I am not now—and my experience with experimental farms was not very good. I am glad to hear that in some parts of the world experimental farms are a success, but the farm I visited, which was near Ottawa, was not what it should be. The potatoes were eaten up with potato bugs until there was nothing but the stalks left, the grain was filled with weeds, and was sowed very late in the season. The cattle were extra good, and we farmers knew very well that they were fed at the Government trough; they were fed at our expense, and so it was easy to pour the feed into them. The great trouble at that farm was the patronage system. Every man about the farm, from the labourer up, was there because of the recommendation of the member for his constituency, and that made them very independent. They said: "We were sent here by So-and-So, and our boss cannot discharge us." So they did no work, and there was no one to hoe the corn. I am glad that in the present Minister of Agriculture we have a young man who is a capable farmer and will attend to his business. I know that he will go to these farms and see for himself how the work is carried on, and I know further, that if he will cut out the patronage system there the work will develop and progress as if the farm were run by private individuals.

The trouble in the East has been the patronage system, no matter what Government has been in power. I am not bringing politics into this because I must say that at the time I visited the Experimental farms they were under the Liberal regime. Now we have a young man at the head of affairs, he gave us a good explanation in answer to the questions that were asked him, and I am certain he will make a success of the experimental farms all over Canada. We must go on with farming and we must do everything possible to increase production.

Mr. ETHIER: I see there is an increase of $122,036.60 in this item for experimental farms and branch stations. Will provision be made for additional branch stations to encourage tobacco culture? Since 1903 there has been a special branch at the Experimental Farm under Mr. Charlan who has charge of experimental work in connection with the culture of tobacco. In view of the increase in the duties which were announced by the hon. Acting Minister of Finance in his budget speech on tobacco, and in view of this increase in the Estimates for experimental farms, we might expect the establishment of additional branches to encourage tobacco culture. We have an experiment station at St. Jacques and I think that is the only one we have in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CRERAR: There is one at Farnham.

Mr. ETHIER: Yes, and we have one at St. Jacques. There was a good start made in 1903 in connection with tobacco culture. The farmers of this section, who were anxious to cultivate tobacco, were encouraged to do so but since that time, as I had occasion to point out to the minister a few days ago, the efforts in this direction have diminished. Nothing has been

done, and yet the duty on tobacco has been increased. No encouragement has been offered to the farmers who are cultivating tobacco. I would suggest that if it is the intention of the Government to maintain branch farms under the supervision of my good friend, the director of experimental farms, whom I see here, the Government might give him more power and might authorize him, out of this increased vote, to establish additional branches in the counties where tobacco culture should be encouraged and intensified. The tobacco industry is well known in such counties as Montcalm, L'Assomption, Jacques Cartier, Two Mountains, and Laval and it should be encouraged more than it is. We have only one station at St. Jacques and that is not sufficient. If it is the intention to take this away from the control of the experimental farm and to place it under the direct control of the department, very well; but if it is to be retained under the experimental farm I would ask the minister to give us, in the counties of Laval, Two Mountains, Montcalm, l'Assomption and Jacques Cartier two or three additional branches. Do I understand the Government intend to continue the station at St. Jacques? The tobacco industry is a good thing for the country and for our farmers, and it should be encouraged in every way possible.

Mr. CRERAR: There is provision for the extension of these farms, and the suggestion that a portion of the money voted shall be used for additional experimental stations to encourage tobacco raising will be taken into consideration.

For the administration and enforcement of the destructive insect and pest Act, $134,400.

Mr. VIEN: Would the minister tell us how the increase of $49,400 is made up? I do not know that the amount spent last year reduced the effects of the destructive insects and pests.

Mr. CRERAR: The increase is to provide for scouting work with a view of preventing the spread of the white pine blister, a pest that has threatened to destroy, to a very great degree, the white pine forests of Canada. A certain amount of investigation work has been carried on in conjunction with the United States Government in this respect, and it is designed to confine this pest to the localities in which it is at present found.

Mr. DECHENE: Has this pest established itself all over Canada, or merely in some parts of the eastern provinces? I am told that in our district balsam and spruce, and especially the young trees, have been attacked by some insect pest?

Mr. CRERAR: The pest alluded to is found in southern Ontario and in Quebec mainly south of the St. Lawrence river. Those are the localities in Canada where it is chiefly found. So far it is not known in Western Canada.

Mr. DECHENE: There are a great many places in the counties of Montmagny and Bellechasse where young trees have been attacked by some pest.

Mr. CRERAR: Pine trees?

Mr. DECHENE: Balsam especially and young spruce.

Mr. CRERAR: The white pine blister does not affect the spruce or balsam.

Mr. DECHENE: In the localities to which I refer balsam and spruce, especially the young trees, have been attacked by a blister.

Mr. CRERAR: It must have been something other than the white pine blister. I am informed that this particular pest affects only the white pine.

For the development of the dairying industries, and the improvement of transportation, sale and trade in food and other agricultural products, $155,000.

Mr. ROBB: As the Government is desirous of passing some resolutions before we adjourn I think the minister might report progress, because this item is an important one and is going to cause some debate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would it be agreeable to pass a few more items, leaving one, with the understanding that there can be a general discussion upon it?

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) had something which he wished to discuss, but he seems to have left the Chamber. In the meantime perhaps this would be a fitting occasion for the minister to make a statement in regard to the dairy industry. There is very little use in spending a lot of money to promote the dairy industry, if the Government is going to pursue the same policy next year that it did during the present year, and that is withholding the feed supplies that are required in Eastern Canada. I have already drawn the minister's attention this session to the fact that the Canada Food Board, of which he is the chairman I understand, after fixing the price of bran and shorts at a very low figure,

put in force regulations prohibiting the shipment of these feed stuffs to Eastern Canada. While we cannot do anything to repair the damage that was done last year, I think it is proper for the minister to make a statement as to what policy will be pursued next year.

Mr. CRERAR: The feed situation for livestock throughout Canada during the past winter was an exceptionally hard one. We were in the position that, had transportation been available, an abundance of corn could have been secured from the United States, and there would have been no hardship to any feeders in Eastern Canada, or, for that matter in Western Canada. The regulations that the hon. gentleman has referred to, which prevented for a considerable length of time the shipment of bran and shorts from the manufacturers in Western Canada to Eastern Canada was passed for two reasons; there was a severe shortage of feed in Western Canada and the farmers there who were short of feed, as their brother farmers in the East were short of feed, desired that they should be given the preference on bran and shorts manufactured in the West; and there was also the necessity of utilizing every possible freight car to carry wheat to the seaboard for overseas. The situation in Great Britain, France and Italy with respect to their wheat supplies, was serious throughout the past winter, as the hon. gentleman is perhaps aware, and the transportation facilities from Fort William east were taxed to their utmost to carry to the seaboard the wheat that in ordinary years would have remained in storage in Fort William until the opening of navigation. I appreciate very fully the seriousness of the situation that existed last winter and also the Department of Agriculture did what it could in the matter. As hon. gentlemen are perhaps aware—some of them at any rate—the department purchased large supplies of oilcake in New York and distributed some five or six thousand tons to the cattle feeders in Quebec, Ontario and the Maritime Provinces. The shipment of screenings from the Fort William elevators to the United States was prohibited, and the material in those screenings that was fit for animal feed retained in Canada. Had cars been available we could have secured thousands of cars of corn from the United States. However, owing to the transportation tie-up it was impossible to get them and the condition resulted that my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has dodged the real issue. What we require now is a statement from the minister as to the Government's policy for next year.

Mr. CRERAR: The policy of the department for next year will be the same as it has been for the past year—to endeavour to supply feed, if there is a lack of feed. In respect of the particular prohibition of the shipment of bran and shorts from Western Canada to Eastern Canada to which my hon. friend takes exception I do not see any reason why that prohibition should be imposed in the coming year unless the crop of coarse grains in Western Canada this season should be another failure, in which case, of course, it may be necessary to retain it. But I will see to it, as far as I am able to do so, that the condition that my hon. friend takes exception to shall not occur again.

Mr. ROBB: I want to follow the subject a little further, because the minister has not made a very satisfactory explanation to my mind. As to his statement that a shortage of cars prevented shipments from the West to the East, that will not go. The western farmer really, in his selfishness, kept that bran and shorts himself and bulled up the price of the oats and barley which the eastern farmer was compelled to buy. That was the outcome of it all. The western farmers kept the low-priced feed for themselves and an embargo was placed on bran and shorts by Mr. J. D. McGregor, of the Food Control Board, who himself is a large cattle owner. That prohibition absolutely debarred the western millers from shipping carloads of bran and shorts to the eastern dealers.

But there were lots of cars to ship oats and barley East. The western farmer kept this cheap mill feed. They fixed the price down low. If this policy is repeated the result will be that the western flour mills will be compelled to shut down, because the men in the East will not buy flour to keep the mills running unless they can get the equivalent feed. The result will be to cripple the industry of Western Canada. But leaving that altogether, I come to another issue that the minister raised. He has told us that they were providing screenings or the scalpings of the elevators, the weed seeds for eastern dairymen. This was a complete change of policy on the part of the Government experts of Canada. We have just passed Estimates to-night to provide salaries for our agricultural experts, the men who are giving advice to the farmers. No later than December, 1916, the

minister's own department put out this circular to the farmers of Canada. The complaint had been made that the millers of Canada were mixing their screenings or scalpings in their feed, and it was having a very detrimental effect upon the animals using it. I will read this part of the circular, dated December, 1916, entitled "Memorandum re Weed Seeds in Mill Feeds":

> This is to advise you that a considerable number of samples of mill feeds and ground feeding stuffs are received from feeders, together with the usual statements that as a result of feeding them their cattle, hogs or poultry, and occasionally horses, are sick. In a few instances some animals are reported to have died.
>
> The investigations that have been made cover a period of several years, and provide an accumulation of evidence that would seem to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the fine weed seeds, particularly of worm-seed and other mustards, when contained in mill feeds or other ground feeding stuffs even in relatively small quantities, are unwholesome and frequently seriously injurious to the health of stock.

And this is the stuff that the minister was putting out, the scalpings from these elevators, which the department objected to the millers putting into the mill feed, which it claimed was injurious to live stock.

Mr. CRERAR: I think my hon. friend is under a slight misapprehension. The warning that was contained in the circular he has just read was undoubtedly well founded. But I wish to point out to him that at that time the general run of screenings from the elevators were shipped in bulk and ground in bulk. During the past year these screenings have been recleaned in the terminal elevators, and the black seeds, etc., referred to in the circular were extracted, and the resulting product, which was termed re-cleaned screenings, was the product upon which the prohibition of export to the United States was placed, and which was retained at home for feeding purposes. Since the opening of navigation, cargoes of the refuse screenings, these black seeds the circular in question takes exception to, have been shipped out to the United States. These re-cleaned screenings were shipped from Fort William under the supervision of the inspection department, and the standard sample that they were inspected to, was carefully selected by the officials of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, and did not contain weed seeds that would be detrimental to the stock using them.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: There was a circular delivered, I dare say, to most of the members of the House to-day from some one connected with this screening business in Fort William, claiming that the elevators were violating the Inspection of Grain law and were exporting screenings in a very large degree, millions of bushels in fact, from the elevators. Does the minister know anything about that?

Mr. CRERAR: The point is scarcely relevant to the item under discussion, but I will give the information. All our Western grain, when it is moving down to the terminal lake ports, is inspected in Winnipeg, and the Government inspector places upon it the dockage. When it enters the terminal elevators, it is the business of the operator to clean it to the standard set by the inspector. That means that a large volume of screenings from the grain is accumulated in the elevators. It has been the custom and the practice in previous years to ship these screenings to Duluth and other United States points. They had a market there which more readily absorbed that class of feed than our market in Canada. However, as I pointed out to the hon. member for Huntingdon, the regulations were enforced last autumn whereby these screenings had to be re-cleaned in the Fort William and the Port Arthur elevators, and the portion taken from them fit for animal food was retained in Canada.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister say if there was a price fixed?

Mr. CRERAR: There was a price fixed of $35 per ton at the Fort William elevators.

Mr. McMASTER: I gather from the minister's reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) that there were possible conditions under which he would suggest that mill feed would not be shipped to Eastern Canada. I must take exception to that. Canada is one unit, and he is Minister of Agriculture for the whole country. And once the price is fixed, or even if no price is fixed, on mill products, then all parts of the country must get equal treatment, as one danger of fixing prices is that after you fix a price, and there is not enough to go around, you must take upon yourselves to make an arbitrary distribution. That is one danger in fixing prices. But I would take very strong issue with the minister if he will say that he is going to favour any one part of the country at the expense of another. He will probably say

that the western mills are grinding this stuff, and therefore the western farmers should be entitled to it because it is made out of their product. My hon. friend from Chateauguay-Huntingdon says that would be all right if the western farmer would eat the flour, but his appetite does not go that far. Perhaps it is a work of supererogation, a painting of the lily or gilding of refined gold, to remind my hon. friend that he is Minister of Agriculture for the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and he must have a Dominion-wide appreciation of his own powers and his own position.

Mr. CRERAR: I can quite assure the hon. gentleman that I shall endeavour not to forget the fact that I am Minister of Agriculture for the whole of Canada, and I hope I am fair enough to endeavour to avoid any discrimination in the exercise of the powers of the department, against any portion of Canada. Possibly a condition might arise where it would be necessary to ship feeding stuffs from Eastern Canada to Western Canada. But there will be no discrimination against any part of Canada. I stated quite frankly that I did not feel like giving a definite, absolute guarantee to the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon that there would be no restriction of the shipment of bran and shorts from Western to Eastern Canada. I do not know what the conditions will be next year. But I lay this down, that there will be no discrimination so far as the administration of the department is concerned.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Will the minister see that the grain laws are carried out to the end that those who are producing feeds at Fort William are not debarred from getting the screenings from the elevator? A circular which I have received points out that the elevator people are sending the screenings to the United States and refusing them to the people who are making mill feed.

Mr. KAY: A moment ago the minister said that the price of screenings had been fixed at $35 a ton, Fort William. The Food Board have fixed the price of bran at $24 a ton, Fort William. As a feeder, I would rather have one ton of bran than two tons of these weeds. The price of shorts was fixed at $35. On what basis were the prices of these feeds fixed?

Mr. CRERAR: There was really no fixation of price of screenings, beyond this: the terminal elevators at Fort William had the situation placed before them and were asked to turn their screenings in at $35 a ton. They agreed to do so. I cannot say what consideration entered into the fixing of the price of bran and shorts; that was done by the Food Controller prior to any association of the Food Board with the Department of Agriculture. My own view is that, in relation to the price of other feeds, the price of bran and shorts was too low.

Mr. ROBB: The minister says that he does not know what consideration entered into the fixing of the price of bran and shorts. I will tell him the story as given to me by a man who was on the board which fixed the price. It was said: why do you want the price of this stuff fixed in bulk?—the trade is accustomed to buying it sacked, and the price should be fixed, to say the least, sacks included. Well, it was answered, the sacks cost $6 a ton and if you fix the price sacks included that will make it $6 higher. As we are on the eve of a general election, it would look better to fix the price at $24. I suppose that the price of screenings was fixed after the election, so that the same considerations did not apply.

Mr. TOBIN: On April 18 I put a question to the Minister of Agriculture:

> In reference to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1917, volume 1, page A-72, C. N. Lyster, Kirkdale, Quebec, care of bulls and stallions, $1,947.08, freight, $104.10.

In this case almost $2,000 was paid to a man named Lyster for taking care of a few bulls and stallions. He received fourteen bulls in one car—of these five were shipped to other districts, leaving him nine —and five stallions, for the care of which this country paid him $2,000.

Mr. CRERAR: When did this take place?

Mr. TOBIN: Last year. This has been going on for one or two years. Why should this live stock be sent to any individual farmer? The men who are paid large sums to look after live stock in the various districts throughout the country should see that these animals are well taken care of. When the animals are sent from one district to another, they should be put in good condition. If they are not in good condition, why should they not be sent to some of the experimental farms to be put in good condition? Mr. McClary who is in charge of the farm at Lennoxville, is a proper farmer; there is no better man in Canada. He runs the farm on a business basis and his work is appreciated by the people of the Eastern Townships. Imagine

paying a man $2,000 to take care of a few bulls and stallions. Is it the policy of the department to continue that waste of money in the future?

Mr. CRERAR: The transaction my hon. friend refers to took place before I became associated with the department and I have no personal knowledge of it. The policy is to run the department as efficiently and economically as possible and to give the service that it is intended to give. The suggestion of the hon. member that these sires be wintered, if necessary, at experimental farms is a good one and will be taken into consideration.

Mr. TOBIN: The head of the minister's department of live stock in the Eastern Townships is Mr. Girard, whose headquarters are at Sherbrooke. The matter to which I refer has been drawn to my attention by different farmers in that district. It is a disgrace that these breeding animals should be unloaded at various places in such bad condition.

Mr. KAY: The Government have been urging the farmers to increase the production of live stock, especially of cattle and pigs. A large number of expert agriculturists were sent out to hold meetings to urge the farmers to increase production, and with this end in view advertising was extensively carried on in the farm papers. In those advertisements and through the speakers at all the meetings, the promise was made that the Government would see to it that the farmers had feed in abundance at a low price.

Mr. ROBB: That was before the election.

Mr. KAY: Yes, but even since the election they have kept up that propaganda. I have here a sheet of advertisements under the headings: "Large supply of hog feed available," "Government co-operation," "bran and shorts," "United States corn." This is sent out by the Dominion of Canada, Department of Agriculture. The advertisement in connection with bran and shorts reads:

> By licensing the flour mills, the Government allows a profit of twenty-five cents a barrel on the flour only—the bran and shorts are to be sold at cost, which ensures the farmer getting his feed at a moderate price. Steps have also been taken to prevent the adulteration of bran and shorts.

We would all be very much interested to know what steps have been taken to prevent the adulteration of bran and shorts, because adulteration has been very extensively carried on during the last winter.

I know of cases where feed sold as bran and shorts has been fed to pigs and cows, and where a large number of them have died, and the post morten held by the veterinary has disclosed the fact that the feed has been responsible for the death. The advertisement on United States corn reads:

> The United States has the greatest corn crop in her history—more than 600,000,000 bushels in excess of 1916. The United States will have a large surplus for export which will be available to Canadian producers. . . . The licensing system will not likely be used in connection with the 1917 crop which will be on the market about the middle of December, but the United States Government will exercise some form of control which will prevent speculation. In the meantime, any one in Canada can import American corn for any legitimate purpose, such as feed, by obtaining a license. Application for license is made through the Canadian Food Controller.

I do not wish to read all these advertisements of which there is a full page, and I have several more of them. The whole drift of these advertisements and of the meetings that were held was to make the farmer believe he would get plenty of good feed at a reasonable price. The poor farmer believed that promise of the Government just as he believed the promise in regard to non-conscription of farmers, and he prepared to increase the number of brood sows and the production of pigs during this year. What happened? Until late this spring no corn came into this country from the United States, and what corn came in then was badly damaged by heating. I do not, of course, hold the Government responsible for that. As regards bran, shorts and middlings, we have been told for a very long time that the Allies require all the flour that we can supply; in fact, that we must curtail our consumption of flour in order to ship flour overseas. The Canada Food Board has even passed orders restricting the quantity of flour which may be eaten. It is very difficult to convince any farmer or any other man in Canada who knows the conditions that there is any shortage of flour in this country. Every dealer or farmer who wishes to buy a car of feed is obliged to purchase 150 to 200 bags of flour in the car. If I wished to buy a carload of mixed bran, shorts, middlings and mill feed, and I wrote to one of the large mills for a quotation, the reply I would get would be that I would have to take in that car 200 bags of flour. I have no use for those 200 bags of flour, neither has a dealer any use for so much flour. Not only from the point of view of the farmer

12 m.

or dealer who did not want the flour, but from the point of view of the example which such action gives to the people of Canada, it is difficult to convince any body of people that there is a shortage of flour and that the consumption of flour should be curtailed when the millers are forcing flour into the hands of farmers and dealers against their wishes. I hold here carload quotations from some of the larger mills. This letter is dated January 31, 1918:

> We can book at present a few mixed cars of flour and feed for February shipment. However, the great scarcity of feeds forces us to ask for flour to be included in the cars. Our cars are made up somewhat as follows:
> 150 bags flour.
> 100 bags bran.
> 100 bags "Bullrush" middlings.
> 100 bags white middlings.

This is another letter, dated January 14, 1918:

> We require 200 bags of flour per car.

That was from the Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, Limited. This is another letter, dated March 19, 1918:

> 200 bags Standard flour.
> 100 bags "Bullrush" middlings.
> 50 bags white middlings.
> 50 bags bran.

And then there are 200 bags of some of those patent feeds which are made up from sweepings and dust and ground weeds, cobwebs, ground straw and that sort of thing. The minister should take up with the Canada Food Board the absolute necessity of making the millers retain their flour for shipment overseas. I have had several conversations with the minister in regard to this matter, and he seems to be under the impression that the mills have ceased putting flour into these carloads of feed, but I assure him that is not the case.

Mr. CRERAR: Are the mills still making that a condition of their sales?

Mr. KAY: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: Will the hon. member furnish me with the names of the mills?

Mr. KAY: I was speaking last week to a dealer who has en route now a car which contains 200 bags of flour. I have seen other letters, and I can furnish the minister with them, but the local dealer says: "I am not going to let you have this letter, because if I do so, and if it comes back to the mills that I have given their name to the minister, they will never again sell me any feed flour; I must have the feed and the farmers are willing to buy the feed at the prices I ask." The dealer is compelled to get rid of the flour as best he can.

I saw another letter from one large mill that my friend had written to asking why they forced flour on him that he did not want. The mill replied that they did not want to force flour on anybody. That is perfectly true in a way, but the mill went on to say in their letter, "If you take two hundred bags of flour in your car we will ship your car at once. If you cannot take two hundred we cannot ship your carload of feed at all. We have not enough feed, and we will send you a few tons of bran and shorts at local freight rates." The minister knows very well how that would run up the price of feed to the farmer.

There is another matter. The price of bran and shorts in bulk was fixed last fall at Fort William. The dealer was allowed to charge five cents a bag, I believe, over and above his cost if he sold out of the car. A great many of the dealers on account of the shortage of feed have asked very much higher prices than the fixed price. Very often the dealer did not buy direct from the miller, but from a jobber. Now the jobbers have been able to sell straight carloads of feed; how I do not know, because no dealer can buy a straight carload of feed from the mills. The jobbers, however seem to have been able to do it and to sell to the dealer. In every case they charge four or five dollars per ton more for a straight carload of bran, shorts and middlings than if a certain number of bags of flour were included. The jobber himself has charged more than the fixed price for bran and shorts, but the farmer could not complain against his local dealer, because he was in the position where he had to have the feed and could only get a ton here and a ton there at a time, and if he complained that the dealer charged too much the dealer would give him no more feed. The live stock industry has been very, very seriously affected by the slackness or incompetence of the Canada Food Board in dealing with the question of feed stuffs. The farmer who believed the propaganda put out by the Board of Agriculture last fall believed he would be able to buy feed at a fair price, and largely increased the number of his pigs and dairy animals generally. When winter came he found he had a great many more animals than he was accustomed to have, and more than he would have had if it had not been for this propaganda, and when he could not get the feed he required he was discouraged. His faith in

the Government and in the Department of Agriculture, to which he looks for protection, has been rudely shaken and very justifiably so. It is almost incomprehensible why the department should have allowed this situation to continue for so long as it has.

I should like to take up for a moment the question of why so much bran and shorts and mill feed has been allowed to be exported from this country to the United States during the last year. I have tried by questions during this year to find out from the Minister of Agriculture how much bran and shorts have been exported to the United States. I asked if the exportation of bran, shorts and mill feed to the United States was allowed, and if so, how much had been exported during the last six months, and he gave me a list of a few thousand bags which had been exported to the West Indies and Newfoundland and never mentioned the exportation to the United States at all. I put a further question on the Order Paper asking for the exportation to the United States, and after it had been on the Order Paper for some days it was changed to an order for a return. A day or so ago I asked the Minister of Customs when I might expect a return to that order and he professed to know nothing about it, and the Minister of Agriculture seemed to be in the same position. However, since then an hon. friend on this side of the House has got the information, so I will not bother my hon. friend further in that respect. I find that from August, 1917, to February, 1918, both inclusive, the value of bran, shorts and mill feed exported from this country was $3,666,784, of which $3,512,945 was exported to the United States.

Mr. CURRIE: What is the item before the House?

The CHAIRMAN: Item No. 48, as follows:

For the development of the dairy industries, and the improvement of transportation, sale and trade in food and other agricultural products, $155,000.

Mr. KAY: It is very difficult for a farmer to understand why, when we are so short of feed in this country, this Government which had prohibited the exportation of feed without a license should have allowed such a vast amount of feed to be shipped to the United States.

Mr. CRERAR: What time was this feed shipped to the United States?

[Mr. Kay.]

Mr. KAY: I will give the figures by months: August, 1917, $959,806; September, $406,091; October, $594,068; November, $806,904; December, $624,733; January, 1918, $182,563; February, $92,619.

Mr. CRERAR: What classes of feed were included in that?

Mr. KAY: Bran, mill feed, etc.

Mr. CRERAR: From what source did my hon. friend get his information?

Mr. KAY: From the Customs Department. I will hand the statement to the minister. I do not like to take up the time of the committee—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KAY: My hon. friends are not farmers or they would be very glad to support me in a plea for better treatment of the farmer by the Government of this country. Some of our friends on the other side of the House are farmers, and some profess to be farmers, but we all know they have not stood up in the House this session for the rights of the farmers, so I am not at all surprised to find them wearying a little because it is getting late. I think the whole question of the farming industry has received altogether too little consideration from the House during this session The agricultural industry is the backbone of the country. We have been told on the excellent authority of the Government that the farmer is doing as much to win the war as the man in the front line trenches. We have been urged to produce and still urged to produce. A great many of the ministers seem to think that all a farmer has to do is to put his seed in the ground in the spring and that the good Lord alone will harvest it for him. Would the minister give the committee some explanation of how this feed situation has become as bad as it is and some guarantee to the farmers that, during next winter at least, steps will be taken by the Government to control, not only the price of feed, but the millers, that flour, which is needed overseas, is not forced into the country at the expense of the farmers and that farmers will be assured a sufficient supply of feed in order to produce the beef and pork necessary to supply our Allies? The dairy industry, unless it receives some convincing assurance from the Government, will be very much curtailed during next winter.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Chairman, I followed with quite a considerable degree of inter-

est the remarks of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay). As far as the lack of feed for live-stock during last winter is concerned, I repeat that it was all due to the difficulty of transportation. At the time the campaign for greater hog production in Canada was embarked upon last autumn it was the intention of the Government—and the Government and the Department of Agriculture endeavoured to live up to that intention—to supply feed, or to see that feed was supplied, to the farmers who undertook the production of these hogs. The United States last year had the largest corn crop in their history. The farmers in Indiana, Iowa, Ohio and certain other corn-producing states could not market their corn throughout the winter months for the lack of transportation. I want to assure my hon. friend that the importance of the matter did not escape the attention of the department at Ottawa. Early in January I brought one of the largest cash brokers in Chicago, a man whom I know personally as a perfectly reliable man, to discuss the whole situation with me in Ottawa and I endeavoured to make an arrangement with him whereby corn might be purchased and shipped into Canada at the least possible margin. The situation which resulted, in consequence of winter storms and the desperate tie up of transportation in the United States, made it practically impossible to move the stuff. I do not think the Department of Agriculture should be held responsible for weather conditions over which they had absolutely no control.

Mr. KAY: How was it that we could ship so much bran to the United States if the railways were tied up?

Mr. CRERAR: I would like a closer definition of the item of "mill feed" that is at the head of the return which the hon. gentleman has handed to me. I do know that since last December the exports of bran and shorts to the United States were strictly under license from the Canada Food Board.

Mr. KAY: Not before December.

Mr. CRERAR: I think it was in December the licenses were first issued.

Mr. KAY: I think it was in August.

Mr. CRERAR: Not under the Canada Food Board. Their licenses, I think, were first issued in December. The return from which the hon. gentleman quoted was an earlier return than that which he referred to last and which I think stated correctly the amount of bran and shorts which was permitted to leave Canada under license. However, the point is one upon which there seems to be some doubt, and I shall take means of verifying my information at the earliest possible moment, and I shall convey any information I may get to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has also complained about the difficulty the farmers had in securing bran and shorts from Canadian millers and of the prices that dealers were charging for the bran and shorts they purchased. I have just this to say, that the Canada Food Board has passed certain regulations governing the prices that shall be charged by dealers for these commodities. It is not primarily the business of the Canada Food Board to enforce these regulations. When a regulation is passed it becomes the law, and it is the duty of the local authorities, or any other authorities who may be charged with the enforcement of law, to see that it is carried out.

Mr. VIEN: Is there still an embargo on the shipment of bran and shorts from the West eastward?

Mr. CRERAR: That embargo has been removed. Reverting to the point I was discussing, if the Canada Food Board are to protect buyers of bran and shorts against exorbitant prices on the part of dealers, they must be supplied at least with the names of dealers who are charging these prices. My hon. friend made a statement that there is a reluctance on the part of farmers to supply that information for fear that they will have difficulty in buying from their local dealer later on. That is one of the difficulties that is inherent in the enforcement of such a law as we refer to, made and created for exceptional conditions. The position of the mills in shipping bran and shorts to customers and insisting that a flour sale shall accompany a bran and shorts sale is clearly against the regulations and instructions sent out by the Canada Food Board. I repeat that if my hon. friend will give me the name of the mill he has made reference to, I will see that the necessary steps are taken to correct the condition of which he complains and to prevent a repetition in the future. Unless the name of the offending mill owner is given it is pretty hard to see how anything can be done. I want to assure my hon. friend that I realize—and I hope he will give me credit for my good intentions in this respect—the very great importance of seeing that those who are engaged in

our dairy industry are supplied with the feed that they require for their stock during the winter months. I hope the same conditions will not obtain next winter as did obtain during the past winter. We can reasonably expect that we shall not have such a severe winter, and with normal transportation conditions I think there will be very little difficulty in supplying the necessary feed. If we should have another severe winter and there should be an almost complete tie-up of transportation, those are difficulties of course that are very hard to overcome.

Mr. ROBB: I want to say a word or two further before the minister gets away from this item. How does he expect to answer the complaint of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) as regards the millers compelling any person who buys bran and shorts to take the flour also, when his own department issues different instructions prohibiting the miller from shipping a straight carload of bran and shorts? These are the facts. Does the minister want the evidence?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is surely mistaken.

Mr. ROBB: I will give the minister the evidence and clear the matter up. Here is a letter from the Western Canada Flour Mills:

Mr. CRERAR: Of what date?

Mr. ROBB: The letter is dated February 5, 1918.

Mr. CRERAR: I think I stated a moment ago, if I might be permitted to speak again, that these definite instructions had been sent out to the mills subsequent to that date.

Mr. ROBB: Just recently, I know all about it, within the last two or three weeks after the western cattle dealers were able to send their cattle out to grass. The letter to which I have just referred contains this statement:

> Re the other cars of bran referred to, we are very sorry to have to advise you that it was impossible for us to get this past the Food Controller in the West at the present time. He absolutely prohibits the shipment east of straight carloads of bran or shorts or even straight cars of mixed bran and shorts.

This is a statement from a reliable concern, as the minister knows well. Here is an extract from another letter dated April 23, also from the Western Canada Flour Mills:

> As far as we can see at the present time there is no more chance of this bran being shipped than there was some months ago, as no straight cars of feed are allowed to be shipped from any of the western mills to Eastern Canada.

Mr. SEXSMITH: It does seem to me that the Food Control Board is making a failure in the policy of endeavouring to control prices, because as a result of that control prices are not going down, but getting higher. In my district as a result of the attempt on the part of the Food Control Board to fix the price of bran and shorts the millers mixed eighty per cent of barley with bran, and what was supposed to cost us from $40 to $45 a ton actually cost $60 to $65. That is what they have been doing all the time, and the Food Control Board sitting in Ottawa has been issuing orders and not seeing that they are carried out.

Mr. VIEN: While we are considering the development of the dairy industry, I would draw the minister's attention to the prevailing conditions in the province of Ontario and elsewhere throughout Canada in relation to the necessary help to carry on food production. The minister has probably taken cognizance of the first report of the Committee on Agriculture, in which it is stated that in the dairying counties of Ontario there is a great demand for experienced help, not only in the dairying industries, but also in the farming industry generally, And the great demand for farm help exists all over the country. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee, acting upon its instructions, wired the several Ministers of Agriculture in Halifax, Fredericton, Charlottetown, Quebec, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Edmonton and Victoria, asking them to inform the Committee on Agriculture by wire of the number of men and women immediately needed on farms as much for seeding as for harvesting. He has received many telegrams which are embodied in the report to which I referred, and which I may be permitted to quote.

Mr. CURRIE: The report in question has been placed on the table of the House, and has been dealt with by motion. Once that is done, it is not competent for the hon. gentleman during the same session to bring forward the document and discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN: I have paid very special attention to what the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) has been saying, keeping in view the point raised by the hon. member for Simcoe. If the report had

been laid on the table of the House and disposed of, I would have had no hesitation whatever in ruling that the point of order was well taken. But I am informed by the deputy clerk that the report in question, although laid on the table of the House, has never been discussed and concurred in.

Mr. VIEN: That was my opinion, and I know the facts to be as stated by the chairman. The answers to the telegrams sent out by the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture came abundantly from all sources. One of these telegrams came from Winnipeg. It is dated April, 1918, and is signed by J. H. Evans. This gentleman informed the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture:

Immediate demand is for experienced farm labour. Impossible to estimate immediate needs owing to uncertainty of drain made on farm hands by conscription. Basing estimate on last year's experience require ten thousand additional help for harvest. Domestic help problematical. Tremendous demand for experienced domestics but not for women farm help.

From Yarmouth, N.S., under date April 29, 1918, came this telegram from Mr. Cumming:

Seeding just begun. Farmers will reduce their cultivated crops in accordance with labour shortage but for maximum production there should be at least four thousand men available.

From Fredericton, N.B., Mr. J. P. Tweeddale wired:

New Brunswick cannot spare any man who is a farmer or farm labourer, if increased production is expected. With these men in the country last year hundreds of tons of hay fields, of oats and potatoes, were not harvested on account of scarcity of labour. We had farmers exerting every effort and would have splendid result. New orders re conscription farmers paralyzed the whole movement and unless positive orders issued from Ottawa insuring farmers that they will not be taken they will not produce enough to feed city populations. Large delegation farmers here yesterday, delegation going to Ottawa.

Another telegram from Mr. Marshall, Alberta, states that if there is an average harvest between six and seven hundred men will be needed.

Another telegram came from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the province of Saskatchewan, which reads as follows:

Your wire re labour: demand for men well met at present but new regulations Military Service Act will take from five to seven thousand men consisting of farmers, farm labourers and farmers' sons, or from every fifteen or twenty farms in Saskatchewan, as men even approximately as useful for production are not available, the effect upon our wheat production with seeding only about half completed can be realized.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman is dealing with a report on wheat production. We are now on a dairying item. I do not think it is competent for him to continue to discuss that matter. We are getting along late at night, and want to get away.

Mr. VIEN: Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to say that this report deals not only with the labour required for wheat production, but it particularly states that in the dairying counties of Ontario there is a great demand for experienced help.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman should confine his discussion to the dairying industry; he should not discuss the part of the report dealing with wheat.

Mr. VIEN: The dairying industry, as much as the wheat industry, is covered in the report. Not only that, but if I may be allowed, I will say that the item under discussion reads: " For the development of the dairying industries, and the improvement of transportation, sale and trade in food and other agricultural products." And it seems that the trade in agricultural products and food will be greatly hampered if the production of food is diminished.

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Chairman, this is dragging that subject in by the tail. The fact is that the report has nothing to do with that at all. The hon. gentleman has read all there is about the dairying industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Would any other hon. gentleman like to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SEXSMITH: I think the point of order raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is not well taken. If you are discussing the dairy industry, surely you have a right to discuss the food given to the animals. Throughout the province of Ontario just recently we are feeding flour to our hogs. That is a fact, and I want to ask the minister this: it seems to me that this food board—

Mr. CURRIE: Order. The hon. gentleman knows that that is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The item before the Committee for discussion is, as every one will admit, a very general item, indeed. It covers the development of the dairying

industry and the improvement, transport, sale and trade in food and other agricultural products. The scope of the discussion upon such an item is necessarily very wide, and, so far, I would hesitate about ruling that my hon. friend from Lotbiniere is out of order. I may say that he is coming perilously near the danger line, and I would ask him to assist the Committee in disposing of the item as early as possible by remaining well within the limits of discussion.

Mr. VIEN: I will surely abide by your ruling, and even by your suggestion. I refer hon. gentlemen to this first report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture, with which hon. members generally are not familiar. I had considerable difficulty to secure a copy of it. It is not printed or distributed, but it is most interesting. You will find other telegrams than those I have already read, from Mr. Riddell, superintendent of Trades and Labour in Ontario.

Mr. CRERAR: I think he is in the Ontario Agriculture Department.

Mr. VIEN: And another from the private secretary of the Minister of Agriculture of British Columbia. There is another from the secretary of the Department of Agriculture in Quebec. These telegrams are all to the same effect, that there is a considerable shortage of men for the farming industry all over this country. They are unanimous; these telegrams truly depict the situation at a date as late as April 29. And the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) concludes his report by saying:

> The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization desires to express to the Minister its opinion that his presence at its meetings would afford assistance and gratification to the Committee and suggests that its discussions might also be interesting and helpful to his department.
>
> The Committee also entertains the opinion that suggestions for legislation considered worthy of the department's attention, if submitted to the Committee, would stimulate interest in its work and offer valuable matter for assistance to the department.

And then it was moved by the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), and seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Lang) and carried:

> That it is the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that the Minister of Militia should be requested to order (a) that actual farmers who have been called up shall be given leave of absence—

Mr. CURRIE: I want to ask whether that is in order.

[The Chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. gentleman state the point of order?

Mr. CURRIE: The point is that the Military Service Act has already been discussed in the House, and the hon. gentleman is starting to discuss that matter.

Mr. VIEN: I am not discussing that.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member for Lotbiniere anything to say on the point of order?

Mr. VIEN: Nothing, Mr. Chairman, except that I am concluding the report before I come to the discussion of the item now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: In connection with the point of order just raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe, I beg to say that I will permit the reading of the report passed by the Committee on Agriculture and which has not yet been concurred in by the House. I may add that any discussion which might possibly arise out of that report relating to the Military Service Act or the Order in Council concerning the Military Service Act, I would consider to be absolutely out of order.

Mr. VIEN: The concluding recommendation in the report is:

> That no actual farmers be required to report until all others in the class affected by the Order in Council of 20th April, 1918, have been put in service; such leave of absence and delay in reporting to be conditional upon their actual employment in farming.

I think, Sir, that another very important document was sent to the Government at a very late date, as late as last week, in which the conference of farmers, recently held in Ottawa, embodied its views. I understand that they have sent that report to His Excellency the Governor General and that it has been referred by him to the Privy Council.

What steps has the department taken with a view to securing for the farming industry the men who are so badly needed? The evidence of this need was given by these gentlemen who met in conference from all parts of Canada, and is set forth also in the document to which I refer, of which my hon. friend must surely have a copy. The Prime Minister told us the other day that the document was on its way and that he expected it to reach his office shortly.

Mr. CRERAR: There was a sufficient supply of farm help to attend to the seeding operations; at least, the reports show that that was the case in Western Canada. Any disturbance of farming operations result-

ing from the recent amendments to the Military Service Act will have to be looked after in the most effective way that can be devised. The registration that is to be made by the Canada Registration Board will afford a great deal of useful information in working this problem out.

Mr. VIEN: Has my hon. friend taken cognizance of the conclusions arrived at by the last conference of farmers held in Ottawa, as embodied in the report to which I referred a moment ago? Has any action since been taken?

Mr. CRERAR: The time intervening has been short. My hon. friend scarcely expects that a policy could be mapped out in so short a time.

Mr. VIEN: Then my hon. friend has received the document of which I speak? He intimates that he has taken cognizance of it.

Mr. CRERAR: I have not received it, but I was present and heard the representations made by the delegation of farmers which was here last week.

Mr. VIEN: Has my hon. friend taken any steps to carry out or give effect to the conclusions embodied in the first report of the standing committee on agriculture?

Mr. CRERAR: Any announcement in that respect would be made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is the Government really considering the matter?

Mr. VIEN: What is the policy of the Government with reference to the farming interests concerned? Has the Government modified its views respecting the enforcement of the recent Order in Council calling even the farmers to military service?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend can hardly expect me to answer that question. Any announcement of policy would of necessity come from the Prime Minister.

Mr. SEXSMITH: The Food Control Board passed an order early in the winter fixing the price of bran and shorts and leading the farmers to believe that they or the Government were going to prevent the millers from profiteering. The millers were allowed a profit of twenty-five cents a barrel on flour and were to sell bran and shorts practically at cost. It has been brought to the attention of the department that the millers are mixing bran and shorts with barley and selling the product at $65 a ton. That should be stopped, because they are making a greater profit now than they did before the price was fixed. Another thing. The farmers' clubs were buying carloads of bran and shorts and they were compelled to take a certain percentage of flour in each car. I have it on good authority that in some districts the farmers actually fed that flour to their hogs; they had more than they wanted. Now, another order has been issued, providing that if a farmer who lives within five miles of a village has more than six weeks' supply of flour in store, he must take the surplus to the man from whom he bought it. In order to get the bran or feed, these farmers' clubs were obliged to buy more flour than they wanted and now they have it on their hands. Whom are they to send it back to?

Mr. CRERAR: It is true that an order did issue from the Food Board a few weeks ago requiring those who had certain supplies of flour to return the surplus to dealers from whom they had purchased it. Undoubtedly that order worked a hardship on the farmers. The matter was drawn to the attention of the Food Board and and amending order has been or will be sent out in the immediate future requiring that farmers shall simply report to the dealers the stocks of flour that they have on hand. The end in view, of course, is to gather up as much flour as possible for shipment overseas to meet the pressing need there until the new wheat crop goes on the market. As to the feeding of flour to the hogs, there is this peculiar position: flour, bran and shorts mixed together was the cheapest food that a farmer could feed his hogs, owing to the price of barley and oats The price of wheat was fixed by the Board of Grain Supervisors last fall on the basis of $2.21, Fort William, while the price of oats and barley was not fixed. It was urged on the board that the price of oats should also be fixed, but it was rather difficult for Canada to take action in that respect unless similar action was taken by the United States. Although in some cases flour has been fed to the hogs, I think the practice has been by no means widespread.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The reason why the price of oats went above the price of flour and wheat was because of the demand for seed.

Mr KAY: The minister asks me to give him the names of some millers who were forcing flour out with their cars. I name two: the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, and the Ogilvie Milling Company.

Mr. VIEN: Can we expect very shortly a definition of the Government's policy as to the supply of men for the farming industry? The minister stated that he could not tell us what change would take place or if any change would take place.

Mr. CRERAR: I would suggest that the hon. member direct his question to the Prime Minister at the morning sitting.

Mr. PELLETIER: Suppose we take the case of a farmer who is the owner of a butter factory and who is making butter and cheese. This man is of military age—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The question is certainly not in order. I have given my ruling that all matters connected with the Military Service Act cannot be discussed here. I have perhaps allowed one or two questions which are more or less out of order, but I must draw the line somewhere.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, the House reverted to Routine Proceedings in order that certain motions might be made.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Hon. Mr. Rowell (President of the Council) presented the third and final report of the Special Committee on Pensions.

Hon. Mr. Rowell moved:

That the report of the Special Committee on Pensions, which has been presented to the House this 20th day of May, together with the proceedings and evidence appended thereto, be printed forthwith and that rule 74 in relation thereto be suspended.

Mr. McKENZIE: When will the report be taken into consideration by the House?

Mr. ROWELL: At the earliest opportunity. I should think that it will be taken up on Wednesday in view of other business being fixed for Tuesday.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): I desire to accelerate on the Order Paper, Government notices of motion in reference to zinc bounties, and to providing ways and means to retire certain members of the Civil Service, in regard to which motions I gave notice this morning. With the unanimous consent of the House, I beg to move:

That the order made this day, for consideration in Committee of the Whole to-morrow of the resolutions respecting Zinc Bounties and Civil Service Commission be rescinded and the said resolutions be considered in Committee of the Whole forthwith.

[Mr. Kay.]

Motion agreed to.

ZINC BOUNTIES.

On motion of Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance), the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the provisions of The Zinc Bounties Act, 1916, chapter twenty-seven of the Statutes of 1916, be renewed and continued in force until the thirty-first day of July, 1920.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister explain the resolution?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under an Act of Parliament passed in 1916, it was provided that a bounty of two cents a pound be paid upon zinc produced in Canada, when the price fell below the standard price of zinc on the London market, which is the world market for that product. It was, however, provided in that Act that no bounty should be paid during the war, and that the amount, when payable, should not exceed $400,000. In 1915, after the beginning of the war, it was considered very desirable in the national interest that Canada

1 a.m.

produce a high-grade zinc. It was at that time not produced in Canada, and I hardly think in the United States, and it was particularly desirable for use in munition works. The Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of British Columbia was induced by the Shell Committee, and later on by the Imperial Munitions Board, to incur very heavy expenditures on capital account in erecting a plant to produce this high-grade zinc, and altogether they spent $2,500,000. It was represented to them that they would receive from the British Government and from some of the other Allied powers orders continuously during the war, so as to enable them to amortize the expenditures they had made in erecting their plant in order to produce this high-grade zinc. They did produce a very considerable quantity, about 30,000 tons altogether, for which they received 15 cents per pound. The price previous to that, in the earlier part of the war, was 40 cents per pound, and Canada and Great Britain have had the advantage of that reduced price brought about by the entrance of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company into the market. By reason of Russia's withdrawal from the war and by reason of the entry of the United

States into the war, all orders for high-grade zinc will cease on the 30th day of June in this year.

When the Consolidated Smelting Company embarked upon the enterprise of producing high-grade zinc, the Government of the day recognized it was in the national interest to pay a bounty under certain conditions, and now that the company is unable to sell its product to any of the countries of the world now engaged in the war, they claim that this assistance should be rendered to them now and for two years to come. The total amount to be paid as bounties will not exceed $400,000, the amount stated in the Bill. Seventy-five per cent of the zinc consumed in Canada is what is known as low-grade zinc; that is not the technical term, but the metal is low grade. It is, however, just as useful to the greater part of the trade as the high-grade zinc, and generally sells at seven cents per pound. The Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company anticipate that gradually they will be able to reduce their costs of the high-grade ore from 9 cents, which is the cost at the present time, to 7 cents. If they reduce it to 8 cents we shall only have a bounty of one cent a pound to pay, representing the difference between the present London standard price and the price they get on this side of the water. The main purpose of the resolution and of the Bill will be to accelerate the time within which they shall receive payment of this bounty. Upon the second reading of the Bill I shall be pleased to give any further information that is desired.

Mr. McKENZIE: What has been paid already?

Mr. MACLEAN: Nothing whatever.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no enlargement of the original appropriation?

Mr. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the high-grade or the low-grade zinc that costs 9 cents a pound?

Mr. MACLEAN: The high-grade zinc that is now produced electrolitically by the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company. They have been able, by the erection of a modern system of production, to reduce their costs from 40 cents to 9 cents.

Mr. VIEN: How is it that if it costs 9 cents a pound to produce, it sells for 7 cents a pound?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the low-grade metal, which is produced much more cheaply and which is not so desirable for munitions purposes

Mr. VIEN: The higher grade zinc must sell for a higher price.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no market for it at the present time except the Canadian market, and the Canadian market largely consumes the low-grade metal.

Mr. VIEN: Could we not sell it to the United States?

Mr. A. K MACLEAN: There is no demand for it in the United States as they are producing the ore in very large quantities themselves, and largely by virtue of the financial credits being given by Great Britain to the United States, Great Britain is obtaining her requirements from the United States. It was expected that large contracts would be received from Russia, but now that she has withdrawn from the war the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company do not anticipate any further trade with her.

Mr. VIEN: A further study of the subject may change my opinion, but it appears to me that if there is such a small market for this product it is scarcely a commendable policy to spend $400,000 to encourage such an industry. We might spend the money on something more productive.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend must remember that it was of vital importance to national interests at the time this industry was started to produce a high-grade zinc in Canada. The industry was started on the request in the first instance of the Shell Committee, and upon request later made by the British Government. It was then the Canadian Government intervened, and sought to extend aid to the company in producing this high-grade zinc. Subsequently an Act of Parliament was passed providing for this assistance, so we are almost in honour bound to stand by the contract made with this company. The maximum to be paid will be $400,000, but I hope the amount will not meet that figure.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I understand the promoters of this Bill are monopolists, and while I am not going to oppose this measure to-night I give notice to the minister that when the Bill comes up for second reading we shall have to investigate. I understand that the ordinary mine owners of British

Columbia, while they may not be opposed to this and probably will benefit by it to a certain extent, want other considerations besides a bounty on zinc and lead. I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company and the Trail Smelter are practically one and the same thing and that the Consolidated produces practically all the ore in the East Kootenay district. The yearly figures are as follows: Paradise, 1,089 tons; Sullivan (zinc), (this is the Consolidated), 30,579 tons; Daly Burton, 34 tons; Hidden Treasure, 2 tons; St. Eugene, 257 tons; Providence, 30 tons; Sullivan, 229 tons; St. Eugene, 214 tons. So the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company practically own the whole shooting match as far as East Kootenay is concerned, and you might say the same thing of the whole mining industry of British Columbia with the exception of Rossland. The Miners' Association have been asking the Government for a duty of five per cent on zinc and lead coming in from the United States, and also for a Royal Commission to investigate the whole question of the Trail Smelter and the mining industries of that section of British Columbia. I would ask the minister to consult with his colleagues and see if he cannot agree when the Bill comes up for second reading to give the ordinary miners, the proletariat, a Royal Commission to investigate this whole question to find out whether it is not one giant monopoly which is sucking the blood of the common people of British Columbia. Unfortunately, the people of British Columbia are not represented to-day in this House by a single Liberal member, and they take their political life in their hands to go against this hydra-headed monster of monopoly.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN thereupon moved to introduce Bill No. 109, to provide for the payment of bounties on zinc produced and zinc ores mined in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RETIREMENT OF AGED AND INFIRM CIVIL SERVANTS.

House in Committee on the following proposed resolution.

That it is expedient to provide that the Civil Service Commission shall forthwith prepare and submit to the Governor in Council for approval the names of all officers, clerks and employees who, owing to advanced age, failing health, or lack of experience or ability, or other cause, are not capable of rendering or do not render efficient service to the State, and should, therefore, be retired from the public service; stating the conditions under which each such officer, clerk or employee should be retired, including the pecuniary provision, if any, that should, in the opinion of the Commission, be made for any such officer, clerk or employee, and in each case the date recommended for his retirement; and for the pecuniary provision to be made for any such officer, clerk or employee, and for the determination of the amount to be paid, the deductions therefrom and the method by which the amount of such deductions shall be paid; and that upon approval by the Governor in Council of the recommendations of the Commission, such officer, clerk or employee shall be retired upon the date fixed and conditions specified, and any moneys required for such pecuniary provisions may be paid out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.—Hon. A. K. Maclean, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: It is too late to discuss the resolution, but when it comes up at a later time I would be glad if the minister would give us some further information. I do not know whether or not the House realizes that under this resolution we will be establishing a superannuation system. Years ago, not very wisely—I think it was one of the mistakes of our own Government—the superannuation system was practically abolished. Here we are going to re-establish it, not by a direct Act of Parliament, but we are going to leave it to the Governor in Council. The reasons may be very strong, and I am not opposing it, but I am only asking the House to consider what it means, because Parliament ought to have a clear conception of the very large order which the Government is receiving in this form.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 110, respecting Aged and Infirm members of the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. LEMIEUX: What business will be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m., Tuesday.

Tuesday, May 21, 1918.

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

OFFICIALS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his recommendation and the Clerk's report in the matter of the appointment of Mr. Marcel Gabard to the position of Official Reporter of the Debates of the House of Commons, in place of Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, superannuated.

Mr. RICHARDSON: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether this appointment dates from the beginning of next session or dates from now? One man is superannuated and you appoint another in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The record speaks for itself. I think it is the 18th of May last.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AND JOURNALS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) presented the first report of the special committee to consider the consolidation of the Votes and Proceedings and Journals of the House as follows:

The Special Committee appointed to consider and report upon the question of consolidating the Votes and Proceedings and the Journals of the House of Commons beg to report that they have not had time to give full consideration to the matter. They beg to recommend, therefore, that the details connected with the work of such consideration be worked out during the recess by the Chief Clerk of Journals, Votes and Proceedings and Orders; and that a special committee be appointed at the beginning of the next session to fully consider the matter.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale) presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders as follows:

The Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders beg leave to present the following as their second report:

Your committee has had under consideration the petition of William Louis Scott and others for an Act of incorporation under the name of the British Canadian Insurance Company—in Bill B2 of the Senate named United Canadian Insurance Company—and also the report, dated 18th May, 1918, of the examiner of Petitions for Private Bills thereon, stating that the notice of application had only been published for three consecutive weeks in the Canada Gazette instead of five consecutive weeks as required by Rule 91.

As your committee has informed itself on the matter and had explanations made and is of opinion that no interests either public or private, will be prejudicially affected by the shortage of notice in this case, it recommends that the notice, as published, be deemed sufficient.

Mr. MOWAT moved:

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders be concurred in.

Mr. CLEMENTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), I beg to move:

That Bill No. 107 Letter B of the Senate intituled an Act to incorporate the British Canadian Insurance Company be placed on the Order Paper amongst private Bills for second reading this day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion as submitted by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) is not an amendment to the main motion. It would be quite competent for the House to accept the motion to concur in the report, and subsequently for the hon. member to ask the leave of the House to submit his motion. But, it is not properly an amendment to the main motion at all. The report points out that although the notice of a certain Bill had not been published for five weeks, no public interests had been prejudiced thereby, and recommends to the House that the notice, as published, be deemed sufficient.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The main motion is that the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders be concurred in and the motion, as submitted by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, is that the Bill referred to in this report be placed on the Order Paper among private Bills for second reading this day. It is not an amendment at all. The motion might be moved with the concurrence of the House. Of course it is understood that either of these motions can only be submitted by the unanimous consent of the House. I now put the motion moved by Mr. Mowat that the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders be concurred in. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Have the Government taken into consideration the very great desirability of having the House adjourn instead of proroguing, in order that the members may

show their genuine enthusiasm at this critical time by manifesting a desire to respond to any necessity that may arise after the Premier's return from Great Britain?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Unanimously carried.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really cannot say that the matter has been under consideration at the present time, but I will give my best attention to what my hon. friend suggests.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did not exactly catch the tenor of the desire of my hon. friend from Peterborough.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is for an adjournment instead of proroguing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On Friday?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Whenever it comes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As soon as the business before us is closed, the House has to prorogue, and we will all be glad to do so. I call the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that Friday, the 24th instant, is Victoria Day, and a statutory holiday. I want to know if my right hon. friend intends that the House shall sit that day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the House cannot prorogue before that day I think we should sit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Of course the House has the power to do what it sees fit, but I should think the law ought to be observed in this case, as in all other cases. The 24th of May is a statutory holiday, and should be observed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Parliament has sat before on that day, and I think on the first day of July, as well.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Prorogue to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should say that under the circumstances we might observe the day better by attending to our parliamentary duties here than by adjourning from Thursday to Saturday.

REPORT ON THE MILLING INDUSTRY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. NICKLE: Would the Minister of Labour tell us whether or not it is his intention to lay on the table of the House, before prorogation, the report in regard to the milling industry?

[Mr. Burnham.]

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): The report, as soon as complete, will be placed upon the table of the House, and I expect that will be before prorogation.

MARINE TRADES STRIKE IN MONTREAL.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have received a telegram from the secretary of the Montreal Marine Trades Federation in which it is stated:

> Four hundred workmen employed upon construction of wooden ships under Government contract by the Fraser Brace Co., Montreal, men ceased to work Wednesday fifteenth instant. Firm promised men's demand of fifty cents per hour, nine hours' work day with overtime rates (The Canadian Vickers Co., have already signed a similar agreement, everything working in harmony). Fraser Brace refuse to sign. Men not working. Kindly use your good offices in effecting honourable settlement.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS: I have no information on the subject but I will inquire into it to-day.

CORRECTION—MR. G. B. NICHOLSON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would ask the liberty of correcting a figure which appears in my speech on the railway situation as reported in Hansard of May 15 on page 2114. Speaking with reference to the conditions of Canadian railways, I am reported as saying that it will cost the Canadian Pacific Railway $100,000,000 to get its grades between Port Arthur and Sudbury equal to those of the Canadian Northern between the same points. I am not sure that it is Hansard that is in error, but the figure there given is incorrect whether I mentioned it or not. Instead of $100,000,000 it should be $10,000,000.

On the Orders of the Day:

FISHERMEN AND MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a matter which is of great interest in the Maritime Provinces. I refer to the cases of hardship among the fishermen on account of the recent changes in the Military Service Act. I have had several messages, but will read this telegram as a sample:

> We see by papers that the Government is doing quite a lot for the farmers, such as granting them leave of absence to put in their crops, etc., but there is nothing about the fishermen who fitted out extensively this spring, getting large supplies from the creditors for which they expected to pay with fish. Now

that spring fishing has just started, why are they not allowed time to have the benefit of the spring's catch? Then they will square up accounts and have better courage to face the enemy. Kindly bring this matter to the attention of the Government and let the public know what is being done.

(Signed) DAVID FISH CO.,
per Fred David.

This matter, of course, is a question for the Government, and I have no doubt that there are cases of great hardship. I simply desire to ask the Minister of Militia who I observe is not in his seat just now, to take this matter under consideration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As my hon. friend has observed the Minister of Militia is not able to be here just at the moment. However, I shall make it a point to direct his immediate attention to the representation which the hon. gentleman has placed before the Government, and I shall ask him to give the best consideration he can to what the hon. gentleman has said.

CIVIL PAY OF MEN OVERSEAS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (West Calgary): I beg to call the attention of the House to a telegram which I have just received:

Mass meeting dependents Civil Servants Calgary held to-day protest Order in Council April second deducting civil pay men overseas. Consider same breach of faith. Petitions being forwarded by mail asking continuation of pay or return of men. Your earnest reconsideration requested.

(Signed) MRS. SPEECHLY,
Committee, Mrs. Jackson,
Mrs. Rackham.

Mr SPEAKER: The hon. member is exceeding his privilege in reading such a telegram on the Orders of the Day. I have allowed considerable latitude owing to the circumstances that there is not opportunity for placing questions on the Order Paper at the approaching end of the session, but, in any case, the hon. member should not submit arguments.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In regard to the matter referred to asked by my hon. friend, I may say that this subject has been under consideration and it is anticipated that the Government will be in a position to make an announcement to-day or to-morrow with regard to it.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

CALLING OUT OF RURAL DRAFTS.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): I am sorry that the Minister of Militia is not in his seat, but as the session is drawing to a close I shall put the question I intended to address to him, and I would ask the Government to reply as soon as possible. A few days ago the Minister of Militia stated that he had issued instructions to registrars that the men newly called to the colours under the Order in Council of April twentieth were to be ordered up from the cities first, and that the rural men would be called up at a later date. I am now informed that the registrars in the various districts have sent out indiscriminately, these notices to report, and these orders are to be complied with on very short notice, many of the rural boys being required to report on Thursday of this week. I would ask the Government to inform the House whether orders were sent to registrars to discriminate between rural boys and city boys, and now that the condition I have mentioned is known to the Government whether it is the intention to see that the registrars properly carry out their instructions?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite sure whether the hon. gentleman refers to those called out under the order directing men from twenty to twenty-two years, both years included, to report for duty. The orders were sent out that those in urban centres should be called first, and that the rural population should be directed to report later. The Minister of Militia and Defence told me that in some instances these orders have been misunderstood. I shall direct his attention to what my hon. friend has represented just now.

Mr. VIEN: For the information of the Government I may say that I am referring to the men from twenty to twenty-two years. I am informed this morning that men in some of the rural districts of Ontario, as well as of Quebec, were ordered to report on Thursday of this week. I would suggest to the Government that they take immediate measures to countermand the orders issued to these men by the registrars, so that the rural population will not be unduly disturbed.

THE YUKON ELECTION.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE.

On the order being called for the consideration of the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, covering the Yukon election:

Hon. Mr. H. GUTHRIE (Solicitor-General) moved: That the third report of

the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections—Yukon election—be adopted.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, this question has now been for some time before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and before the House. I am going to ask the House to be indulgent with me if I refer once again to the matter. I want to say right away that we are not intending in any way to try to prevent soldiers overseas who have voted from having their votes counted. On the contrary, we want full justice done to the soldiers overseas who have voted regularly and legally, and to have their votes entered as legal votes. On the other hand, the House has a very important task before it to decide and that question is whether we wish, through any misplaced sentiment, to place upon the records a position taken by this House which will stultify it for all time to come, and which otherwise will go down in the parliamentary history of this country as an act which we might not have committed if we had exercised saner judgment. Will you allow me, Sir, to begin at the very beginning of this question and really see what occurred in connection with the Yukon election.

The Yukon election was considered in committee on the Military Voters' Act, and I want the House to bear well in mind from the start that the Yukon electors were not caught by any technicality of the law. When the question was considered by the committee which was discussing in 1917 that portion of the Dominion Elections Act known as the Military Voters' Act, full consideration was given to the Yukon territory. Full consideration, Sir, I say, was given to the possibility of bringing the Yukon territory within the provisions of the Military Voters' Act. Full consideration had been given to it by the Government before any mention was made in this House of the Yukon territory, and when the question was brought up in the House, as I will show in a few moments, the Minister of Justice, speaking in the name of the Government, used this language: that it was either a question of deferring all the elections in Canada by one month or deferring the Yukon election for one month; that if the Yukon election was to be brought in under the operation of the Military Voters' Act then some system would have to be devised and the Government thought that it was better to defer the Yukon election, taking it away from the operation of the Military Voters' Act, than to adopt some new provision of law which might prove impracticable. That is a point which it is well to consider at the very outset: that if the soldiers overseas, as respecting those who would have the right to vote in the Yukon territory, were disfranchised they were disfranchised by the Government, after full consideration by the Government, and before any provisions respecting them were brought before this House then sitting in committee upon the Military Voters' Act. And, by no act of this House were they disfranchised except upon the proposal of the Government, which I intend to prove.

The Dominion Elections Act provided for a general election to take place on December 17. On February 26 the Government passed an Order in Council directing the general returning officer to make a special return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. A period of forty days from the election day is allowed within which to enter a petition to contest the election or to show cause why the return was not made. The forty days allowed to the candidates in the Yukon election would expire on March 9, 1918; it must be admitted that their recourse to the courts would expire on that date. But by the action of the Government in passing the Order in Council of February 26, both candidates, Mr. Congdon and Dr. Thompson, were prevented from making any application to the court by way of petition or otherwise. All proceedings were stopped; the character of the general returning officer was thereby immediately changed. The passing of that Order in Council had this effect: first, it suspended the discharge by the general returning officer of functions devolving upon him by Act of Parliament; second, it divested the recounting authorities of power to pursue recount proceedings under the same Act; and, third, it divested the court of the jurisdiction conferred upon it by the same Act. These results were accomplished by the fact that the Order in Council expressly prohibited the general returning officer from making a return. No petition could be filed until such return had been made save a petition complaining of no return—to which the general returning officer would have the obvious answer that he was prohibited from making a return by the terms of the Order in Council. That is the second point that I want the House to bear in mind while following me in the story of the Yukon election.

Part IV of the Dominion Elections Act is the Military Voters Act, 1917. Section 6 reads:

At the expiration of the time for nominating candidates the returning officer for each electoral district shall inform the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by telegraph, or other expeditious means, of the names, addresses and descriptions of the several candidates who have been nominated. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall thereupon transmit by telegraph to every officer in command—

And so on. The section concludes:

Presiding officers shall cause placards containing this information to be posted upon the bulletin boards of each battalion in all camps where the same may be possible and shall use all other reasonably available means to bring such information to the knowledge of the military electors.

It was absolutely essential, therefore, that that notice be given; that placards be posted up showing where and when the vote was to take place. In the official notification which the Government did give to the soldiers overseas the placard contained these words: "The Yukon Election Deferred." What other sense could be taken from these words than that the soldiers were not to vote in the Yukon election at that time, because the election had been deferred?

I wish to draw the attention of the House to section 8, the next section which bears materially upon this subject. After reading this section and the debate which took place when it was adopted by the House, I do not see how any one can conscientiously assert that these votes are legal. Subsection 1 reads:

Polls shall be held in such camps or other places, in Canada or elsewhere, as shall be assigned to the charge of presiding officers for the purposes of this part. Those held without Canada shall be maintained open during such sufficient number of days and during such hours as military exigencies will permit, but so that no polling shall commence before the day following that of the nomination of candidates nor continue after eight o'clock in the evening of the day for holding the poll within Canada.

The Minister of Justice, who had a great deal to do with this Act, will not say that any vote taken before nomination day was a legal vote. Will hon. gentlemen say that votes cast in contravention of section 8, before nomination day, are legal votes and must be counted? Must the returning officer be ordered—no discretion is given to him by the report of the committee—to declare them legal? You are assuming no light obligation when you instruct him to declare the vote legal when you do not conscientiously believe that the vote is legal. This is not a party question; it is a question for the mature deliberation of the House of Commons. Upon each member of the House will rest the grave responsibility. if you take this action, of having ordered the returning officer to declare a vote legal —not according to his judgment, but according to your dictation—which by the very wording of the Act is declared to be illegal. Subsection 3 of the same section reads:

In Canada, and, where conditions make it reasonably possible, without Canada, the deputy presiding officer shall give public notice of the time and place of an intended poll, and, in cases of polls to be held without Canada, a special notice to any person whose appointment as a scrutineer or deputy scrutineer has been communicated to him.

The last subsection, which bears upon this and which I wish to comment upon, is subsection 5 of the same section:

In any case where, for any reason, unless the vote of a military elector is immediately taken, it is likely that he may not subsequently be able to vote, the deputy presiding officer may take such vote otherwise than at a formally held poll, but such votes shall be so taken in the presence of the deputy scrutineers, or failing either or both, of a military elector or two military electors, who shall, together with the deputy presiding officer, sign upon the envelope in which the ballot is inserted a certificate that the vote was taken under this subsection and the reasons which made it necessary.

Mark well that subsection. By that subsection those votes would not be counted, but the returning officer will not have any latitude. He will be ordered by this report to declare those votes legal, because you gentlemen have studied the legality of the question, and you declare that according to your conscience, those are legal votes, and the returning officer must in consequence declare them so.

Mr. MORPHY: Not being on the committee, I am not familiar with all the details. Were the votes cast for the Government, or for any one by name, or how?

Mr. DEVLIN: The votes were cast as follows. I am reading from page 24 of the special report of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. This is the report of the special returning officer:

Paris, France.

We, the undersigned, special returning officer and clerk, who have counted the ballots hereafter mentioned for the electoral district of Yukon, do hereby certify as follows:

(a) The number of votes cast for each party or candidate is as follows:

Name of Party.	No. of votes.
1. Government	85
2. Opposition	10
3. Labour	—
4. Independent	—

Names of candidates, A. Thompson, F. T. Congdon.

(b) The names of the respective candidates for whom votes cast for a party were counted are as follows.

They were allotted.

1. Government, Alfred Thompson.
2. Opposition, Frederick Tennyson Congdon.

To Alfred Thompson were given the 85 votes marked for the Government, and to F. T. Congdon the 10 votes marked for the Opposition, and 3 votes were spoiled ballots, making a total of 98 votes. But that was only a portion of the votes that were cast overseas for the Yukon Territory. It is now a question of dealing with all the votes cast, and not only with the ones referred to in this report of the special returning officer. I could, perhaps, give my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy) a fuller answer by reading the special return of the general returning officer, but I do not want to take up unnecessarily the time of the House.

The next subsection to which I wish to refer is section 12, subsection 5, which is material to the case in point and which will also answer the question of my hon. friend. It reads:

A vote for a party shall be counted as a vote for the candidate or candidates who has or have been recognized, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, as the candidate or candidates representing that party in the electoral district to which the vote has been applied. Such recognition shall be made in the case of the Government party by the Prime Minister, in the case of the Opposition party by the leader of the Opposition, and in the case of any Independent or Labour party by the recognized leader of such party.

Then follow these words:

Within five days after the day of nomination, the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition, and the recognized leader of any Independent or Labour party, shall severally notify the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the names of the candidates recognized by them, and such notification shall forthwith be published in the Canada Gazette and communicated to the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If a military elector votes for a party, and there is no candidate recognized as aforesaid as representing that party, his ballot shall be rejected, and the reason for the rejection shall be written and signed by the special returning officer and his clerk on the back thereof.

His vote shall be rejected. On the fifth day after general nomination day in Canada there were no recognized candidates for the Yukon Territory, because the nomination took place only at the end of December and voting was to take place on the 28th of January.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. member not distinguish between the case of the Yukon where the election was deferred and a case where there was no election at all?

[Mr. Devlin.]

You must surely give the franchise if an election is ever held.

Mr. DEVLIN: I think I shall make that clear to my hon. friend in a few moments when I refer to the debate that took place on section 8, with which I was dealing a moment ago. I want to call his attention to this fact, and he will find it on page 5 of the special report of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery:

On the 5th day of January, 1918, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada published in the Canada Gazette, pursuant to section 12, subsection 5—

The very section I read a minute ago.

—of Part IV of said Act official recognition of the candidate Alfred Thompson by the Government party, and of the candidate Frederick Tennyson Congdon by the Opposition party.

That proclamation, therefore, was given on the 5th day of January, 1918, in accordance with section 12, subsection 5, which says:

If a military elector votes for a party, and there is no candidate recognized as aforesaid as representing that party—

And there was none recognized until the 5th day of January.

—his ballot shall be rejected.

I simply quote that to show by the Act itself that it is not a question of disfranchising soldiers now. It is a question of finding out whether the soldiers who voted for either of the candidates in the Yukon election prior to the nominations there should or should not have their votes counted. My hon. friend will remember that some 15,000 soldiers' votes were set aside on this and the other side of the Atlantic during the last election. You may say that that was disfranchising soldiers, that these soldiers, whether their votes were illegal or not, should have had their votes counted, because by the spirit of the law no soldier was to be disfranchised, and that is the argument that has been adduced in this House in connection with this very matter.

Mr. BURNHAM: It was considered necessary that the soldiers' opinion should be expressed. It is admitted now that the soldiers' opinion has been expressed.

Mr. DEVLIN: No, because the Government, by their legislation, prevented the soldiers from expressing their opinion. I want my hon. friend to follow me particularly in what I am about to quote, because I think he will then better catch the point. When the Military Voters' Act was

up for consideration in this House and the debate on the most important sections, Nos. 6, 7 and 8, took place, in reply to a question by Mr. Carvell:

"How can they do that? The voting is to commence the day after nomination."

the Hon. Mr. Doherty, Minister of Justice, said:

The provision is that the vote may begin the day after nomination, but the obligation is imposed upon every presiding officer who holds a poll to give these notices.

What notices? The notices I have just read to the House as contained in section 6. They were absolutely essential. The minister goes on:

Though the period in which voting can legally be done extends from the day after nomination until the polling day the requirements of the statute with regard to the giving of notice must be complied with.

Those very words, "the statute must be complied with," constitute the main principle which was laid down in the Ethier case that was tried some years ago. The Minister of Justice reiterates the principle that the Act must be complied with. He does not at the time consider whether the vote given before nomination should be counted; he brushes that aside and says that only between nomination day and voting day can the votes be legally given. Now apply that to the Yukon election. Nomination day was at the end of December and voting day at the end of January. It was a deferred election, and placards were out in the camps overseas that it was a deferred election. I want to lay special stress upon this, and I know my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham), a soldier himself, will appreciate it. Here we have notice given to the soldier that the election for the Yukon was deferred. Here is the opinion of the Minister of Justice that no voting before nomination day would be 12 noon. legal, except in the emergency cases which are referred to by the statute and have no concern with the present case. The minister goes on to say that not only would such voting be illegal, but that the notice must be complied with; that is an essential. If there is any doubt as to the statute itself there is no doubt as to the spirit of the legislation.

May I recall for a moment to my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) the speech delivered in this House by the Prime Minister the other day, which speech he no doubt heard and has read very carefully since. My hon. friend will find that throughout that speech the Prime Minister, who is an excellent and able lawyer, knowing that he had a bad case to deal with from a legal standpoint, attacked the weak point in a strong case and fought against that point all the way through. What was the gist of his argument? It was that there was no machinery by which this question could be referred to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. He said that he had listened to the speech of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and agreed with the major portion of it, but he found fault because neither the report of the committee nor the amendment did suggest that the Governor in Council should take any action. The Prime Minister knows perfectly well, as does every other lawyer in this House, that under section 60 of the Supreme Court Act the Governor in Council may refer to the Supreme Court for interpretation or opinion any Act of Parliament whether federal or provincial. But the Prime Minister does not say that. He goes on constantly arguing that there was no provision by which reference could be made to two judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. That was a clever argument. Let me call attention to what he finally says:

Well, if we are to have special legislation, was it not the duty of the committee on Privileges and Elections to suggest that to us and to prepare a draft of that necessary legislation and report it to the House? Instead of doing that, they have brought in a report which I repeat is in its terms both impracticable and ineffective.

He does not say that the question is not open to doubt. He does not say that the question of the legality of the votes is not a question for reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, but plays on the words " not contained in the motion and report of the committee" in a very clever way, and then sits down. He does not commit himself to the statement that this question is not one for interpretation or decision by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would ask the hon. gentleman to bear in mind the fact that the old strictum jus interpretation has been done away with.

Mr. DEVLIN: A lot of old things have been done away with.

Mr. BURNHAM: And we are permitted to decide the case according to the principles of justice and right.

Mr. DEVLIN: And legality.

Mr. BURNHAM: We want to see justice done though the heavens fall. I admit

that the hon. gentleman is presenting a very fine argument but why should we not leave this question to the House?

Mr. DEVLIN: I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman make the statement that he made a moment ago. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) when sections 6, 7, and 8 were under consideration by the House, asked a question in these terms:

> Before six o'clock I asked one question about section 7. I understand that under that section there will be no deferred election in Canada.

To which the hon. the Minister of Justice replied:

> I moved an amendment this afternoon to except the Yukon Territory where it will be impossible to hold the election because the election list has to be prepared after the issue of the writs. A period of forty days is allowed for it, and if we were to try to bring in the Yukon Territory we would find that it would be impracticable.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve goes on and then the Minister of Justice again answers:

> As we have four weeks between nomination and election day, I do not think there is any need for deferring the election in any place but the Yukon. If it were not for the long delay in preparing the list in the Yukon, that territory would be included also, but we are forced to make an exception of it.

Mark well that this discussion took place under the very sections of the Military Voters' Act which are up now for consideration in this House. Then the Minister of Justice makes this statement:

> We went into the provisions of the Act and it seemed fairly clear that, in view of the long interval between nomination and election, there would be no substantial difficulty anywhere except in the Yukon.

Mr. Oliver comes into the debate and the Minister of Justice again says:

> The four weeks between nomination and election would not be sufficient for the preparation of the list. It seemed to us that the balance of convenience was in favour of deferring the election in the Yukon rather than delaying the elections all through Canada or devising a new system for the holding of elections in the Yukon.

Mr. Oliver still persists and the Minister of Justice says finally:

> As I said, we decided it was more convenient to defer this election than to delay all the elections in Canada or to make new provisions for all of this procedure in the Yukon.

I want hon. gentlemen opposite to remember these words. The question before the House was the giving of votes to the soldiers overseas. It was found that every constituency in Canada could have its election on the same day, but the Government, after due consideration of the question, decided that it would not be practicable for the Yukon Territory and that they would have to devise some new system. Instead of devising a new system they simply deferred the election and gave notice to the soldiers overseas that the election was deferred and that nominations were to take place one month afterwards and voting one month after that.

I feel that I have taken up enough of the time of the House in discussing this question but I want to call the attention of the House before I sit down, to the words of a man who held a very high position in the councils of the Conservative party in Canada. We know that there is to-day no Conservative party, that there is only a Liberal party and a Unionist party. But there were at one time a Liberal party and a Conservative party and the gentleman to whom I refer was the head of the Conservative party and also a very eminent lawyer. That man was Sir John Thompson who held the respect of all classes of citizens of Canada. Here are the words which he used, words which have already been referred to by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) in reference to this question:

> But as soon as the question has been decided as to the qualification of the person so returned, the conduct of the returning officer, or the number of votes which were received, the conduct of the candidates, and every other question connected with the election, or with the conduct of the returning officer, has been relegated to the judiciary, and the House has always declined to exercise its functions and its power to interfere.

Mr. Speaker, that law referred to by Sir John Thompson is the law to-day as my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) has reminded us many old things have disappeared but there is one thing that neither he nor I, nor any member of this House, wants to see disappear and that is that right and justice shall prevail over every party consideration. When a citizen of Canada comes to this House and claims justice, whether that citizen be a soldier or a civilian, he is entitled, at the bar of the House, to all the fairness and justice that has ever prevailed in the traditions of this Parliament or of this country or in the traditions which we have received from Great Britain and to which we cling so fondly. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask my Unionist friends how they think this question would be dealt

with by the Conservative party and if the Conservative party would not decide, without a moment's hesitation, to deal with it as Sir John Thompson dealt with a similar question and just as the question was dealt with in the Baird-King election case to which reference was made by my hon. frend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). In resuming my seat let me say that I am not asking for favour, or pity for either candidate; I am asking for justice and justice alone. I am asking hon. members not to make this a party question, for it is not a party question. Both candidates were pledged to conscription, both candidates were pledged to the support of the Union party; one called himself a Liberal-Unionist, the other called himself a Conservative-Unionist. But must the line be drawn as closely as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) speaking in this House upon the question the other day, would have it drawn—that the one perhaps was a stronger Unionist than the other, and for that reason the one rather than the other should be declared elected by this House, and that the rules of justice and right should not prevail? I know, Sir, something about human nature. I know something about mankind, I know something about my fellow man. I know how strong party feelings may be, and how strong they may run, but back of party feeling there is something in the soul of every man, if you can only reach it, which rises above party and above petty action, and to that element of the soul I appeal to-day in presenting the amendment which I am about to present. I appeal to that better feeling in man so that he may forget party and do justice. I appeal to hon. members to do justice to themselves and do justice to the claimants for justice before the bar of this House. But in doing justice, Sir, do not ask the General Returning Officer to do a thing, if hon. gentlemen in their very souls do not believe that what they are asking him to do is right. I beg to propose, Sir, seconded by Mr. McKenzie:

That all the words after "that" to the end of the question be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: That the special return of the General Returning Officer in respect to the Yukon elections be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada by the Governor in Council for adjudication and final decision, and that such decision be reported to the House of Commons for such further action as the House may deem proper.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The recommendation contained in the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections is set forth in the following words:

That the votes purporting to have been cast, counted and applied under part IV of the Dominion Elections Act, as shown in the Special Return of the General Returning Officer are properly applicable to the respective candidates to whom they have been applied, and that said special return be re-committed to said General Returning Officer with a direction that he do forthwith openly proclaim and return as duly elected a candidate to represent the electoral district of the Yukon Territory pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of said Part of said Act.

The special return referred to in the recommendation which I have just read, at clause eleven does apply the soldiers' votes to the two candidates according as they have been cast for the Government, or for the Opposition, and the votes which were given for the individual candidates are applied likewise. When this matter came before the Committee on Privileges and Elections for hearing, it was objected by one of the candidates that the effect of the Order in Council, which was passed in February last, had been to destroy the right of filing a petition in the courts under the provisions of the Controverted Elections Act. One of the candidates objected that a candidate was now deprived of bringing any election irregularity to the notice of the courts, and that no matter how great had been the contravention of the law in regard to this election, the effect of the Order in Council was to prevent any relief against it all. It appears to me that there was a good deal of force in that particular contention, and I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I had expected there would have appeared upon the Order Paper to-day notice of a Bill which the Government intends to introduce dealing with that particular aspect of the case. Through some omission, the Bill in question does not appear on the Order Paper to-day, but it will be there to-morrow. This Bill will provide, in the first place, for the extension of the time for filing a petition under the Controverted Elections Act for a period of forty days after the general returning officer has made his return.

Mr. FIELDING: Will that Bill apply to this case?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If the hon. gentleman will just allow me. In the next place, the Act makes the general provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, and amendments thereto, and of the Military Voters' Act of 1917, apply to the Yukon, and provides also that the soldiers' votes cast in the last

election shall be counted, notwithstanding the time at which they ware polled. The Bill follows in the last cause, in general, the principle adopted by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. So far as the question of the time of polling the soldiers' votes is concerned, the finding of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is not disturbed, but so far as any other election irregularities are concerned, either candidate will have the right to file a petition in the courts under the Controverted Elections Act, as heretofore.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the hon. gentleman a copy of the Bill under his hand?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, I have a copy of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to read it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The provisions of the Bill, which contains just two clauses, are:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of section twelve of the Controverted Elections Act, the time for presenting a petition in respect of the election of a member of the House of Commons for the Electoral District of Yukon, held on the twenty-eighth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, shall be extended for a period of forty days from the date of the return of the General Returning Officer made in respect of such election.

2. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Dominion Elections Act or any Act amending the same, or in the Military Voters Act, 1917, chapter thirty-four of the Statutes of 1917, the provisions of the said Acts in respect to fixing the time for polling the votes of military electors shall apply and extend to the Electoral Districts of Yukon; and the votes of the military electors polled at the last general election for a member to represent the said Electoral District in the House of Commons and marked either for the Government or for the Opposition or for an individual candidate shall be duly counted for and applied to the candidate who has been recognized as the candidate representing the Government or the Opposition, pursuant to section twelve of the Military Voters Act, 1917, or to an individual candidate, in accordance with the marking of the several ballots, nothwithstanding the date or dates upon which the said votes were polled.

That is the Bill which it is the intention of the Government to introduce to meet the objection raised by one of the candidates when the matter was before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the objection raised by my hon. friend who has moved the amendment to the motion before the House.

As chairman of the committee, I took no part in the discussions before the committee. But I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate which took place in this House on a former occasion when the House referred back to the committee its second report with regard to this matter; and I have also listened to the remarks of my hon. friend who moved the amendment in this House this morning. I cannot come to the same conclusion upon this case as that at which my hon. friend has arrived, either in regard to the law or in regard to the facts as they present themselves to me. I do not find the difficulty which some hon. members seem to find in placing a proper construction upon the terms of the Dominion Election Act and of the Military Voters Act. In my judgment, there is nothing to render the votes cast by the military voters, cast between the 19th November and 15th December last, invalid. In my view they are legally cast, although I grant that there is room for some difference of opinion upon that point.

It has been stated and argued that a nomination of candidates is an essential to an election so far as the military voter is concerned; it has been referred to as a pre-requisite. To my mind this is not so. The Act does not contemplate anything of the kind. The Act provides that in certain cases military voters may vote before nomination day. It only applies that section to those who may be leaving Canada, but section 16 of the Military Voters Act certainly contemplates a military voter casting his vote before there is a candidate. It says:

In case any military electors shall, at the time of or subsequent to the issue of the writs for a general election, be under orders to leave Canada prior to the day for holding a poll within Canada, the Governor General in Council may make provision for the polling of their votes, in the manner by this Part provided, on a day prior to their departure, and may modify the provisions of this Part relating to time or procedure in so far as may be necessary to render such polling possible.

I put this case to the House, Mr. Speaker: the writs for the last general election were issued at the end of October; the day fixed as general nomination day throughout Canada was the 19th November. I take the case of military electors ordered to leave Canada before nomination day, say on the 15th November, when there were no candidates. It is after the issue of the writ, and at a time before polling day. Section 16 provides that these military electors shall be entitled to vote at that time. There are no candidates. For whom can they vote? They can only vote "for the Government" or "for the Opposition." No nomination has taken place. I think

one may assume that, in regard to that particular class of voters who might be under orders to leave Canada, Parliament intended that they should have the right to express their opinion in a general way, irrespective entirely of the question of who was the candidate. Another thing I would point out, Mr. Speaker, which influences the matter: that there is only one period of time mentioned in the law at which military electors may vote. That is in section 8 of the Military Voters Act, which says in regard to the polls:

> Those held without Canada shall be maintained open during such sufficient number of days and during such hours as military exigencies will permit, but so that no polling shall commence before the day following that of the nomination of candidates nor continue after eight o'clock in the evening of the day for holding the poll within Canada.

That is the only period at which military voters may vote anywhere. Now the Military Voters Act gave to the military voter the right to vote. We gave him the right and provided but one time wherein he must cast his vote. Why should a military elector of the Yukon not vote within that prescribed period? It is the only time. We are driven to it. There is no other conclusion. If a man is entitled to vote he must be entitled to vote at the only time laid down by the law wherein he can cast his vote, and that is between the day fixed after the general nomination and the polling day throughout Canada.

Then, Mr. Speaker, let me call your attention also to the language of subsection (5) of section 8, which applies to immediate voting. This must have been in the contemplation of Parliament when this clause was enacted:

> In any case where, for any reason, unless the vote of a military elector is immediately taken, it is likely that he may not subsequently be able to vote, the Deputy Presiding Officer may take such vote otherwise than at a formally held poll, but such vote shall be so taken in the presence of the deputy scrutineers, or failing either or both, of a military elector or two military electors, who shall, together with the Deputy Presiding Officer, sign upon the envelope in which the ballot is inserted a certificate that the vote was taken under this subsection and the reasons which made it necessary.

Note the language, Mr. Speaker, 'In any case, where for any reason, unless the vote of a military elector is immediately taken, it is likely that he may not subsequently be able to vote." Surely that covers the case of these military electors in the Yukon.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If they did not vote at the time prescribed their votes would not be taken.

Mr. ROSS: What does the word "immediate" mean?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Unless he voted between the 19th November and the 17th December it is likely that he cannot subsequently be able to vote—he would not have another opportunity. Surely Parliament contemplated, when it passed that section, that all military votes, no matter from what riding, were to be taken within those two dates. It is the only period specified in any of our Acts in which a military elector can vote. If we gave the Yukon military elector a vote at all, he must vote within that prescribed period, or we did not enfranchise him. Now, the men did vote within that period. If their vote is irregular, I submit it is cured and section 18 is the validating clause. It says:

> The validity of any election shall not be questioned on the ground of any omission or irregularity in connection with the administration of this Part which has not affected the result of the election, or on the ground that for any reason it was found impracticable to record or to secure the vote of any military elector or any votes whatever hereunder.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The section says "which has not affected the result of the election."

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is, the validity of the election shall not be questioned on the ground of any omission or irregularity, in the first place; and in the second place by reason that it was found impracticable to record or secure the vote of the military elector. First, if the votes were cast and there were irregularities—that would not invalidate the result. And, second, if military electors did not have an opportunity to vote that could not be held to invalidate an election. That section was put there to cure irregularities. And, I submit it is operative under the present circumstances. To my mind the matter is not doubtful, but so many other opinions have been stated in regard to it that I am willing to say that there are two opinions upon the question. Listening, as I did this morning, with great care to the speech of my hon. friend who moved the amendment, I think, even on his own speech there was every reason why his amendment should not be adopted by this House. According to my hon. friend, the question is a very technical one. His argument was a very refined one. But we cannot, upon a refinement of argument, or upon a tech-

nicality, wipe out over 300 soldiers' votes. We gave them the right to vote; we specified only one time at which they could vote. We gave them special facilities for voting. We employed a special form of ballot to get over the difficulty of who was or who was not a candidate, and to allow them to vote for a party or for a principle. Our Act was an enabling, not a restrictive Act, and, because it was an enabling Act, we are entitled to give it the most liberal interpretation. We should not give it the technical or narrow interpretation which my hon. friend would have us place upon it. He urges that this House is no place to interpret or to consider the effect of the language of our Act; that the matter should be referred to the court. There is this difference between the interpretation by Parliament of its own legislation and the interpretation by the court of the same legislation. Parliament can look to the intention of the House when it passed the Act, gathering that intention from what took place and from the real purport and meaning of the enactment. On the other hand, a court of law is bound to gather the intention from the exact language which is employed in the statute. One is a legal, technical interpretation; the other is a broad, general interpretation, going to the real intention of Parliament when the Act was passed. No one can come to any other conclusion than that it was the intention of the House in passing this law that the military electors of the Yukon should vote. We only prescribe one time at which they may vote; by process of exclusion you come to the result that they must vote at the only time specified. I do not know that this Parliament has on many occasions interpreted its own statutes; perhaps it has on some occasions. The Imperial House has frequently interpreted its own statutes, though I have not found any that it has interpreted in regard to elections. The Ontario Legislature certainly has done so. For many years we had in Ontario a Liberal administration which stood very high in the regard of the people of that province. In the year 1898, when we had a general election, petitions were lodged against a great many of the candidates in Ontario on the ground that certain constables and persons who had allowed their premises to be used as polling booths for a fee had voted at the edection whereas under the Act they were disqualified from voting. The disqualification of all constables and owners of polling booths would have affected the result in a great many constituencies. It was not the intention of the legislature to disqualify every constable from voting—but there was the question, laid before the courts in concrete form. The legislature of Ontario, at a special session in the summer of 1898, interpreted their own law, declaring the meaning of their Act to be that constables and proprietors of polling places were not disqualified, and that that was the intention of the House when the Act was passed. Of course, the precedent of the Ontario Legislature is not binding upon this House, but the reason for their Act then was good and the reason for our Act now is good. I do not entertain the difficulty that some hon. members seem to have in discussing this matter. It is my view that the court would uphold the soldiers' votes; that, on the strict meaning and interpretation of the statute, the votes in question were validly cast. But I do not think that we should submit such a question of doubt and technicality to the courts. Now that the Government is prepared to allow petitions under the Controverted Elections Act to be filed by either candidate in respect of every question except the single one as to the time at which the votes were cast, the one substantial objection urged by the candidates or by any one on their behalf before the committee or in the House has been removed. I think, therefore that the report of the committee should be concurred in.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the case presented by the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) in support of his amendment is so full, comprehensive and complete that I shall not add one word to what he has said. To do so would be simply spoiling an absolutely good case which he has sustained and supported at every point. I shall direct my observations for a few moments to the speech just made by the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie).

Let me ask him, in the first place, whether there is such a thing as dividing an election into two parts? Did part of an election ever take place in this country on one day and the other part on another? I submit that such a thing was never known and that such a thing was certainly not contemplated when we passed the War-time Elections Act last year. The member for Wright quoted the remarks made by the Minister of Justice (Hon. C. J. Doherty) in reply to questions put to him as to how the election in the Yukon would be conducted. If it was then in his mind or in the mind of the Government that special provisions would be made for the taking of

the soldiers' votes for the Yukon, or that part of that vote would be taken at one time and the balance at a later date, he would have so expressed himself. But he said nothing of the kind. He said: "We are deferring the election." What did that mean? Simply that the election was put off; that no part of it was to take place at the time. No specious form of pleading or argument of the Solicitor General can change that. If it were stated that the election for the city of Ottawa had been deferred, that would mean that the election for that district was put off; that it was not to take place on the same day as the others; that it was to be conducted later on a day to be fixed and under certain machinery provided for the purpose. The Minister of Justice said that the Yukon election was to be deferred, that a certain day was to be named by Order in Council, as provided in the Act for nominations for that district. That was done. In compliance with the Act, nomination day was on December 31, and the polling day was twenty-eight days thereafter. That was the day on which all the vote, not part of the vote, was to be taken for the Yukon.

There was nothing in the world standing in the way to prevent the vote, whether on this side of the Atlantic or on the other, from being taken on the 28th of January, 1918. I submit to hon. gentlemen who are lawyers, to any men of common sense, that it is the practice that mere physical inconvenience does not stand in the way of the application of the law. It has always been British justice and the principle of the British courts that physical inconvenience does not stand in the way, or that if physical exertion or the expenditure of money will enable the parties to comply with the law, it must be complied with. There was no physical or other inconvenience whatever that stood in the way of the vote for the Yukon Territory being taken on the 28th of January in all parts of the country just as it was taken in the parts in which the vote was polled upon that day. Could it possibly have been in the mind of the Minister of Justice, when he was making those pronouncements in Parliament, that votes could be polled before nomination day, and that such votes could mean anything at all? That is not arguable, and I am not going to say another word about it. The Minister of Justice said that the Statute must be strictly complied with. That is his version of the law as he is reported on Hansard. The matter is not left to haphazard. It is not left to any construction that I may put upon his words. He said that the Statute must be strictly complied with; that the notices must be given; that selection must be made of the candidates for the Government and for the Opposition; that that must be done at the proper time, and that no voting can possibly take place until after the parties are nominated, or until after nomination day. That being the case, the legal period for voting—I care not what we do in this House—was between the 31st day of December, 1917, and the 28th day of January, 1918. I suppose a majority of this House can distort that to something else, but such action is entirely contrary to every principle of justice, and is not in conformity with the proper interpretation of the Statute. The legality or illegality of this election must stand or fall by the condition of the law on election day in the Yukon Territory. The law existed then in a certain way, and polling should have been held in a certain way according to the law. If it was not held according to the law as it existed on that day, the election is void and declaration to that effect should be made by this House and a new election held. The Bill which the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says he is going to introduce is not a fair Bill at all; it is retroactive legislation. What is the use of saying to a man: You can go to the court if you like, but I am taking mighty good care to pass legislation that bars your rights and takes away the point of law you want to argue; I am going to tie the hands and shut the mouth of the judge before you go to the courts; I shall let you go there, but that is all you will have for your pains, because I am going to legislate you out of court. If there is any sense of justice in regard to this matter, let the Government send the case to be tried in accordance with the law as it stood on election day. Then we shall accept the situation at once and not another word will be said about the matter. Let the parties submit their claims and let the case be tried; let the judge declare on the whole facts and the law, and then we shall have no fault to find. But we find fault that the Government or the Governor in Council interfered where they should not interfere; that they exercised a jurisdiction which they did not possess to take this matter out of the hands of the returning officer. I take the responsibility of saying that they had no jurisdiction to pass that Order in Council; they had no

jurisdiction to take the jurisdiction, which rested in the returning officer, out of his hands and drag it into this House. If they made that mistake, they should take the earliest opportunity of righting the matter and putting it where it was before, absolutely free as it was on the 26th of February last, and they should say to the returning officer: Use your own judgment and let the parties go to the courts and stand or fall as the courts will interpret the statute and the rights of the parties as they stood on that occasion. Nothing else will do full justice to the parties, and nothing else will receive the full approbation of the independent and right thinking people of this country.

At one o'clock the House rose.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Speaker, this question was fairly well discussed at an earlier stage and perhaps there is not much that is new that can be now added. I have no desire to engage in any lengthy debate or delay the proceedings of the House at this stage, but there are a few thoughts to which I should like to give expression before we are called on to give our votes on this really important question. A few days ago the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) entered a mild but well justified protest against the manner in which the soldiers' services were being exploited from time to time by persons who are not more devoted to the soldiers' interests than are ordinary people. He said:

> When a man in this House wishes to draw applause he simply has to refer to something that has been done on the Western front by the Canadians.

He might have gone a little further. We are all familiar with that very old and well-worn story of the legal profession where an eminent counsel who was asked to advise on a certain case endorsed on the back of the brief: "No case. Abuse the plaintiff's attorney." The story is very old, but sometimes helps to illustrate a thought. We have had a lot of that already in this House and we are going to have more of it. If a man has a bad case, if his argument is without a leg to stand on, all he will have to do, according to this new idea of the best way to influence public opinion, will be to appeal to the glorious story of Vimy Ridge and Ypres. We have had a lot of that already this session, and shall probably have more of it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is not a bad thing.

Mr. FIELDING: Not in its place, certainly. Nothing is too good for the soldiers who have acquitted themselves with great honour, to the glory of Canada and the glory of the Empire. But there are men in this House and out of it who, when they have no case to present, are quite ready to resort to pointing to what the soldiers have done.

There are two views to this question; that which is called by some hon. members the equitable view, and then there is the strictly legal, or parliamentary, view. Now, where the case is so clear as respects our statute law, so clear as respects our parliamentary law, and so clear as respects all our parliamentary precedents, it seems to me that these should be the prevailing considerations, and that we should have less reason to consider what might be called the equities of the case, even if we were satisfied that they should exist. The great issue in this matter, the main question from which we should not get away, is the precedent which has been established by long experience in this House, and which is sustained by the highest authority, that matters of controverted elections should not be determined by a partisan committee or a partisan body in this House, but determined by the courts. That is the great question, and any attempt to get away from that should be resisted, and any evasion of it, any half-qualifications concerning it, are not consistent with the best rules of parliamentary life. I think that the equities alleged in this matter are largely matters of imagination; I do not think they have foundation. These difficulties have arisen through the operation of what is called the War-time Elections Act. I suppose there are some members of this House who have a veneration for that document, but I confess that I am not one of them. If I desired adequately to express my mind on that subject I am afraid I should find that the very moderate language which I always endeavour to employ in addressing this House would prove insufficient for the purpose, and I should be obliged to fall back upon some quotations from the very vigorous speeches in this House and out of it of my Liberal friends who are now sitting in the Cabinet. The War-time Elections Act is the cause of this trouble. We are told that we must put aside precedents, put aside the statute, and consider what is called fairness and equity towards the soldier. Now, I want to say that the soldiers did not vote for Doctor Thompson; I want

to emphasize that very strongly. The Prime Minister did the voting for Doctor Thompson. We are not proposing to disfranchise the soldiers. The worst that can happen is that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will be disfranchised in that particular matter. What is my warrant for that statement? What was the issue at the recent general election? It was not the record of the old Government, we all admit that; we were told the old Government had ceased to exist. It was not the record of the new Government that had just been formed, for they had had no chance to make a record. What, then, was the issue? Surely I will be justified by every hon. member of this House, and especially by those who like myself are called Liberals, when I say that the one great issue was the question of conscription and co-operation in the carrying on of the war. I will let the Prime Minister himself define the issue. I find that in discussing the War-time Elections Act my right hon. friend spoke as follows:

> What is to be the issue in this election? The issue in this election is to be upon Canada's part in the war, upon the necessity of sending reinforcements to our men overseas, who are holding there the first battle line of Canada. The question is as to maintaining Canada's effort.

I agree with that statement of the Prime Minister. He correctly described the issue as we all understand it. Now, according to all the information we have upon that issue, Doctor Thompson and Mr. Congdon stood on equal terms. They were both conscriptionists; there was a Liberal conscriptionist and a Conservative conscriptionist, but they both stood, in the words of the Prime Minister, for sending reinforcements to our men overseas; both stood for Canada carrying on the war. That being the case, we talk of fairness and equity! Why should the right hon. the Prime Minister in that case and under these circumstances cast the soldiers' votes in favour of the Conservative conscriptionist to the disadvantage of the Liberal conscriptionist? That is the whole situation. I claim that when the Prime Minister cast those votes, because he had the power to cast them under the Act, in favour of Doctor Thompson and not for Mr. Congdon, he was not dealing fairly as between the two candidates who on that great and paramount issue occupied a place of equality. Therefore I say that the soldiers did not vote for Doctor Thompson. The soldiers voted for conscription, and that vote might have just as well been applied in favour of Mr. Congdon as in favour of Doctor Thompson, and I therefore say that if these votes are not to be counted you do not disfranchise the soldiers; you only disfranchise the Prime Minister himself.

Mr. BURNHAM: Did Mr. Congdon state that he intended to support the Government which alone would have the power of carrying out conscription?

Mr. FIELDING: I have not discussed the matter with Mr. Congdon, but the statement has been made repeatedly in this House and I have never heard it contradicted, that he stood as a conscriptionist.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Of course if hon. gentlemen say it is not true——

Mr. DAVIDSON: It is not true that Mr. Congdon was recognized and endorsed by the leader of the Opposition, and received, as a result of that recognition, the anti-conscription soldier vote?

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend say that Mr. Congdon sought to be recognized by the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. DAVIDSON: The right hon. gentleman of all men would not recognize a candidate who was not willing to be recognized.

Mr. FIELDING: As between the two candidates I can understand that the leader of the Opposition might have a preference. But we must get back to the essence of the question. Did Mr. Congdon stand for conscription or not? If he did not, if he was opposed to conscription, then my point is not well taken; but if it be true, as I am told, that he stood for conscription, if it be true, as stated by the Prime Minister, and I confirm his statement, that conscription was the issue and not the merits of Tom, Dick or Harry, if that be the true issue, and if my friend Mr. Congdon was in favour of conscription, I say that he was as much entitled to those votes as my friend Dr. Thompson was.

But, we are told that there is too much technicality in this matter. We are told that we ought to deal with the great equities. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says with great earnestness that he is not satisfied that this law is not valid. I think I ought to quote his exact words:

> I am far from admitting that under a correct or reasonable interpretation of the statute those votes should not be counted.

The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) confirms that and goes farther. In the first place, he claims that the vote should go

to Dr. Thompson, and more than that he claims that if there be any doubt under one section there is another section which cures all the evil. These are two eminent lawyers. I need not say that I have not the presumption as a layman to question their judgment. But, if the Minister of Justice believes that this is a valid law, and if the Solicitor General believes it is a valid law, why in the world are they so anxious to keep it away from the courts? If they have complete faith in the validity of the law, as they say they have, they should jump at the motion of my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) and submit the matter to the courts.

But the Minister of Justice, speaking with regard to the various methods that might be adopted in dealing with this matter, says that it would be "the most futile of remedies to send the matter to a tribunal which will be bound down to the letter of the law." The letter of the law? The letter of the law is the law itself and, if there is any difference between the letter of the law and the spirit of the law, surely the courts of the country are the best tribunals to establish the difference. The letter of the law? We have 230 odd members sitting in this Parliament all of whom have to submit to the letter of the law. What harm will there be if one gentleman representing the Yukon shall submit to the letter of the law? The letter of the law denounced practically by the Minister of Justice! What are we coming to? I have heard the Socialists of England and members of other organizations in Hyde Park, London, on a Saturday afternoon, proclaiming to the people that no one should pay any attention to the law. In New York I have heard the soap-box orators on the corners of the streets calling upon the masses of the people to show their contempt for the letter of the law. I have heard Socialistic speakers in the city of Montreal preaching the same doctrine. But now you have the same doctrine preached by the man who sits, as Minister of Justice, at the fountain head of justice. The letter of the law? Mr. Bumble says "The law is a ass." Mr. Bumble goes farther and says "The law is a idiot." Let the Bumbles everywhere rejoice; they are in good company now. They will rejoice when they come to find their views are precisely the same as those of the Minister of Justice.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I regard the main issue to be: Is this matter to be governed by our law and our custom? I am paying some little attention to these

questions which have been raised in the debate because I do not want it to be said I have ignored them altogether. We are told about technicalities. To most minds all law is a bunch of technicalities, and if there is one law which, more than any other, is a bunch of technicalities, that is the election law. We are asked to take very generous views of these things. A young man comes into the poll to poll his vote on election day. Everybody knows him, he is a bright young fellow, one of the finest fellows in the town. He gives his name and residence and he is about to get a ballot when somebody says: "Hold on, young man, how old are you, are you twenty-one years of age?" "Yes, substantially." "What do you mean by substantially?" "I am not actually twenty-one to-day but I will be twenty-one to-morrow." That young man should get a ballot because he will be twenty-one before the election proceeding is all over. You are going to shut him out of that right on a mere technicality. Later in the afternoon another man comes in, out of breath, two minutes after the hour fixed for closing the poll. He asks for a ballot and he is told: "You are too late." "Why," he says, "I have a vote, my name is on the list and surely you are not going to deprive me of a vote because I am two minutes late?" He says "The train was late; my carriage broke down; my wife was sick." But he can not get the right to vote. These technicalities are such as to prevent him from getting a ballot. The whole election law abounds in technicalities. The extraordinary part of it is that while the rest of us are supposed to be governed by technicalities, in this case we are to turn to the broader view, to set aside all precedent, all law, all rule or custom of Parliament, adopt a new principle, and give the seat to a gentleman who has not been lawfully elected.

I have said before and I repeat that the principle to be followed in this case is the one which, I believe, has been established by the law and custom of Parliament for a very long time. The principle which has been laid down beyond all question is that, except as to the matter of the qualification of a candidate, Parliament will not intervene in the trial of a controverted election; we had dark days in the old times when Parliament did deal with that question. I am not going to allude to that. We have come to better days. We have moved forward since the time away

back in the dark days of fifty years ago when elections were decided by partisan committees and a partisan House. The views of Sir John Thompson have been quoted during the course of this debate but they are of sufficient importance to justify me in quoting them again. They deal with the essential principle of the whole question. Sir John Thompson was speaking in the famous King-Baird case in 1887. If ever there was a case where the equities were on one side and possibly the law on the other that was such a case. Mr. King had been elected by a majority of the votes. The question was raised at the eleventh hour as to his deposit. The deposit was made in good time but the point was raised that the deposit had not been handed in by his agent but had been handed in by another person. Surely that was a case in which all the equities were in favour of Mr. King. If there ever was a case in which Parliament should have intervened it was that; but Sir John Thompson said there was no question in that case for Parliament to deal with; that it was to be determined by the law, custom, and precedent of Parliament, and that Parliament must be guided by these. I have been indulging the hope that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) who is the guardian of the laws and precedents of Parliament, would see the wisdom of adopting the views expressed by Sir John Thompson, not only because they were the views of Sir John Thompson, although that in itself had merit, but because of the intrinsic merit of the argument itself. Sir John Thompson spoke as follows:

> Twenty years ago in the Imperial Parliament the gravity of questions connected with Parliamentary elections, and the necessity of having them adjudicated upon by an entirely impartial tribunal, led the Parliament of Great Britain to adopt an Act which relegated to the judiciary of the country the disposal of all questions connected with controverted elections. Upwards of ten years ago a similar statute was not only adopted by the Parliament of Canada, but adopted by a number of the Provincial Legislatures.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Since the change which I have referred to, and by which Parliament has renounced its rights to deal with the matter of controverted elections, there has been fully recognized in the various discussions that have taken place in the House of Commons this principle,—that everything has been transferred to the judiciary in connection with controverted elections, excepting the one question of the qualification of persons who have been returned to Parliament. The House, therefore, is still seized of the right to decide whether the Writ has been obeyed by the election of a person who is fit and proper to sit in that House. But as soon as the question has been decided as to the qualification of the person so returned, the conduct of the Returning Officer, or the number of votes which were received, the conduct of the candidates and every other question connected with the election, with the conduct of the Returning Officer, has been relegated to the judiciary.

I think I was warranted in assuming from the hon. gentleman's remarks that he recognized the propriety of leaving the case to the courts.

The King-Baird case was the subject of very keen party strife in this House, but I think I am justified in saying that the principles of parliamentary law then laid down by Sir John Thompson were not questioned by anybody. I must say, Sir, that I think that is the principle that should guide us in this case. This ought not to be a party question. I was sorry when the matter was before the House on the last occasion to see evidences of partyism on one side or another. I found that some hon. gentlemen who had not been in the House at all during the day, who had not heard the debate and probably paid little or no attention to the matter, were suddenly inspired to come in on one side or the other and cast their votes. And if there was any doubt as to the party character of the movement, that doubt was removed when an hon. gentleman rose after the division and said, "I am paired with Mr. So-and-So," and another said, "I am paired with Mr. So-and-So," and so on to the extent of half a dozen gentlemen on either side. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the troubles of the past, in the light of the struggles that great men have made to place this question of controverted elections upon a sound basis—surely in the light of all that, we ought not to feel happy at the idea that we are undertaking to deal with this question from the point of view of party division.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that somehow a great mistake has been made in this matter. We talk about fairness and fair-play. Speaking this week in Montreal, Lord Reading asked the question: "What is the fundamental principle which makes the Englishman admired everywhere? It is his fundamental love of justice and fair-play." That is true. Whether it be in the field of sport, or in the field of business, or in the trials of the battlefield, the appeal to the Englishman to show fair-play is always responded to. The stirring words of New-

boldt "Play up, play up, and play the game," appeal to an Englishman. Mr. Congdon has played the game boldly and courageously.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING: He came before a committee of this House and said: "I believe I am lawfully elected, I believe I have a substantial majority of the electors of this constituency, I believe I am entitled to my seat in the House; but in view of questions that have been raised, if I am elected, I will resign and submit myself to the electors of the Yukon." That is fair-play. That is the kind of declaration of fair play which will appeal to the soldiers on the battlefield, if one may allude to them at all. That is the kind of declaration of fair play that is apt to meet the view of every man. "Ah," said the Minister of Justice, "that should not be; if you have another election the soldiers will not have their votes." Well, whose fault is that? There is an electoral vacancy to-day in the county of Glengarry, and we shall soon have, I presume, a by-election there. The soldiers from Glengarry that are overseas will not have votes. That must be right because it is the law that my hon. friend made, and if it is no great harm to disfranchise the Scotch electors of Glengarry who happen to be overseas, what harm could it be if we had an election in the Yukon and had to disfranchise the Yukon soldiers who are overseas? If my hon. and respected friend, the Minister of Justice were called to-morrow to his heavenly reward, there would be a vacancy in St. Ann's, Montreal, and the Irish soldiers from St. Ann's who are now over at the front would have no vote. That must be right, because the Minister of Justice made the law. Now if it would be no wrong to cut out the votes in a by-election of the Scotch electors of Glengarry, or the votes of the Irish electors of St. Ann's, what great wrong could it be if the votes of some of the Yukon electors overseas were also cut out? But I will go beyond that argument. If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice thinks that is not giving the soldiers a fair chance, I will make this suggestion: Let the Government take steps to order a new election. Let them give ample time, let them give time enough to have the soldiers in every part of Europe notified, and give them a chance to vote, not for the Government or the Opposition, but for the man. Let them vote for the man for whom they want to vote.

Let the Government take time; there is lots of time between now and the next session. Mr. Congdon has played the game fairly. He has offered to resign. Take his offer, accept the proposal, order a new election, and let the two men fight it out. Give time for the soldiers overseas to vote. Pass your special Act here and qualify them to cast their votes. Although you would not give votes to the Irishmen of St. Ann's and the Scotchmen of Glengarry, give votes to the Yukon men, and let us have fair play. That is the kind of fair play, that is the kind of spirit that will appeal to the nation.

My hon. friend, the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie), has given us an intimation to-day of what the Government are going to do. What is it they are going to do? They are going to bring in an Act by which they will slam the door in Mr. Congdon's face, and then invite him to come in. That is the effect of what the Government proposes. Mr. Congdon was in possession of his rights as a petitioner at the close of the Yukon election some day towards the end of January last. If you do not want to give Mr. Congdon the seat, respect his rights as they stood at that time. Surely that is a fair and reasonable proposal. But if it be proposed now to pass a Bill which will practically bar the door to Mr. Congdon, and then invite him to come in, that is not fair play and that is not playing the game as it should be played.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the subject that is now before the House was under discussion in virtually the same form and with virtually the same purpose some few days ago. At that time I had the honour of addressing the House, and in what I say this afternoon I shall add very little to the material presented then. What I shall say, though, shall have particular reference to the speech that has just fallen from the lips of the hon. member from Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman was a member of this House for many years prior to 1911. Those of us who recall his performances in those days will have cause to regret that though his reputation as an impassioned orator may not have suffered by his deliverance to-day, we cannot remember and recognize the sound, logical debater in the speaker of this afternoon.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Other hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I do not go so far as to say that the hon. gentleman's performance was shameful, in many respects it was creditable, but it was not a sound, logical deliverance, and it was not a fair deliverance. The hon. gentleman argues that it matters very little whether the soldiers of the Yukon are disfranchised or not, and he supports that by several allegations.

In the first place, it is well he argues that, because that is the issue, that and nothing more. If the course that the hon. member suggests, and which the amendment which we are now discussing proposes, is to be adopted, that course invites the possibility of the permanent, irrevocable disfranchisement of 325 soldiers of the Yukon territory. It is because it invites that possibility that I oppose that amendment and have opposed the principle from the beginning. I can assent to no proposal which in any way admits that possibility under any circumstances whatsoever. The hon. member says we have to do it because the law, even the technicalities of the law, say so. I do not know that the technicalities of the law say so. But I say this that whether it does or not the duty of Parliament is to see that it does not, even though the law must be changed. The hon. member says it matters very little, because both of these candidates were conscription candidates, and that was the issue; consequently, he says, the vote of the soldiers overseas in that Yukon election might just as honestly or fairly, no matter how they marked their ballots, be counted for Mr. Thompson or Mr. Congdon. I am surprised that the hon. member should argue that in the determination of the rights of the constituency, even of the candidates in the constituency, we should take into account the political view of these candidates. If we are to take that consideration into account, in the sense that because their political opinions were one on the main issue it did not matter how the soldiers votes went, then I am ready for him on that controversy. The hon. member may be right when he says that each of them, at some time or the other, supported conscription. But this I do know that one of them consistently supported conscription in principle and practice, and took the only course that could enforce conscription. The other, though he may have in theory supported it, took the course which would ultimately defeat conscription. Did he support the conscriptionist leader of a government? What is to be thought of the opinions of a candidate supporting conscription who takes the course that is destined to defeat the object he professes to have in view? Mr. Thompson is recognized by the leader of the Conscriptionist Government. Mr. Congdon is recognized by the leader of an anti-Conscriptionist Opposition. Does anybody in this House, in honour to his own mind, even dream for a minute that any of the 293 soldiers overseas who voted for the Government intended that their vote should be cast for a man who opposed the Conscriptionist Government, for the man who was recognized as the candidate of an anti-conscriptionist leader? Does any one for a moment dream that any one of these 293 men who voted for this Government would not have been outraged if his vote had been cast in favour of the candidate who opposed this Government and supported the leader who wanted this Government destroyed? Consequently, what is there in the contention that it did not matter how the soldiers' votes were cast? It mattered just as much how these soldiers' votes were cast as it did matter how the votes of the men at home were cast, and just as much as it mattered how the votes of the 300,000 soldiers were cast in the last election. Oh, but he tells us, "that is a technicality, a technicality that must stand; we cannot cure a technicality, no matter what the object to be gained is." I never heard that doctrine supported by a member of the standing of my hon. friend from Queen's-Shelburne before—that Parliament could not cure such a technicality if it did no injury in the process; that it could not cure any technicality of the law if by doing so it would prevent injustice. I never knew that Parliament's hands were tied like that. The hon. member himself has sat in this House and loosened the bands that tied Parliament in similar cases. Does he remember that not very many years ago, when he was a distinguished member of the Government of the day, a Bill was introduced in this House to declare elected a candidate whose seat was in peril by a technicality of the law? Does he remember that the member for West Huron at that time was declared elected by the returning officer, and that it was afterwards found that he was a guarantor on a bond for some post office liability, and consequently that the seat of the member for West Huron was in peril? Did the hon. member then get up and discuss the soapbox orators in the city of London and New York who dared to defy the majesty of the law, and those who suggested that Parliament should

go back and cure that technicality and prevent the injustice that would be done to Mr. Lewis if he were to be unseated for that cause? No. He was the spokesman for the Government, the member of the Government who supported the Bill, and rightly supported the Bill, to cure the technicality and declare the member for West Huron elected. So, if only soapbox orators and Hyde Park declaimers are the men who are ready to cure technicalities in the law, where these technicalities do injustice, then my friend from Queen's-Shelburne must take his place with them, because that is where he stood at that time. He has made reference to the King-Baird case. I gather from his words that that case was something like this: A deposit was made by the candidate and some irregularity through a technicality occurred—I do not know the case, but I gather from the words of the hon. member that on account of this technicality the seat was imperilled and Parliament was asked to cure that technicality. Parliament refused. I do not know that Parliament was justified—I do not know the circumstances—but if the circumstance my hon. friend presents is the only one, I would say Parliament was not justified. There is this that distinguished the King-Baird case from the present case: If Mr. Baird was unseated through an irregular deposit, an appeal could be made to the electors, because that meant an appeal to the same electors who had voted before. But an appeal to the men of the Yukon does not mean an appeal to the same electors who voted before at all; it means an appeal to four-fifths of the electors and the disfranchisement of the other fifth, the most deserving of all. You cannot cure a technicality then by an appeal to the constituents of the Yukon.

Mr. FIELDING: Why not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend suggests that we should go to the constituency now. He knows that the soldiers' votes cannot be taken in a by-election, not one of them can be counted by the law as it stands. To get the vote of the soldiers now we should have to chase through all the countries at war, and even if we had only to go through France and Flanders alone would be to commit an outrage on those soldiers—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, my hon. friends opposite laugh—

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. BUREAU: It is laughable, too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Their regard for the war is measured by their laughter.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. That is a gratuitous insult to every man in this House, and I ask the hon. minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not so take the remark of the Minister of the Interior, but I would ask him to withdraw it if it was so meant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Don't look so pale.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I would state it, for the purpose of making a repetition—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I made the statement that I did not take the remark of the hon. the Minister of the Interior as an insult; that if I had, I would ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. McMASTER: May I say a word, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. I ask your permission, Sir, to speak to the point of order. The minister said that the laughter which he elicited from this side in response to one of his remarks was the measure of our interest in the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: It is applauded now from the other side. The inference was, Sir, that members sitting on your left did not take the same interest in the war as members sitting on your right. That is a gratuitous insult to every member on this side of the House, and I will not allow it to pass unchallenged.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the remark can be interpreted in that way, I should be the first to ask the minister to withdraw it. I feel called upon to ask him to say that no such meaning was conveyed by his remarks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not question the interest in the war of any individual in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said calls for no apology and no withdrawal. I do not question the interest in the war of any hon. member. But there are ways of measuring interest in the war, and I do think that one who seriously suggests that our forces at the front should be disorganized to the extent of withdrawing 325 men from various points all over the fighting area in order to repeat the vote of the last election does not realize what the necessities of the nation are.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The one who says that does not seriously understand his responsibilities as a member of this House. It is all right for Mr. Congdon to say: I am ready to resign. Under ordinary circumstances that answer might be taken and it might be possible to cure the defect, as in the King-Baird case, by an appeal. But as the law stands to-day it is practically impossible to take the vote; that impossibility has been recognized by this House itself. Why was the War-time Elections Act made applicable only to a general election, and not to by-elections? Because it was a practical impossibility to take the soldiers' vote in a by-election, and it would be an injustice to our fighting forces, for all the purposes that would be served, to subject them to such disorganization as would result from the taking of the vote of the soldiers in a by-election. That was the decision of this House; why should it be reversed in a single case? In fact it cannot be reversed in a single case; consequently the offer of Mr. Congdon, supported by the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) leads to the possibility of the permanent and irrevocable disfranchisement of 325 soldiers, if by any chance the court should find that under the strict and literal meaning of the Act the votes cast before nomination day in that special constituency were illegal. I do not say that it means that or that it does not, but I am not prepared as a member of this House to take the responsibility of committing to any court or any man the possibility of disfranchising 325 soldiers from the Yukon. I will not take into account the possibility of doing it, either directly or by a circuitous route —and that is all the difference there is between the two suggestions. You do it directly if you disfranchise them now and declare Mr. Congdon elected; you do it circuitously if you disfranchise them now, have a by-election and elect Mr. Congdon on the vote that votes for him and cast aside the vote that votes against him. There is no difference whatsoever in principle; it is only a difference of method. Because I am not ready, as a responsible member of Parliament, to take any course which permits of that possibility, I cannot support the amendment.

If in the ordinary sense this were to be a controverted election, certainly the court is the place to try the case, in so far as the courts can try it and do justice. A Bill is before the House, or will be, whereby the right of protest on all subjects that possibly could be in dispute in an ordinary controverted elections case will be restored. It appears that that was taken away by the commitment of this case to the committee on Privileges and Elections. It was not the intention to take that right away. The case was committed because Mr. Congdon raised a legal question, and this method was adopted of solving it. There was no intention to take away any right of protest. That right is restored and protest may be entered in any fair and proper case—namely, on any charge of fraud, or to decide whether any votes were fraudulently obtained or whether anything else was wrong in connection with the contest. Surely that is all that should be covered in any commitment to the courts. We should not commit to the courts—because it is the right of Parliament, not the right of the courts—the question of the permanent enfranchisement or disfranchisement of a considerable portion of the population of any constituency. It is right to safeguard that franchise and if there is no practical method of restoring it surely it is our duty to make good and valid the measure of franchise which those 325 men were able to exercise and did exercise.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Devlin, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lanctôt,
Boivin,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Bourassa,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Boyer,	Lavigueur,
Brouillard,	Leduc,
Bureau,	Leger,
Cahill,	Lemieux,
Campbell,	Lesage,
Cannon,	McCoig,
Cardin,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Casgrain,	McKenzie,
Copp,	McMaster,
d'Anjou,	

Déchêne,	Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Murphy,
Desaulniers,	Pacaud,
Deslauriers,	Papineau,
Devlin,	Parent,
Duff,	Pedlow,
DuTremblay,	Pelletier,
Ethier,	Power,
Euler,	Prevost,
Fafard,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fontaine,	Robb,
Fournier,	Ross,
Gauthier,	Savard,
Gauvreau,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Gervais,	Tobin,
Gladu,	Trahan,
Jacobs,	Truax,
Kay,	Vien,
Kennedy,	White (Victoria).—68.
Lafortune,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Maclean (Halifax),
Anderson,	MacNutt,
Andrews,	McCurdy,
Argue,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Armstrong (Lambton),	McGregor,
Arthurs,	McIsaac,
Ballantyne,	McLean (Royal),
Bolton,	McLeod,
Borden (Sir Robert),	McQuarrie,
Bowman,	Maharg,
Boyce,	Manion,
Brien,	Marshall,
Buchanan,	Martin,
Burnham,	Meighen,
Burrell,	Mewburn,
Butts,	Middlebro,
Calder,	Mowat,
Carvell,	Munson,
Casselman,	Myers,
Chaplin,	Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Charters,	
Clark (Bruce),	Nicholson (Algoma),
Clark (Red Deer),	Nickle,
Clarke (Wellington),	Paul,
Cochrane,	Porter,
Cockshutt,	Reid (Grenville),
Cowan,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Crerar,	Richardson,
Crothers,	Rowell,
Crowe,	Scott,
Cruise,	Sexsmith,
Currie,	Shaw,
Davidson,	Sheard,
Davis,	Sifton,
Finley,	Simpson,
Foster (Sir George),	Smith,
Foster (York),	Spinney,
Fraser,	Steele,
Fripp,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Glass,	Stewart (Lanark),
Green,	Sutherland,
Guthrie,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Halladay,	Thompson (Hastings),
Harold,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Harrison,	Tolmie,
Hay,	Turriff,
Henders,	Tweedie,
Hocken,	Wallace,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Whidden,
Knox,	Wigmore,
Lang,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Long,	Wright.—103.

[Mr. Meighen.]

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Tremain,	Chisholm,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Blair,	McCrea,
Clements,	Molloy,
Chabot,	Verville,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Blake,	Lapointe (St. James),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Douglas (Strath.),	Hunt,
Bristol,	Fortier,
Maclean, W. F., (York),	Denis,
Stevens,	Mayrand,
Tudhope,	Baldwin,
McLeod,	Seguin.

Mr. TURGEON: I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I was paired with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the vote of an hon. member be challenged according to the rules, I doubt either the wisdom or the necessity of announcing pairs in the House, inasmuch as through an arrangement made by the whips, pairs are now recorded on Hansard.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, this question was discussed in the House last week, and it has been further discussed to-day. I do not rise for the purpose of repeating arguments which have already been adduced, but I intend to make a few remarks which I shall conclude by moving an amendment to the motion now before the Chair. Let me first draw the attention of the House to the wording of the Order in Council of February 26, 1918, which directed the General Returning Officer to abstain from proclaiming elected the candidate who might have appeared to him as having received a majority of the votes legally cast at that election, and which ordered him to file a special return which is now submitted to the House. Section 1 of the regulations made by virtue of that Order in Council reads:

4 p.m.

The lawful disposition of certain ballots purporting to have been polled under said Part IV of the said Dominion Elections Act having become a matter of difference, it is now with respect thereto provided that the special returning officers and their clerks shall comply with all the provisions of section 12, subsection 4, Part IV of the Dominion Elections Act, but that the General Returning Officer shall not declare any candidate to have been elected, to represent said Yukon Territory.

Therefore, there can be no discussion nor argument as to the causes or motives or raison d'être of the Order in Council. The difficulty was purely a legal one, it being stated that the matter of difference was the lawful disposition of certain ballots purporting to have been polled under Part IV of the said Dominion Elections Act. The House should remember this when dealing with this question. The Government accordingly by virtue of this Order in Council made regulation No. 3, which reads:

The General Returning Officer shall, with respect to the elections in said electoral districts of the Yukon Territory, and Nelson, make to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a special return fully disclosing the conditions and showing the result of the polling and such return shall be put before the House of Commons for its consideration and for such action by it as may be deemed necessary or proper according to the circumstances.

What were the effects of that Order in Council? By virtue of sections 13 and 14 of the Military Voters' Act, the General Returning Officer was substituted for the returning officer for the electoral district of the Yukon for the purpose of proclaiming elected the candidate who, according to the provisions of the law, had obtained a majority of the votes legally cast at that election. The duty imposed upon him was imperative. That duty is prescribed by section 184 of the Dominion Elections Act, and sections 13 and 14 of the Military Voters' Act. Section 13 reads:

The general returning officer shall be substituted for him—

That means the returning officer for the constituency.

—and shall act in his place and stead as returning officer in respect of the said election.

Section 14 reads:

The General Returning Officer shall add the number of votes given for or applicable to the respective candidates in each electoral district, as disclosed by such statements, to the votes given for the candidates as shown by the certificate of the returning officer made pursuant to section 13 of this Part, and shall openly proclaim and shall return pursuant to the provisions of section 211 of Part III, as being duly elected a member or members to represent such electoral district in the Commons of Canada, the candidate or candidates found to have the greatest number of votes.

Therefore, the General Returning Officer has to exercise his own judgment in the matter. He has to apply the law. It was part of his duty to interpret the law. He had the right to take legal advice if he found that necessary; but he was the officer appointed and designated by statute to decide as to the validity or legality of the ballots which were disputed, and his decision could be challenged only by either candidate before the tribunals of the country. The Governor in Council intervened and prevented the course of the law from being followed. The effect of the Order in Council of February 26th was manifold. In the first place, it prevented a public officer from fulfilling a duty and accomplishing a task which was imposed upon him by a special statute of this Parliament. Secondly, it prevented the authorities entrusted by statute with recounting the votes when requested by one of the candidates to do so, from proceeding with such recount. In fact, Mr. Congdon, one of the candidates, applied for a recount, and sent to the General Returning Officer a telegram which will be found on page 23 of the special report of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and on page 24 is a copy of the telegram which was sent in answer by the General Returning Officer, and which reads:

Fred T. Congdon, K.C.,
Dawson, Yukon Territory.

Governor General in Council having by Order in Council directed special return of Yukon elections proceedings to Parliament as result your contention that Military Voters' Act does not apply to Yukon election must respectfully decline obedience to Justice Macauley's order as being made without jurisdiction.

(Sgd) W. F. O'Connor,
General Returning Officer.

In the third place, this Order in Council deprives the losing candidate of his right to protest the election, which right is guaranteed and provided for by statute. So the provisions of the law have been set aside, and the equal rights of both candidates under those legal provisions, and the still greater rights of the whole people of Canada in seeing that the election of each and every member of the House of Commons shall be made according to well established rules and principles, have been utterly disregarded as a result of the Order in Council of February 26. That Order in Council was and is illegal. The Governor in Council had no right to adopt it, he had no power to virtually annul the provisions of both a general and a special statute respecting elections in this country, simply for the purpose of electing a supporter of

the Government. By what authority was that Order in Council passed? The authority is stated in express terms in the Order in Council itself, which reads as follows:

> His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State and with reference to Sections 89, 90 and 91 of Part III of the Dominion Elections Act and to Sections 7 and 8 of Part IV of the said Act and with respect to the deferred election of a member to represent in the House of Commons the Electoral District of the Yukon Territory, and to the postponed election of a member to represent in the House of Commons the Electoral District of Nelson, in the Province of Manitoba, is pleased under authority of Scetion 19 of Part IV of the Dominion Elections Act, and Section 6 of the War Measures Act, 1914, to make the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:—

Sir, I contend that neither of those two statutes could empower the Governor in Council to pass that Order in Council. The War Measures Act was never enacted for the purpose of enabling the Government to tamper with the election laws of this country. It was enacted in order that in cases of emergency, when Parliament was not in session, the business of the war could be carried on, without summoning Parliament, for the benefit of Canada and her Allies. Now, was it necessary to the success of the Allied armies, was it necessary for the winning of the war, that a member for the electoral district of the Yukon should be elected as a supporter of the present Government, and that in order to accomplish this end the statutes and the laws of this country should be set aside? Section 19 of Part 4 of the Dominion Elections Act, which is the Military Voters' Act, reads:

> For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Part or supplying any deficiency therein, the Governor in Council may make such regulations, not inconsistent therewith, as may be deemed necessary.

There is nothing there which gives the Governor in Council power to make regulations that would supersede or prevent the operation of the statute as it was passed. First, only such regulations could be made as would give effect to the provisions of the statute, and in the second place, no regulations could be made that would be in any way inconsistent with the provisions of the statute.

I believe I have shown that the Order in Council not only is not consistent with the provisions of Part 4 of the Dominion Elections Act, but actually cancelled those provisions and made them null and void. Moreover, any regulations made under Section 19 of Part 4 could only be made before the election had actually taken place, and not after the election for the purpose of electing the candidate wno happened to be favoured by the Government. No wonder the Government felt this Order in Council could not be passed under the authority of section 19 of the Military Voters' Act, and therefore invoked the authority of the War Measures Act. But two wrongs do not make a right or, as we say in French, "Deux noirs ne font jamais un blanc." From the day that Order in Council was passed on February 26 up to the present time all things done in connection with the Yukon election have been done illegally, and I claim that this matter is illegally before the House to-day. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) said last week when this question was before the House that we had no right to refer it to the Supreme Court by way of resolution. What right, I would ask, has this Parliament to elect by way of such a resolution as is now before the House a member of Parliament to represent the electoral district of the Yukon? What moral or legal right have we to set aside a statute? What right have we to let a partisan majority substitute itself for the courts of the country, and virtually to change the law by a mere resolution of the House, when that change moreover is retroactive in its effect? What right have we to declare by resolution that votes given at a time when there were no candidates nominated must be considered legal and valid? I believe that in view of the vote that has just been taken there is only one fair, just and legal way for us to act and that is to order a new election for the electoral district of the Yukon. I cannot see any serious objections to carrying out that proposal, which would be fair to all parties, and put both candidates on an equal footing. Of course, I foresaw the objection which was raised a few minutes ago, namely, "What are you going to do with the military voters? Do you want to disfranchise our brave boys at the front?" As my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has said—perhaps I am going a little further than what he actually said, but the meaning is the same—every time our friends opposite have any illegal or doubtful expedient to propose they should shield themselves behind the gallantry of our Canadian soldiers. The Minister of the Interior has just sat down after playing that chord with all the art and science of a virtuoso, and everybody knows that he is

a Paderewski in that line. I do not yield to any one in my desire to give the franchise to the brave boys of the Yukon. Let then vote at this new election. That should be easy enough. The name of every man who registered his vote for the Yukon district in the election last December is inscribed on the back of the envelope containing his ballot. There are lists of all the men who voted at this election and it would be an easy matter to organize the machinery for the purpose of enabling them to register their votes at a new election. When such a course was suggested before the committee it was said by the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) that the British authorities might object to the vote being taken. If it was possible in the month of December last to register the votes of 300,000 men, how is it impossible in the months of May or June to register the votes of 300 men?

Furthermore, this Parliament must have something to say in regard to the Canadian army. We must have some control of our own soldiers. If we have not we have been deceived in the grossest way. If our soldiers are simply a part of the British army, without any direction or control on our part, if Canada is not fighting in this war as a self-governing, autonomous country, then the Military Service Act and the principle of compulsion which it involves would constitute the extreme limit of serfdom.

I submit that a new election is nothing but fair to the soldiers from the Yukon because they have the same rights and privileges as those which were enjoyed by the soldiers of other constituencies. Those who want to treat the Yukon soldiers unfairly and to deprive them of the rights which we gave to their brother soldiers at the last election are not those who ask for a new election. Those who refuse to give them the privilege of knowing who the candidates are who solicit their votes, who compel them to vote blindly while the other soldiers are treated in a different way, are the ones who are depriving the soldiers of their rights. Mr. Congdon has been a resident of the Yukon for many years. He has occupied many public positions in that territory. He has represented that constituency in the House of Commons. Every soldier at the front, who has gone from the Yukon, knows Mr. Congdon. They all know his ability, his standing, his qualifications, his loyalty to their interests, to the interests of the constituency, to the interests of Canada and to the interests of the British Empire and they are entitled, they have the right, to know that Mr. Congdon is one of the candidates when they register their vote in an election in the Yukon Territory.

Some time ago the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) complained very bitterly because the list of candidates which was posted in certain military camps in England did not contain the names of two soldier candidates who were running for constituencies in the province of Ontario. They described that condition of things as most unfair. What do they say of a condition where no candidates have been nominated at the time the actual voting took place? I am really surprised that those gentlemen siding with the other side of the House when the vote was taken a few minutes ago. It must shock the sense of justice of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to act as the Government require them to do in the present instance. It must shock their sense of justice to be a party to doing away with the statutes and the courts of justice for the purpose of giving a seat in this House to a supporter of the Government. It must shock their sense of justice to listen to the argument as it was put forward the other day, when the matter came before the House, and when an hon. gentleman said that he, himself, having benefited by the votes of soldiers, he could not do otherwise than vote in favour of another one profiting by the same vote. Another hon. gentleman undertook to question the Unionist principles of Mr. Congdon, saying that they were too elastic, too flexible, and that Mr. Thompson was a much safer man to elect as a supporter of the present Government. To those gentlemen on the other side of the House who still believe in Liberalism, who believe in justice and fair play, who believe in the equality of all citizens before the law, I can fairly appeal and ask their support for the amendment which I am going to move. The election of a member for the Yukon Territory by a partisan majority in this House is, under the circumstances, the quintessence of Toryism. I cannot believe that this temporary union with the Tories is sufficient to prevent some—I say some—hon. members opposite from looking at that matter in its true light. If it is, I can justly apply to them these words of Robert Burns:

> Or like the snowfall in the river,
> A moment white—then melts forever.

I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be not concurred in, but that this House is of the opinion that the seat for the electoral district of the Yukon Territory is and should be declared and considered vacant, and that writs be issued for a new election in the said Yukon Territory, and that legislation should be at once adopted for the purpose of enabling the military voters who are entitled to vote in the said electoral district to register their votes at the said election.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one or two words in regard to the motion which is just proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe). The legislation which was passed at the last session, comprising both the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act, had regard to the right of the men at the front to exercise their franchise, notwithstanding the fact—more than that, because of the fact—that they were fighting the battles of this country over yonder in France and in Belgium. Let me grant for the purpose of argument, and only for the purpose of argument, that there were two oversights in that legislation—one the oversight of failing to provide for a deferred election in the Yukon, or in any other constituency where it might possibly happen that the election would have to be deferred, as it had to be deferred in Nelson. That was one oversight, in the Military Voters' Act, we may grant for the purpose of argument. The other oversight was the failure to make provision for the filing of election petitions at a date which would ensure the right of any man who was a defeated candidate at that election, or any man who desired to present a petition, to bring the matter before the courts of this country and have it determined. The report of the committee before the House at the present time relates solely to the Yukon Territory, but it restores each one of those rights. It seeks to repair those two oversights. It seeks to repair the supposed oversight in respect of the franchise of the men from the Yukon who were in the Canadian army overseas. My hon. friend the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) will not for one moment pretend that he, or any member of this House had it in mind, that those men should not exercise their franchise. The hon. gentleman will not tell the House that he, or any member of the House had it in mind that if an election were deferred by reason of unforeseen circumstances, the men from that constituency who happened to be overseas should be deprived of the right to exercise their franchise. My hon. friend, (Mr. E. Lapointe) does not venture to take issue with me in that regard, and I know that he agrees with me. Well, then, is that, or is that not, an error which this Parliament has not only the right, but the duty, of repairing? And that is all that is proposed in the resolution now before the House.

But there is something more: If in the Yukon, or anywhere else, any man who, under the ordinary law of the land as contained in the Dominion Elections Act, would have the right to file a petition against the return of the successful candidate, is deprived of that right, it is proper that that right should be restored. Therefore we propose that that right shall be restored to the unsuccessful candidate in the Yukon, or to any other man in the Yukon who would have the right to present an election petition. That is what it comes down to in the end. The argument of my hon. friend at its best is that there was an oversight in the Military Voters' Act. Let that be repaired. There was an oversight also in not preserving the right to file a petition for the purpose of contesting the election. Let that oversight also be repaired. This matter will then stand before Parliament and before the people of this country precisely in the way that Parliament intended when the legislation in question was passed.

Now my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has spoken of this question as being dealt with in a partisan way. I do not desire it to be dealt with in a partisan way, and I hope my hon. friend will acquit me of that intention. I might say in that connection that the case of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) was brought to my attention early in the session. It was pointed out that he was in precisely the same position as Mr. Lewis—that by reason of having signed a guarantee for a person who had a contract with the Government, he came technically within the law which would prevent him from sitting in this Parliament. I said at once, "It seems to me doubtful whether the Act really means that, but you can assure the hon. member for Lunenburg that if that question is seriously raised in the House, or in the courts, I am prepared to go before Parliament with a Bill declaring that notwithstanding any such enactment he shall have his seat in Parliament." I stand precisely

by that declaration to-day. I might be overriding a technicality in the law in doing so, but I am prepared under such conditions to override such a technicality in the case of any hon. gentleman on either side of the House. And after all, my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) will remember there is a very wise and very grave saying: "The law killeth, but the spirit maketh alive." It is the spirit of what was intended by the legislation enacted at the last session of Parliament that we are keeping alive in this case. My hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe) is somewhat shocked that Parliament should have anything to do with this question. Does he not realize that his vote in this House, along with the vote of about two hundred other gentlemen, kept him in his seat for a year after the time when otherwise he would have ceased to be a member of Parliament?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Much against my will.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend seeks to evade the issue by saying that it was done against his will. That is an extremely unsatisfactory answer. If he thought the legislation was not right he should have stood up and voted against it. By his silence he voted for that legislation, and he kept his seat in Parliament for a year beyond the term for which he was elected. I am not saying that by way of reproach, because I myself proposed the motion, and I thought it was a wise and just proposal under the circumstances; but if my hon. friend intends to cast discredit upon Parliament, by reason of the action proposed at the present time, his hands are not absolutely clean in that regard, and that applies also to two hundred and twenty other gentlemen who were members of the late Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: It was in a moment of weakness that we yielded to you.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friends on the other side in a moment of weakness are endeavouring to controvert the just proposal which the Solicitor General has submitted. There was a moment of weakness on the other occasion, my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) says. Let me suggest to him that he is also yielding to a moment of weakness on the present occasion.

Mr. BUREAU: We yield very often.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The opportunities are not so frequent now as formerly. Well, I cannot put it better, according to my view than in the manner indicated a moment ago: That there was an oversight, let us say, on the one side, and there was an oversight on the other. Such being the case it is not only the right but the duty of Parliament to repair them both, and that is what the Solicitor General proposes by the motion which he has submitted.

Mr. J. ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): If neither the Government nor the Opposition had endorsed the candidates, as happened in other constituencies, or if, on nomination day, on the 31st of December, there had been only one candidate who was elected by acclamation, would the Yukon soldiers' vote in that case have been applied to any other constituency?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly not.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Then the soldiers from that constituency would have been disfranchised?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Not at all; no more than the soldiers or any other electors would have been disfranchised in any constituency where there was an election by acclamation.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: They would have been disfranchised.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Not at all.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince): I would have been pleased to support the original motion if it had been a fair one, and, if it had gone to the extent of repairing the wrong perpetrated by the Government in passing the Order in Council, which took the rights from these candidates which they now seek to restore; or if the Bill my hon. friend the Solicitor General has proposed to the House did not eliminate the very controversy at issue as it eliminates that part of the point in dispute which refers to the validity of the soldiers' vote. My contention is—and I look at this matter absolutely from a non-partisan and independent standpoint—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I am not like some of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House who sit down and let them drop worms, shingle nails or sparables or anything else into their mouths if they were young robins! The point I want to make is this: that the record of the soldiers' vote that has been sent to the returning officer here is not the correct return of the soldiers' vote, and I want to show hon. gentlemen why and how. In the first place, the prin-

ciple of representative government involved in the election of a candidate to represent a constituency has been based upon the personal equation, upon the individual. The War-time Elections Act was the first piece of legislation which violated that principle and changed the principle to a vote for a certain party or against that party, "for the Government" or "for the Opposition." But I understand they re-considered that sweeping change in the principle of election, and put in the Act the right of the voter to vote for an individual. They not only did that, but when they made their official ballot they provided a blank for that particular purpose on the very top of the ballot. The very first principle then involved in the Military Voters' Act, so far as the soldier was concerned, the very first principle recognized by the late Parliament, was that the individual candidate was the first factor on the ballot to receive the attention of the elector. But as there was no candidate in the field when the election took place, it was impossible for the elector to write the candidate's name on the ballot with the result that the returns were all wrong. It is not the same result that would have obtained had a nomination taken place before the election. This is a case where the election took place before the nomination, and where the name of the candidate was not known and could not be put in the first blank provided on the ballot to receive it. But if the Government will undertake to allow us to put in the new Bill that the whole matter can be referred to the court, including the question of the validity of the soldiers' vote, I have no objection to the motion. Otherwise I must vote for the amendment.

5 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: But if that is refused, I cannot do anything else than vote for the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe).

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. E. Lapointe, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Devlin,
Duff,
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Jacobs,
Kay,
Kennedy,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
McCoig,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcile (Bagot),
Michaud,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Robb,
Ross,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Vien,
White (Victoria).—69.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,
Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Bolton,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Bowman,
Boyce,
Brien,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Elkin,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Glass,
Green,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Knox,
Lang,
Long,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacNutt,
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McLeod,
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Marshall,
Martin,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Mowat,
Munson,
Myers,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nickle,
Paul,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Richardson,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Smith,
Spinney,
Steele,
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tolmie,
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Wallace,
Whidden,
Wigmore,
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wright.—102.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Tremain,	Chisholm,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Blair,	McCrea,
Chabot,	Verville,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Blake,	Lapointe (St. James),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Stevens,	Mayrand,
Tudhope,	Baldwin,
Douglas (Strath.),	Hunt,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Casgrain,
Bristol,	Molloy.

The House divided on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Guthrie, for the adoption of the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections (Yukon election) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Long,
Anderson,	Maclean (Halifax),
Andrews,	MacNutt,
Argue,	McCurdy,
Armstrong (Lambton),	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Arthurs,	McGregor,
Ballantyne,	McIsaac,
Bolton,	McLean (Royal),
Borden (Sir Robert),	McLeod,
Bowman,	McQuarrie,
Boyce,	Maharg,
Brien,	Manion,
Burnham,	Marshall,
Burrell,	Martin,
Butts,	Meighen,
Calder,	Mewburn,
Carvell,	Middlebro,
Casselman,	Mowat,
Chaplin,	Munson,
Charters,	Myers,
Clark (Bruce),	Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Clark (Red Deer),	Nicholson (Algoma),
Clarke (Wellington),	Nickle,
Cochrane,	Paul,
Cockshutt,	Porter,
Cowan,	Reid (Grenville),
Crerar,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Crothers,	Richardson,
Crowe,	Rowell,
Cruise,	Scott,
Currie,	Sexsmith,
Davidson,	Shaw,
Davis,	Sheard,
Elkin,	Sifton,
Finley,	Simpson,
Foster (Sir George),	Smith,
Foster (York),	Spinney,
Fraser,	Steele,
Fripp,	Stewart (Lanark),
Glass,	Sutherland,
Green,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Guthrie,	Thompson (Hastings),
Halladay,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Harold,	Tolmie,
Harrison,	Turriff,
Hay,	Tweedie,
Henders,	Wallace,
Hocken,	Whidden,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Wigmore,
Keefer,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Knox,	Wright.—103.
Lang,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Boivin,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bourassa,	Lavigueur,
Boyer,	Leduc,
Brouillard,	Leger,
Bureau,	Lemieux,
Cahill,	Lesage,
Cannon,	McCoig,
Cardin,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Copp,	McKenzie,
d'Anjou,	McMaster,
Déchêne,	Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Murphy,
Denis,	Pacaud,
Desaulniers,	Papineau,
Deslauriers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Pedlow,
Duff,	Pelletier,
Du Tremblay,	Power,
Ethier,	Prevost,
Euler,	Proulx,
Fafard,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fielding,	Robb,
Fontaine,	Ross,
Fortier,	Savard,
Fournier,	Seguin,
Gauthier,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Gauvreau,	Tobin,
Gervais,	Trahan,
Gladu,	Truax,
Jacobs,	Vien,
Kay,	White (Victoria).—69.
Kennedy,	
Lafortune,	
Lanctôt,	

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Tremain,	Chisholm,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Blair,	McCrea,
Chabot,	Verville,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Blake,	Lapointe (St. James),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Stevens,	Mayrand,
Tudhope,	Baldwin,
Douglas (Strath.),	Hunt,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Casgrain,
Clements,	Molloy.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the election held in the electoral district of the Yukon.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill, of course, can be introduced only by unanimous consent of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Next sitting of the House.

Motion stands.

ORDER IN COUNCIL ON HEREDITARY TITLES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By the leave of the House I should like to lay upon the Table a copy of the Order in Council of 25th of March last respecting titles. It has already been read to the House, but it has never been formally laid upon the Table.

HEREDITARY TITLES IN CANADA

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House proceeded to Public Bills and Orders for the purpose of resuming the adjourned debate with respect to the resolution of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) respecting titles (resumed from April 8, 1918).

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): When this motion was last under consideration on the 8th of April, the hon. member from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) moved the following amendment:

> That the word "hereditary" be struck out from the Resolution, and that the third paragraph thereof conclude with the word "Canada" in the ensuing line.

And then, as explained by the hon. member for Springfield on that occasion, the result of that amendment, if carried, would be that the motion would read:

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada.

Before moving the adjournment of the debate, I ventured to point out to the members of the House the far reaching effects of that amendment if it should be carried, and at the conclusion of my brief remarks, I moved that the debate be adjourned, and it is now resumed upon that motion. I am still of the opinion that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield goes too far, and I am still of the opinion, which I expressed to the House on the 8th of April, that the concluding portion of the motion of the hon. member for Kingston ought to be eliminated. It has been suggested to me that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield might be amended so as to pray His Majesty to refrain from conferring any hereditary titles upon persons domiciled or living in Canada or any titles other than such terms, distinctive of variations of naval and military rank, as are necessary or customary for the purposes of His Majesty's naval or military forces. Even if that form of resolution were adopted, it seems to me it would carry the proposal beyond what is desirable at the present time. For example, we have in Canada, under the authority of the Crown, acting under the constitution, certain distinctions which are recognized and which would have to be withdrawn if the motion passed in the form which my hon. friend proposes.

I find that the word "title" is defined in the dictionaries as "an appellation of dignity, distinction or pre-eminence," and I find also that under the authority vested in the Crown there are certain appellations which have been in force from Confederation down to the present time, which I think have not heretofore been found in any way prejudicial to the public interest, and which would have to be withdrawn if the motion which my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) proposes should be passed by this House and by the Senate. That House, it must be remembered, is a recognized part of this Parliament, and has a voice in such matters.

The Lieutenant Governor of a province is designated by Royal authority as "His Honour," Privy Councillors in Canada are by Royal authority designated as "Honourable," and that during the term of their life. The Solicitor General of Canada is by the same authority designated by the title "Honourable." Senators of Canada, by the like authority, are designated by the title "Honourable," but only during their office, the title not being continued afterwards. The Speaker of the House of Commons during the tenure of his office is entitled under Royal authority to the designation of "Honourable." The Chief Justice of Canada, the judges of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts of Canada, and the Chief Justices and judges of the Superior Courts of all the provinces of Canada are by Royal authority entitled to the designation of "Honourable" while they hold office. The same authority provides that upon the recommendation of the Governor General the title may be continued to them after they have resigned from office. The Presidents and Speakers of the Legislatures of the province are styled "Honourable" during their tenure of office. The Executive Councillors of the provinces are styled "Honourable" while in office. Legislative Councillors in any province are not to have that title except those who were appointed before Confederation.

The amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson), as I pointed out, would prevent recognition

by the Crown of the service of men serving in the military forces of Canada, and if adopted it would create what seems an invidious distinction between men who are serving in the Canadian Army Corps beyond the seas and the men who are serving in the forces of the Empire from other dominions. I think even the hon. gentleman who proposes the motion would agree that a man who has earned the Victoria Cross or any other of the distinctions conferred by Royal authority in recognition of valorous service at the front should be recognized, if he belongs to the Canadian army corps to the same extent and in the same manner as if he belonged to the forces of any of the other dominions of the Empire or of the United Kingdom.

But in the suggestion put forward, it is proposed that military distinctions shall be continued, and that all other distinctions in this country shall be discontinued. I suggest to hon. members that it might be worth while to consider carefully before this Parliament embarks upon such a policy. Our country, I hope, and more than hope, I believe, is not embarking upon the path of being a great military nation. We are fighting in this war in order that war may end. We are not fighting that our Empire may embark upon the project of becoming a great military power. We want to bring it about that the menace of war shall cease. It does not seem to me appropriate that we should continue designations of distinction solely to those who have served in military or naval forces. There may be persons in this country who have rendered valuable public service to Canada in other spheres of national activity. If we adopted the proposal of recognizing only service of a military or naval character we would be very much following the example which Germany has given to the world. So I would suggest with all due respect that perhaps we have gone for the present, by the Order in Council which has been laid on the Table to-day, about as far as it would be wise for us to go without further consideration, and I have myself prepared an amendment to the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Springfield. The sub-amendment which I thus propose to move, reads:

That after the word "Canada" referred to in the said amendment, the following words be added,

"Except in accordance with the principles enunciated in the Order in Council approved on the 25th day of March, 1918, and laid upon the table of this House on the twenty-first day of May, 1918."

In order to make my proposal perfectly clear, I shall read to the House the Address as it would be if the sub-amendment which I have just now proposed, should be adopted:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada, except in accordance with the principles enunciated in the Order in Council approved on the twenty-fifth day of March 1918, and laid upon the table of this House on the twenty-first day of May, 1918.

In order that I may make the matter still clearer to hon. gentlemen, I shall read, not the whole of that Order in Council, because I read it in my remarks on the 8th of April last, but just the portion that sums up the conclusions which Council reached and which, when approved by His Excellency the Governor General, have been forwarded to His Majesty's Government:

1. No honour or titular distinction (saving those granted in recognition of military service during the present war or ordinarily bestowed by the Sovereign proprio motu) shall be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except with the approval or upon the advice of the Prime Minister of Canada.

2. The Government of the United Kingdom shall exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time.

3. No hereditary title of honour shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.

4. Appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title of honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognized as having hereditary effect.

I should add that it is my intention, so long as I am called upon to discharge the duties now incumbent upon me, to see to it that whenever any honour of any character is conferred upon my recommendation, the reasons on account of which the honour is conferred shall be publicly stated at the time when the honour is announced. That is the course which, I understand is to be followed in the United Kingdom and I think it eminently desirable that it should be followed here.

There is another consideration which I submit to the House and it is this: His Majesty's Government have to take into consideration, of course, the relation of this proposal not only to Canada but to all the dominions of the Empire and they have asked us, in a respectful and courteous way, that the whole subject be brought

under discussion during the coming summer when certain of the Canadian ministers are to visit the United Kingdom. It seems to me that as the Order in Council has been passed and has been communicated to His Majesty's Government, the delay that would ensue between this session and the next session, when the matter might be taken up again, if desired, ought not to stand in the way of our acceding to that respectful request. I do not imagine that the public interest will suffer by any action taken before Parliament shall assemble again. The Government of this country will then be in a position to announce to Parliament the result, of their conference with the Imperial authorities in respect to this subject. So, I would suggest to my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson)—and I hope he will accept this suggestion— that the sub-amendment which I have proposed be accepted.

There is just one further consideration which I omitted to mention, and it is this: If the amendment in the form proposed by my hon. friend on the 8th day of April last, or in the form since suggested to me, were passed, I think it would have the effect of preventing any minister of the Crown or any other person in Canada, from being appointed to His Majesty's Imperial Council. Appointment to the Privy Council carries with it the designation of "right honourable" and the terms of the motion as proposed on the 8th April, and of the motion as suggested to me since, would prevent the appointment of any person domiciled, or living, in Canada to His Majesty's Imperial Council, if I understand the terms of the motion correctly.

I venture to submit that we have made a very important advance by the Order in Council passed on the 25th May last and that this matter might very well stand at that until there has been consultation with the Imperial authorities. If it is thought that a further step should be taken in the immediate future, that step can be taken in five, six, or seven months from now when Parliament assembles again.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough W.): In approaching this question I first of all desired to assure myself that the right hon. leader of the Opposition would not consider a vote upon it as a vote of want of confidence, so I asked him if we were all free to express our opinions without any such dire consequences attaching themselves, and he said most distinctly, Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am aware of what the people of Canada think; they are sick of the whole titles business. I would, with all humility, have been perfectly content that during the prevalence of this disastrous war this question should have stood over for a more convenient season, but when such a distinguished gentleman as the right hon. leader of the Government has laid an amendment before this House and requires a vote upon it, he has precipitated the issue. He has called for a decision in this way and therefore we must go to it. It is now a question of titles or no titles; and I do not see that those members of the House who have steadfastly set their faces against these distinctions, if such they can be called, can be blamed for taking up this matter seriously at this juncture. But they can be greatly blamed if they do not respond to this invitation of the Prime Minister and say once for all what they have to say, and abide by the consequences.

The people of this country have been greatly stirred over this question. It is not for us to recapitulate the pros and cons, the arguments, one way and the other. They have all been recited at length, the people understand them, we all understand them, and therefore I would proceed in the most respectful way to take up the latest phase of the question, and that is the one enunciated by the right hon. the Prime Minister himself. First of all he says:

> I think even the hon. gentleman who proposes the motion would agree that a man who has earned the Victoria Cross or any other of the distinctions conferred by Royal authority, in recognition of valorous service at the front should have authority if he belongs to the Canadian Army Corps to the same extent and in the same manner as if he belonged to the forces of any of the other dominions of the empire, or of the United Kingdom.

Well, I am not, by any means a great lawyer, but I did not know that there was any title of honour attached to the Victoria Cross—in fact, I am well aware, having looked up this matter at length when I compiled my little volume on "Canadians in the Imperial service," that there is no distinction attached to it. It is an iron cross which the winner is entitled to wear, and that is all. And the greatest distinction connected with that cross is that the possessor wears it without blazoning to the world that he is the winner

of it. He simply is entitled to it, and in the modest wearing of that distinction he finds a satisfaction which all brave and great hearts must prize.

Then the Prime Minister in his speech dealt with the question of military distinction. I understood from him that if we brought in a measure to take away titles it would affect the titles attached to military men. Now I understand from the right hon. Prime Minister that if we do confer these distinctions we shall give rise to a military caste. Therefore, he has given us an extremely strong argument that all classes shall be treated alike, whatever that treatment may be. I think with that everybody throughout the country will agree.

The Order in Council, which is the basis of the amendment, says in paragraph No. 1:

> No honour or titular distinction (saving those granted in recognition of military service during the present war or ordinarily bestowed by the Sovereign proprio motu) shall be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except with the approval or upon the advice of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Now it is the Prime Minister of Canada who gives that advice, and he gives it because he thinks that in so doing he represents the opinion of Canada. If he found out, however, that he is not representing the opinion of Canada, of course he would not give any opinion at all. Now we wish to show him, and I think the people of Canada wish to show him, that they do not wish him to give any advice, or anybody at all to give any advice, with regard to conferring titular distinctions upon Canadians. The Order in Council, I submit, completely begs the question, since we do not want to do what is suggested by it at all.

Paragraph No. 2 says:

> The Government of the United Kingdom shall exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time.

That is what we do not want to do. We do not want these titles to be allocated to Canada at all. The procedure, doubtless, has been to draw up a string of titles representative of the powerful, the mighty and the rich, and even the greedy, transmit that list from Canada to London, ask the people there to put their names on it, and then send the list back here to meet the expression of the will and opinion of the people of Canada with regard to the conferring of honours upon those to whom honour is due. I think it is only necessary to consider that procedure for a moment to see that it is an absolute caricature, it is an impossibility. The people do not want titles bestowed, they do not want any procedure provided for their continuance.

Now I heard the Prime Minister say:

> There is another consideration which I should like to submit to the House, and it is this: His Majesty's Government have to take into consideration, of course, the relation of this proposal not only to Canada but to all the dominions of the Empire and they have asked us, in a respectful and courteous way, that the whole subject might be brought under discussion during the coming summer when certain of the Canadian ministers are to visit the United Kingdom.

Quite so. Now is our time. Let us instruct our delegates. Do not postpone it. Since we have to adjudicate upon it, let us say with a distinct voice to our delegates, "As for Canada, believe me, Canada is dead against it; we do not want it." If, however, our delegate goes to London, and does not know the decision arrived at by the people of Canada through their representatives in this House, how can he possibly be expected to give any advice upon it that is worth the paper it is written on? Now is our time to make that excuse impossible. The excuse is done away with. We have the opportunity now. The Prime Minister continues, "It seems to me that as the Order in Council has been passed and has been communicated to His Majesty's Government, the delay which would ensue between this session and the next session, when the matter might be taken up again, if desired, ought not to stand in the way of our acceding to that respectful request." It ought not. The conference has requested an opinion. Let us give it to them. Further, the Prime Minister says, "I do not imagine that the public interest is going to suffer by any action taken between this date and the time when Parliament shall assemble again and when the Government of this country will be in a position to announce to Parliament the result of their conference with the Imperial authorities in respect to this subject." Why, it is just the reverse. We want to announce to the Imperial Conference the opinion of Canada with respect to this subject. We are not going to take our instructions from them. If the people of the Old Country want to get down on their knees and continue the lickspittle business, let them do it. If the Australians must have titles, hit or miss, let them have them. As I understand it

in Canada we want to be a democracy. If possible we want to eliminate as far as possible all these meretricious things such as titles and humbugs of every kind. Now is our time. Let us announce, not only to the Old Country but to the world, in the politest, most respectful and humble way, in fact, crave them not to encumber us with titles, because we do not wish them. In doing so, we do not wish to offend the people of the Old Country. Far from it. Let our politeness be excessive, if necessary, but do not throw our principles to the wind because somebody else may be offended, and do not let us act as if we had no convictions in this matter, and could not originate an idea without thinking of what somebody else thought about it. That stage of life in Canada, I am sure, has long since passed. Our soldiers and great men—including the great men who sit on the front benches to-night—have established a condition of nationhood in Canada and for Canada which make us above all this petty business. Boosting some men, who may be merely railway swindlers or cement merger experts, into the seats of the mighty, and letting the poor people, whose voice could not be heard, because they do not wish to be heard, whose lives are the very fruit and flower of virtue, leaving them to die in obscurity because we do not know any better than to let them die and prefer others instead of them; such a condition of affairs in a highly educated country such as this is insupposable and is certainly intolerable. Let me repeat: on account, Mr. Speaker, of the Prime Minister's having asked us for a decision to-night, and having demonstrated by his speech that he must be instructed as we want him to be instructed, and as he can express our wishes, no man in this world better, and in view of the fact that the leader of the Opposition says, "Go to it; this is a matter for the general benefit of Canada, and the Opposition will take no advantage of it whatever"—in view of all that, let us make this decision; let us instruct the Prime Minister that it will be better to postpone this whole question than to committ the dreadful faux pas of going to London and expressing the opinion of Canada in any way equivocal or unequivocal in favour of titles, when, as a matter of fact, we want to be let alone and do not want titles. I am persuaded that the people of this country will not have them.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): When this question was first introduced by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), I was of the opinion that his resolution, in that it merely asked for the cessation of the granting of hereditary titles, did not go far enough, and after the debate was continued on that motion for some time I got the impression from the remarks made by various members that the desire of Parliament was that we should cease granting all titles in future. I listened with very great interest to the declaration of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that, so far as his title was concerned, he would be delighted to throw it on a bonfire in the market-place and have it consumed. I was delighted to hear an expression of opinion of that kind, and in the hurry of the moment I prepared an amendment calling for the abolition of all titles. I was going to ask the House to agree unanimously to the substitution of a more carefully worded amendment than the one which I hurriedly threw into the arena on the spur of the moment. But my right hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden) thinks that my amendment goes further than the House would wish to go. I do not quite agree with the right hon. gentleman, because I believe, with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), that the entire country is heartily sick of titles. I come from the great West, where I have lived for over thirty-five years, and I believe that I am not going too far when I say that the idea of titles is practically an offence in the nostrils of the people of that country. Titles have been conferred upon some very unworthy people in the Dominion of Canada, but that is not the main objection to the continuance of this practice. The people do not believe in titles. Now, when we have the opportunity and the question is before the Parliament of Canada representing the people, I feel that it is the bounden duty of every member to express his opinion by his vote. I am persuaded to express that opinion more strongly because of the declaration of the leader of the Opposition that he does not propose to make this in any sense a party question; he throws it open so far as he and the party that follows him are concerned, and thus throws it open to every member to express his opinion. Therefore, I believe the duty presses itself upon every member of the House to speak his mind through his vote at this time. And I cannot help but be persuaded, from the conversations I have had with a great many members of this House, that this House almost unanim-

ously believes that the conferring of titles is an evil in this country. Apart from a desire to support the Government or a party, members almost unanimously are in favour of wiping this thing out at this time. As I said in the few remarks I addressed to the House when this matter was first brought up, I believe that the time has come, particularly in view of the struggle through which this world is passing, when, if we are not going to have a new heaven, we are at least going to have a new earth. The idea of titles will grow more unpopular daily, and I believe we could not do better at the present time than wipe titles off the slate for all time to come. The right hon. Prime Minister has suggested in his amendment to the amendment that the matter be left to the nomination of the Prime Minister. That, of course, would be a great improvement on the system which has prevailed in the past, because we know that titles have been given over the head of the Prime Minister and over the heads of the advisers of the representative of the Crown in this country. That is an intolerable state of affairs, and even if the amendment to the amendment carries we shall have made an important step in advance. In doing so we should be representing the people of the country and the best interests of all concerned. We wish to build up in Canada a real democracy. What need we care about precedent? Let the people who constitute this premier nation of the Empire take the lead for once. Let us say what we believe should be done. If the Australasian colonies or other portions of the Empire choose to follow suit, all the better; but let us have the credit of taking this important step towards the building up of a real democracy.

When this matter was first brought up in the House the circumstances connected with the conferring of titles were referred to as leading to corruption. No statement, however, was made by any of the speakers to the effect that such corruption had prevailed in Canada. On that occasion I had a case in mind and I had intended to mention it to the House. A prominent man in the West who is well known to almost every one who has participated largely in the public life of this country told me personally that he had been offered a knighthood if he would pay $10,000 for it. When I was in Winnipeg a few days ago I discussed the matter with one of this gentleman's friends, who said: "Why, he told me the very same thing; I understand that he has told a number of people." I do not wish to emphasize the point; I simply want to show that the conferring of titles has been made the subject of corruption in the political life of our country. We ought to strike it a deadly blow when we have the opportunity.

The reference of the Prime Minister this afternoon to the danger of depriving members of the Senate, of the Federal Cabinet and of provincial Governments of the prefix "honourable" was an unhappy one. As a mattter of fact, these are not real titles; they are simply appellations of courtesy. If we adopt this resolution or my amendment, members of the Senate, of the Federal Cabinet and of provincial Governments will still be called "honourable," and judges will be called 'Your Lordship." These are merely appellations of courtesy and will continue.

The Prime Minister spoke also of the danger of creating a military aristocracy in this country. My proposal is that no knighthood shall be conferred on any military or naval man who has distinguished himself. The V.C., the D.S.O., and other awards of that kind, are merely military distinctions, and will continue. To meet the objection made by the Prime Minister in this respect I recast my amendment, and if the amendment to the amendment is voted down I purpose asking the House to allow me to substitute the following for the amendment which I originally proposed:

That all the words in the first paragraph of the address after the words "or any" in the fourth line be struck out and that the following be substituted therefore:

"Titles other than such terms distinctive of variations of naval and military rank as are necessary or customary for the purposes of Your Majesty's naval or military forces."

The resolution as amended will then read as follows:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any hereditary titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada, or any titles other than such terms distinctive of variations of naval and military rank as are necessary or customary for the purposes of Your Majesty's naval or military forces.

I believe that if that amendment is adopted, it will cover the entire ground. You have sat in the Chair, Sir, during the last two months and you know how the soldiers are exploited on every possible occasion. Gentlemen hold up their hands in holy horror and say: "Do not interfere with the militia of this country." As

I said the other evening, I believe that all members of the House are thoroughly impressed with the great debt that we owe to the soldiers who have fought and bled on the plains of Europe and who are today fighting and dying for the liberties that we enjoy. Please God, we will all try to do our duty by the returned soldiers and by those who have fought for us, and we will honour and revere the memory of those who have fallen. But let us not, because of these considerations, refrain from doing our duty on this occasion. It will not add anything to the stature or to the glory of any Canadian soldier who has fought for our liberties if a knighthood is conferred upon him. As the Prime Minister said when we first debated this question, no distinction of honour conferred by King or Empire can add anything to the dignity of manhood or to the glory of any achievement on the battlefield. You cannot find anything greater than the real dignity of manhood. Gladstone, Chamberlain, a whole galaxy of the greatest statesmen who have figured in British history, were content to be plain "Mr." Why should the people of this country wish to be more titled than Gladstone? Why should they desire any titular distinction?

I wish to read an extract from the last issue of Truth, that great organ of democracy published in London. The writer says:

> The absence of Canada from the lavish colonial distributions of the Order of the British Empire has now been explained by Sir Robert Borden with a frankness which the Downing Street announcement lacked. He was asked to prepare a list of recommendations, but, considering other business more urgent, he did not do so.

What a splendid tribute that is to the Prime Minister of a country such as Canada. The article continues:

> The bearing of this observation lies in its application to our War Cabinet, which has dedicated not a little of the time and talent of Lord Curzon (to say nothing of the labours of the secretarial staff) to this kind of foolery.

"This kind of foolery." Fancy an expression of that kind coming right from the centre of the British Empire:

> Nor is this all. It seems that Sir Robert Borden's Government has formally requested that in future no hereditary titles whatever shall be conferred upon any one ordinarily resident in Canada, and that other titles or honours (save for military service in the war) shall be conferred only with the approval of the Canadian Prime Minister.
>
> As to existing hereditary titles in Canada or the hereditary titles of persons hereafter settling in that country, the Canadian Government proposes that after a prescribed period they shall not be recognized. The emigrant peer or baronet will, therefore, have to abandon his escutcheon. I suppose that constitutionally these proposals are an interference with the prerogative of the Crown. But they are backed by a practically unanimous public opinion in Canada, some day perhaps we shall become equally sensible in this country.

Let Canada set the example to the old Mother Country. Surely the idea with respect to titles and distinctions that exists in the mother land, is an abhorrence to all free, democratic people. After all, are not all men born equal? They may not be equal in ability, but before the majesty of the law they are equal. Why should we, in this young nation, which is trying to set an example for democracy and to stand for all advanced ideals, tether ourselves for all time to the idea of titles? I do not know when the precedent was established, but this is a time when we ought to strike down precedents if they are wrong, and I appeal to this House to let the people of Canada exercise, through their members who represent them in Parliament, the real and almost unanimous opinion from the Atlantic to the Pacific that the time for wiping out all titles has arrived.

Mr. A. R McMASTER (Brome): Mr Speaker, as I had the honour of seconding the motion concerning titles which was moved about a month ago, in a most able and eloquent speech by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), I may perhaps detain the House for a few minutes in expressing the views which I hold upon the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). When the hon. member for Kingston and myself proposed to do away with hereditary titles, we felt we were taking the shortest possible steps in the right direction, and it was a great pleasure to me to find that the House was prepared to take a longer step in that direction and therefore I purpose voting for and supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield and voting against the amendment to the amendment moved by the Prime Minister. I am not unaware, nor unappreciative, of the advance which the amendment to the amendment moved by the Prime Minister indicates. It indicates first that there is a unanimous public opinion in Canada against hereditary titles—and that is a good thing. Secondly, it enunciates the principle that the Prime Minister and the Government of the day should, and will in the future, be responsible for the creation of all titles. But I want to take a

step further; I do not want us to be creating titles in this country at all. We have our own political evils to fight against, why perpetuate, why sanction an abuse from overseas?—for the giving of titles in the Old Country is admitted by all in that country to be a great source of political corruption. Let us get rid of it altogether.

Just a word as to the arguments advanced by the Prime Minister against the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield. The Prime Minister says that this will interfere with Canadians accepting the office of Privy Councillor, because a Privy Councillor is known as "the Right Hon." Mr. So and So. In the first place, I would think that the argument used by my hon. friend from Springfield that the title "Right Honourable" is merely a courtesy title, will apply. But even suppose it will not apply, is a Canadian who is given the distinction of being made a Privy Councillor any bigger man because he is called "Right Honourable?" Surely one of the biggest men in the whole world to-day is proud to be known as "Mr." Woodrow Wilson. You do not add anything to a man's stature, nor to the consideration which is felt for him by informed people by calling him "Sir" or "Lord" or anything of that kind. I rather fear that John Morley has gone down in the scale by calling himself "Lord" Morley, and the name James Bryce signifies a bigger man than "Viscount" Bryce. They have not added anything to their stature, socially, intellectually, or in any other way by accepting those titles. The Prime Minister seems to find difficulty in the fact that it has been customary to call our judges "Lords," or to address them as "Your Lordships." This is purely a matter of custom, of courtesy. I remember, shortly after I came to the Bar, that in the province of Quebec, we changed our mode of addressing our Court. We had formerly addressed the court as "Your Honour," and subsequently we addressed the court as "Your Lordship," and I do not think that made the slightest bit of difference. I do not think they were treated with one atom more of resepect, and I doubt if the judges were one whit better or worse after they were called "Your Lordships." The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who was a judge of the Superior Court of Montreal at that time, will be able to bear me out in what I say.

There are other courtesy titles. We have in this country the extraordinary spectacle of certain dignitaries of a church being called "Your Lordships." Men who follow the Founder of our religion, who washed His disciples' feet, are addressed as "Your Lordships." If that term disappears, then we shall be returning to proper first Christian principles.

I do not purpose detaining the House at any length. The burden of proof, in this House and in this country, is upon those who advocate the continuance of titles of any sort or kind. We do not seek to interfere with calling a man "captain" or "commodore," if he is in the army or navy. Nothing of that sort is suggested, and an argument founded on that is trying to draw the proverbial herring across the trail. The question before the House is this: Do you want in future to have a system by which the leader of the Government, for reasons best known to himself, can put handles to certain of His Majesty's subjects living in Canada, or are you against that? I am against that, and I am going to vote with the hon. member for Springfield.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, I think it is a great misfortune that the three proposals before the House could not be submitted to us separately. The presentation of three motions on this subject is rather embarrassing. It is, I think, a pity that we could not be allowed to vote on the motion of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) against hereditary titles as a distinct proposition. I think we shall all agree that we should probably have on that question a unanimous vote. At all events, I have heard no expression of dissent. Then if we come to the motion of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), I am inclined to think, from the widespread endorsement of it, that the vote on that will be pretty nearly unanimous. But I do not think it will be unanimous. I have not any very strong opposition to it myself, but it goes a little further than I am disposed to go, and I do not think at present I will support it. Possibly there may be others who feel in the same way. Then we come to the third proposition, that of the right hon. leader of the Government. I regard that as objectionable for several reasons. I was glad to hear the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) say that he had discussed the matter with the Prime Minister, and that this was to be an open question.

Mr. BURNHAM: No, it was the leader of the Opposition I spoke to, and he assured me he would not make it a party question.

Mr. FIELDING: I have heard that one or two excellent members of the House are not a little worried over the motion of the Prime Minister, being afraid if they vote it down the Government might have to resign. On these terms I would not like to see the motion voted down. I am not always able to agree with everything the Prime Minister proposes, but if it was a question of turning out the Government, I would not vote to turn them out. The House is strongly behind the Government; there is no doubt about that, and I am not so sure that hon. members who sit on the left of the Chair are very anxious to succeed the Government just now. I do not think they have very much reason to desire that. When we see the members of the Cabinet rushing from pillar to post from hour to hour and day to day, pestered with a thousand and one different things, how in anybody's name could any one envy them the job? However that may be, I see objection on the merits of the motion of the Prime Minister. I dislike very much the idea of coupling the Order in Council with the action of this House. Let the Order in Council stand for what it is worth. There is a great deal in it that has met with the approval of the House; perhaps it is entirely approved, but I think it is very desirable that the Order in Council should stand by itself and that the Parliament of Canada should express its conclusion, whatever it may be, entirely separate and apart from the Order in Council. An Order in Council, after all, is an order of the ministry of the day, and while I do not suppose such a thing would happen, another Government in power at any distant day could repeal that Order in Council. Therefore, I think the motion of the Prime Minister, in which he mingles the Order in Council and the other motions here, ought not to be approved.

There is another thing mentioned in the Order in Council which rather grated on my nerves. The right hon. Prime Minister, in that Order in Council, indicates that knighthoods, or honours, or whatever it may be, are to be conferred upon his recommendation. It seems to me that is a little too much emphasis laid on the office of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is the channel of communication between the Cabinet and the Governor General, and in that sense he is brought into close relations with his Excellency the Governor General, but, after all, this country is not governed by the Prime Minister, but by the Cabinet and Parliament, and any attempt to give to the Prime Minister in his individuality a special power in these matters, except as he is the representative and exponent of the Cabinet, would, I think, be a great mistake. For these reasons I shall feel obliged to vote against the amendment of the Prime Minister, but I do hope it will not be regarded as a non-confidence matter, because, as I have already told the House, I do not want to turn out this Government. I do trust that we are going to have absolute freedom of thought and of discussion in these various matters, and while there is no question of the desire of the House to stand strongly behind the Government of the day, we are going to exercise our freedom on all the questions that come up. I think that is important, and I am sure the ministers of the Crown will think none the less of us for making that assertion of our independence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I had the opportunity on a previous occasion to make known the views I hold on this subject, and I would not rise at all this evening were it not for some words which fell from the lips of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) this afternoon. My right hon. friend, in speaking to the motion, coupled with it the title of "Honourable," which has been bestowed on some classes of His Majesty's subjects in this country, members of the Privy Council of Canada, for instance, members of the Senate, and some of the judges. Such titles, if titles they can be called, are not at all affected by the present motion. These titles exist by Royal letters patent, and they will continue to exist whether this motion passes or not until, upon petition of this Parliament, or upon proprio motu of the Sovereign, the Crown chooses to withdraw these letters patent. Therefore, we can dismiss altogether that aspect of the case.

With regard to the motion of the Prime Minister, that these titles should be conferred upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister to the Crown, for my part, if I were a Conservative member, I would hesitate very much before voting for such a motion as that, because if these titles have any value at all in the eyes of those who accept them it is because they come from the Crown, from the supreme authority of the King. But if they are going to be conferred upon ministerial responsibility on the advice of the Prime Minister they are no longer the gift of the Crown, but simply the gift of the Prime Minister, the gift of a subject like myself but who for the time being is in supreme authority. I repeat, it seems to me the

very idea is destructive of the honour which may be involved in these distinctions, and for these reasons alone I think the motion of the Prime Minister ought not to be accepted.

With regard to the effect of this motion if it were voted down, it having been moved by the Prime Minister, I quite agree with my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) that such a vote would not involve a change of Government. For my part I will say at once that I do not make it a party question, and when my hon. friend from West Peterborough, (Mr. Burnham) asks me if I intend to make it a party question I would say no, it is not for me but for the Government to do that. But I have understood all along that the Government did not intend to make it a party question. At all events, without any such understanding, if the motion of the Prime Minister were to be voted down I can tell my hon. friend from West Peterborough and every one else in this House that I think I know my business as a party leader too well to be tempted under such circumstances to assume office. I do not want anything of the kind, and I do not contemplate anything of the kind. I do not want to bring about a ministerial crisis on this question. There is a great deal of discontent and irritation among the people over this question, but I am sure no one in the country would want to make it a party question if it were to involve a change in the Government. If there is to be a change of Government some day, as many people hope there will be by the providence of God, it will be upon a more serious question than this and one in which the people of the country take a deeper interest. I look upon these proposals as a step in advance of an educated public opinion. All these titles will gradually lose their value as people become more educated and more democratic, and, for my part, my plan and my disposition is very plain. I shall vote against the motion of the Prime Minister; I shall vote for the motion of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), hoping it will carry, and if it is defeated I shall vote for the motion of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle).

Hon. A. L. SIFTON (Medicine Hat): There does not appear to be any very great difference of opinion between the members of the House who have spoken on this question as to what is the desirable result. There does, however, appear to be a very considerable difference of opinion as to the proper means of getting there, and the five or six hon. gentlemen who have spoken have all apparently rather a different idea as to the proper course to be followed.

We have had three motions which are all possible and none of which would do any grave harm to the country at large, and we have had a little difference of opinion expressed by some hon. members of the House in regard to the best way by which our object may be accomplished. In the first place, I would not like to vote for the original motion in a House in which the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the leader of the Opposition and in which the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden was the leader of the Government, eminent statesmen who, probably for good reasons, for reasons best known to themselves, have seen fit to accept titles at the hands of their Sovereign. I do not think it would be nice for us as members of this House under circumstances of that kind to say that no title of this kind should be given in the Dominion of Canada.

I thoroughly agree with the gentlemen who have spoken in regard to hereditary titles, and there is a strong reason for the position that has been taken upon this question. There is a reason why hereditary titles should not be drafted upon the democratic feelings of the people of Canada. It was due to this reason, and some other things, that have taken place in regard to various titles given in this country, that the Order in Council which has been laid on the table of the House was passed with a view to providing a way in which to approach this subject in a constitutional manner. I fail to see the strength of the idea that this Order in Council should not be backed up and supported by the members of this House, and the hands of the Government strengthened along the line of democratic feeling that it is endeavouring to persuade the British Government to give effect to in reference to the Dominion of Canada.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took the same stand practically a number of years ago. A copy of the letter that was written in regard to this question by his own Government was read to this House upon the same occasion that this Order in Council was read, and the Order in Council is just along the same lines, but a little stronger than the action which was taken by the former Government. If the members of this House can see their way clear not to weaken it but to strengthen it so that the

Order in Council may be transmitted to the Colonial Office in England with the support of a united House behind it, the House will have done a great deal more to carry out the idea which is the foundation principle of that order than if they separated it and made two distinct propositions for the Government to consider.

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

Mr. NICKLE: If nobody else wishes to speak I would like to exercise my right to close the debate.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the various expressions of opinion upon the subject now before the House. I have had my own thoughts while this discussion has been going on. I am bound to say, in the first place, that I stand by and thoroughly agree with the Order in Council which has been laid before the House and which was the reasoned judgment of the Government as to the step that might be taken at this time in regard to this question. I am told by different members of the House—and I do not want to impugn their authority at all—that the country is greatly stirred up over this matter. Well, I take leave to think that the country is not widely and largely paying very much attention to this subject at the present time. I know it is easy to think that one's own opinion is the opinion of everybody else in the country, but when we start out on that line we are apt to get a rude shock and to be disappointed in that belief. As I say, I have not seen in the country at large any determined agitation or any deep feeling in regard to the bestowal of certain distinctions and honours by the Crown of the Empire upon people in this country.

There is, I think, a very deep and wide feeling amongst the people against the importation of hereditary titles to this country. If a title or honour is given at all fairly, through proper methods and in an organized and orderly way, it is given to mark some act, some quality, some phase of character, some activity, in the person upon whom the honour is given. There is a basis for that. There may happen to be cases in which, through lack of judgment or information, or otherwise, the distinction has not been well bestowed, but the raison d'être for the bestowing of the distinction is that which I have stated—it is to mark the approbation of the State itself intimated through its head. There is a basis and a good ground for it. But I need not say that I think it is foreign to all Canadian ideas, that because that mark of approbation has been given for a particular phase of character, or activity, or act of excellence, there is any reason why it should descend from father to son and from that son to his son. Therefore, I am absolutely opposed to hereditary titles in this country and I would be just as much opposed to them if I were in any other country.

We talk a good deal about being democratic in this country. Well, democracy is in the air all the wide world through and it is a pretty bold thing for any one man, or any one country, to set himself, or itself, up as par excellence, the example of democracy. I go to France, I go to Great Britain, I go to Italy, I go to other countries, and I find that democratic principle and feeling always in varying currents and in different degrees. But in some of these countries I have named it is even more radical, I think, than the average democratic opinion is in this country. I go to the United States and I find the very same kind of feeling. Yet, in all these democratic countries, or nearly all of them, you find honours and distinctions. If you really come down to the heart and essence of the matter, do you not weaken your case when you make the argument for the doing away with the bestowal of these marks of distinction by the Crown upon persons in Canada and yet in the very same breath admit that no matter if royalty, or the head or symbol of the State, ceases to give them, distinctions, even in this country, will always exist?

For I think my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) said that we would always call the judges "Your Lordship", and we would always call the senators "Honourable", and we would by courtesy, if not by patent, have our distinctions even in this democratic country. That goes to the very root of the matter, to my mind. If we are true democrats—and if to be true democrats we must have a dead level in which no hill is higher than the other, no mountain top goes higher into the blue than the other—then we cannot have these courtesy titles any more than we can have patented titles. And so it seems to me that we may well revise some of our ideas, probably, with reference to this matter of a democracy being dead against all distinctions and marks of difference. We are all born free and equal, it is very commonly said. So we are. But you may put a nation

to the birth and have all its sons born free and equal, and before the end of a generation has been reached you will find distinctions of all kinds and of all grades. Human nature is built that way, and it is impossible to escape the general verdict of humanity and the absolutely evident trend of human progress by trying to keep everything onto a dead level of uniformity. Men will be different, excellencies will appear, activities will develop, and the mark of appreciation and approbation in one way or another will be differently placed according to the degree of evolution and of progress. There is no feeling more widespread in humanity than the desire for approbation, for appreciation. It is in the infant from the time that it begins to take cognizance of its parents, and the approbation of the parent is decidedly looked for and is desired by the child as it grows up. It goes with the child from the home into the school, and the very essence of the progress and work of school life is that the deserving and the studious, the one that is applying himself to the acquisition of knowledge is largely influenced by the desire for appreciation and approbation. That is not vanity, that is one of the springs of human progress. That is one of the motives which makes the world climb higher. I do not care how much a man may profess, or how humble a name or a profession he may write upon his brow, the man is not worthy of being called a man unless, having done good work, he feels glad to be appreciated for that work. Now, does it harm the man to be appreciated? Whether it is the public approbation of his town, of his community, of his country, or whether it is the word of the Sovereign of the State, which marks the majesty and which is the symbol of the whole State, that puts that mark of approbation upon him, it is only a difference in degree—it is not a difference in essence at all. Now if that is a general feeling in humanity—deeply inset in it from the very birth of humanity until the present, and which will remain as long as humanity struggles along into an upward course of betterment and of amelioration—if that is so, it is absolute folly to talk about doing away with distinctions, for there will still be these public valuations: First by the family, second by the community, thirdly, by the State, and afterwards by the Empire—as the service and the action become widely known—and that stamp of appreciation will cling to the individual. It may be made known by a label, it may be by the tongues of the thousands who acclaim the action and applaud the characteristics of the man; but it may be made known also by a word of the ruler of the State—it is all the same in essence, it is different in degree, that is all. But that is an absolutely necessary coincident of the progress of the world, to my mind, and we cannot cheat ourselves by the idea that we will get away from all valuations, that we will sink to one common level and there will be no distinctions at all.

Now, my argument, or my statement, may be connected in some men's minds with the idea that I am standing up for an honour which has been conferred upon myself. Well, I do not think that need affect the argument; I think I may go on with my argument just in the same way. Perhaps it may be well to say that I never sought the distinction, that it came to me after thirty years of very considerable effort and public work, and that when it did come I did not feel that I was one single iota better than before the honour or the distinction was given. But I will confess—what any honest man will confess—that I did feel deeply the mark of the honour that was given, because it united me to the head and to the heart of the country that I love and to which I had given some of my effort. It was not King George that tagged me, it was the country of my birth—the Empire out of whose loins I sprang, that aggregation of units which existed, lived, struggled, and died for a thousand years, and has built itself a name and a character that shall endure. I felt that the hand of that past, present, and future was laid on my shoulder, and that the words were said to me, "Well done; it is for something you have done for your country, and which goes afterwards to those that succeed you." I was not made any worse, I was made better—a better servant of the State, linked by a tie that did not before exist. That is my honest confession, and any man, I think, who has gone through the same experience, and has really, in part, deserved what he got, has felt exactly the same way.

Now there will be abuses of everything. Some one made the assertion here to-night that if we could not have a new heaven we could have a new earth. We have got to get out of heaven to get rid of the distinction.

Mr. BURNHAM: How does the hon. gentleman know?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman, with his usual incisive inquisitiveness, wants to know how I know. How does

he know that he is a Christian, if he is? How does he know what he believes? How does he know the Christian doctrine and tenets? He draws it from the Book of God, from the Bible, which is the charter of the faith of our Christian religion, and the Bible, from one end of it to the other, talks of differences and of hierarchies in heaven as well as upon earth. But what I started out to say, and to remind my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Burnham), was that he would not get rid of distinctions when he gets to heaven—it is against fair-minded, fair-play work, that there should not be distinctions.

For instance, my hon. friend, who may get into Heaven by the very skin of his teeth, having done many things that are naughty and comparatively few that are good, and another hon. gentleman who has been a saint from his youth up and has done no naughty things and an immensity of what is good, would my hon. friend have the face to take the same high seat in Heaven as he?

Mr. BURNHAM: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have the absolute argument on my hon friend. His own conscience is testimony to the fact that there are grades, and he would not aspire to the higher grade, because he felt that he was unworthy. It is no argument against titles and distinctions because they may be sometimes unworthily bestowed. That is where the human factor comes in, and the human factor is apt to make these mistakes. But I would not admit that a system which is as wide as the world, as distributed as nationalties are distributed, as persevering and constant as a force of action in this world and in these nations as anything else well could be—I would not undertake to say that the whole experience in the course of the world had gone on a delusion, and that it was a delusion, and that we at this present time are just beginning to find it out. I am not making an argument that the world may not for a long while have remained under delusions with regard to certain things. But I think there is something from the world-wide situation that teaches us that there is more in this maybe than we would think of at first sight and before giving it most mature consideration. I do not want to weary the House with what I have to say. I have not much more to say. I think the House will be wise if it will come to one conclusion, to support the Order in Council which has been passed, and which does away with hereditary titles and affirms the doctrine that the Canadian people shall be the supervisor of its own distinctions. Having done that, I think we will have gone forward a long way, and that would be my mind. Every other man has his own mind and has a right to it.

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, up to the present juncture I have taken no part in this debate for several reasons. The main reason is because I thought it preferable to leave the discussion of this subject to more highly talented members, although I have been, and am, thoroughly in accord with the proposer of this resolution. However, I cannot refrain from making some very brief remarks on the sub-amendment proposed by the right hon. the Prime Minister. As I see it, and as it has just been explained to this House, if this sub-amendment should carry, titles in the future will be conferred upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister; and consequently the Prime Minister will virtually be conferring titles himself. Everybody in Canada will be well aware of that. Should any one receive a title from overseas, the first impression that will strike him will be that he has received a title upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister; in other words, that the Prime Minister has given him a title. And this person will, of course, be aware that if he owes gratitude to any one, he owes it to the Prime Minister for the title he has received. Therefore, we are only shifting the title conferring powers and instead of leaving it to the Imperial authorities to confer titles, we are leaving it in the hands of the Prime Minister of Canada. I am not alluding in any way to the personality of the hon. the Prime Minister, but in accepting such responsibility the Prime Minister, whoever he may be, will certainly not improve his position before the people of Canada. The matter goes much further. We have passed a Bill in this House this session abolishing patronage. Well, this is patronage. If we leave it to the Prime Minister to distribute titles, is not that patronage? Is not the title of "Sir," or any other title, just as much patronage to many people as a position in the Civil Service? It is nothing more nor less than patronage. And the Government—well, not even the Government, but the Prime Minister—will have it in his power to distribute the patronage of titles. So I say that we are not improving our position by any means, and I think it is beneath the dignity of any country to

leave it to its Prime Minister to beg titles from England. As it is now, the titles come from the other side, and they are supposed, at all events, to come without recommendation. It has been stated to-night that titles have been given over the head of the Prime Minister. I am not sorry for that. Titles are a gift that we do not want, but at all events they are supposed to come from the highest authority in the British Empire. Now it is proposed that it will be the Prime Minister of Canada who will send a request to England asking that Mr. So-and-So in Canada shall receive such and such a title. I say that is beneath the dignity of this country. By adopting the amendment moved by the Prime Minister we would not be improving the situation; we would be making it far worse than it is now. For these considerations, Mr. Speaker, I think that if any proposition now before the House should be defeated, it is the sub-amendment of the Prime Minister. I would rather see the amendment or the main motion itself defeated than to see the sub-amendment carried, because in so doing we would be making the position worse than it is now. For that reason I will vote against the sub-amendment.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I am sorry that I was not in the House at the time of the introduction of either the resolution or the amendment, and that I did not hear any of the discussion on this question. I did start to read the speech of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), but had not got very far before I was called away to something else, and, unfortunately, was not able to return to it. Therefore, I speak with some ignorance on the question as it goes to the House. But I have thought it over considerably, and I am opposed to hereditary titles in this country under any possible excuse. This is a democratic country, and we should not have hereditary titles here. So long as we are under the British Crown I am not opposed to the conferring of life titles as a reward for very distinguished service in the public interests of the country.

If the King wants to honour a man who has given distinguished service of any kind, political or otherwise, to his country, I do not see why he should not do so. But the reckless distribution of titles which has been going on for the last few years is absolutely absurd. I may add that some men in the country who have performed great public service carry their titles properly and are a credit to the community. But, from what knowledge I have of the subject, I should think that titles should be conferred only on the recommendation of Parliament. Parliament should know whether or not a man has rendered such service as to warrant his receiving a title. Then, if Parliament recommends it, I see no reason why he should not receive it. I do not know what the resolution is or what the amendment is, and I shall have to become better acquainted with them before I can give an intelligent vote. In the meantime, I think it is but right that I should give my views to this extent. There are times when it is perfectly right for the Sovereign to confer titles upon people who have given distinguished service to the country.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this subject to the House over five weeks ago, I was actuated by a three-fold motive. First, I desired to project in the House a discussion on the constitutional aspect of the question. Second, I desired to bring to an end the practice of granting hereditary and what I have termed reflective titles in Canada. Third, I desired to direct attention to the anachronism of titular distinctions in Canada and the abuses which would probably arise from a continuance of the practice of granting recognitions which gave privileges without carrying responsibilities and duties.

As the Prime Minister said in the speech that he delivered to-day and also in the speech that he delivered when the motion was first heard, the whole national tendency in Canada has been to the recognition on the part of the Crown of ministerial responsibility. My attention was first directed to the subject in 1912, I think, when the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) introduced a Bill into the House which, on the occasion of its second reading, was discussed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). If I understand the English language, the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his speech on that occasion, clearly enunciated the doctrine that the granting of titles was entirely within the control and prerogative of the Crown and that, viewing the matter from his point of view, he thought that the House of Commons had nothing whatever to say in the matter and was not justified in expressing an opinion. The language used by the Minister of Trade and Commerce at that time was as follows:

> I have not very much to say upon this question, except that I think the bestowment of honours comes from the source of all honours,

that is, the King; and that we must allow the King to have unrestricted scope as to the selection of persons upon whom to bestow these titles of honour.

If that means anything, it means that the Minister of Trade and Commerce enunciated the doctrine that the prerogative of the Crown was to be exercised without constitutional limitation and without ministerial responsibility. As I said on the 8th of April, when I introduced this resolution, that principle is not satisfactory to me as a Canadian. I made up my mind in 1912 that if suitable opportunity ever offered itself I would again bring the subject before the House for discussion and, I hoped, decision. I have listened with great interest to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-night. I always listen with interest to his addresses; they are couched in language of singular force; they are perfect treatments from his point of view on the subjects that are under discussion. Looking at the matter from the point of view of the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he gave utterance to the words which I have just read, I quite understand how he was moved, by obtaining the recognition of his Sovereign, to the feeling that he was drawing nearer, as he expressed it, to the heart and the Throne of the Empire. But when he takes into consideration the evidence I laid before the House when last I spoke on this subject of the gross corruption that characterizes the granting of titles in England at the present day, I do not think that he can, with reason, say that the titles which are granted to-day carry with them the honours to which he refers. I admit that down deep in the hearts of us all there is a desire to do the right thing. But, Sir, I am not of that school of thought which believes that men do the right thing so that they may have the recognition of their fellowmen. I believe that the true standard by which a man should be judged is not whether he does that which at the time has the approval of his fellows, but whether he does that which has the approval of his conscience. I am not much given to speaking on religious matters; I do not profess to be very much of a biblical student. But when I heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce speak to-night about whether or not there should be gradations of rank in Heaven, I was reminded of that part of the New Testament which tells us of the thieves who hung on the cross with our Saviour between them, and of our Saviour saying to one of them: "This day shalt thou be in Paradise with me."

If a man is repentant for the things that he did which he should not have done and that he left undone which he should have done, I should be sorry to think that when the day of final reckoning comes he would not get equal forgiveness with the man who, perhaps, from his early days had lived as a man should live. I judge a man not so much by what he actually does as by the temptations that he has overcome; as by the resistance that he has shown to the temptations that may have surrounded him. I am not moved, therefore, for the reasons which I have given, by the arguments advanced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not believe that the recognition given by the granting of titles is an incentive to action in most men, because if it were, most men would become absolutely indifferent and would settle down selfishly in life. There is no man in this House, there is no man in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, who cannot give, as the former Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said a short time ago instances by the score of men equally worthy of recognition as those who have obtained the recognition of the Sovereign. When you analyse the thing to the last word, it is not recognition by the Sovereign at all; the Sovereign probably knows nothing whatever, except so far as the information may be conveyed to him by another, of the merits or demerits of the man to whom the recognition goes. Thousands of people in Canada have within the last few years given faithful service never expecting recognition. Many who never expect a title and never had any reason to do so are just as sincerely and honestly bound to the heart and the Throne of this Empire as those who may have enjoyed the distinction that the Minister of Trade and Commerce enjoys. If the recognition of a title was the thing that moved men to duty, what would the 30,000 men who to-day lie dead in Flanders' fields have thought if they knew that death was to overtake them before that recognition could be given? They did their duty because it was their duty.

It is a pernicious doctrine to preach in this country that recognition is the reward of virtue. What should be preached in this House and in this country is this: that virtue is its own reward, and that man should act from a conscientious motive and not that he may obtain recognition from an extraneous source. As I was going to say before I was led—I shall not say astray—aside by the argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) the whole tendency of constitu-

tional practice has been along the line of recognizing ministerial responsibility. In 1876 the Hon. Edward Blake secured the recognition that the Department of Justice should have the last word in regard to clemency. In 1902, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then the leader of the Government, submitted to the Colonial Secretary a note to the effect that he desired to be consulted or to have the determining voice as to those who in Canada should obtain recognition. True, his claim was not recognized, but he laid down, in language clear and forcible, what he called and what we now recognize to be the true constitutional practice. In 1916, the right hon. leader of the Government told us that when the British Government decided to commandeer our shipping, representations were made to the British Government that this should not be done without the consent of the Canadian Government, and the principle was recognized by the British Government that Canada had the right to speak and must be considered in the matter. Again in 1918, by the Order in Council to which the Prime Minister has made reference, the Prime Minister and the Government of to-day laid down the principle that hereditary titles and all other titles shall be granted only in the event of the Prime Minister consenting to the bestowal. I want to say this for the Order in Council of the Prime Minister, if I may be at liberty to comment favourably on an Order in Council that has been drawn up by or has had the approval of the First Minister: In my opinion, it is one of the finest and most dignified constitutional documents that any country could desire. It lays down, in a way that cannot be contradicted, the true position that I think every Canadian should take in regard to the position that our Government, the Government of an overseas Dominion, should take in the administration of the affairs of the Dominion.

I said that the second point which I desire to bring before the House and the principle that I desire to have admitted was that hereditary titles should no longer be granted to domiciled Canadians. I do not think I need elaborate the argument further, because, since this subject was introduced into this House, I have not heard, either on this side or the other, one favourable word said in regard to hereditary titles. Every one admits that they have no place in Canadian life. I think we all admit that they have lost their position in the British constitutional system, and that to-day they constitute a privilege without a corresponding burden or obligation. In regard to this second point, when last I spoke in this House, I directed attention to the fact that I wanted reflected titles also put an end to. I said that, in my judgment, much of the desire for recognition had its inception in the desire of the wives of certain men for social pre-eminence and social priority. In replying to me, the Prime Minister said that, in his opinion, the term "lady," as applied to the wife of a knight, or the wife of a baronet, was purely a title of courtesy, and he did me the honour of saying to the House that I differed with him on that conclusion. He also said that he had not the time nor the inclination to dig further into the law or the regulations. Having more of desire and also more of time, since the debate of April 8, I have gone somewhat into the question, and I want to be absolutely fair to the Prime Minister and say that in the discussion I think we break on a basis of fifty-fifty. As far as my researches have taken me, I have reached the conclusion that the title of "lady," as given to the wife of a knight, is a title of courtesy, but that the title of "lady," as given to the wife of a baronet, is hers of right. If the House will permit me, I shall read a few notes that I have prepared so that I may speak with greater exactness than if I spoke without them. The Prime Minister was quite right in saying that many of the dictionaries did lay down the principle that the wife of a baronet or a knight is commonly spoken of as "lady," but the customs—this is not from the dictionary; this is the result of my researches—and privileges and duties of knighthood go so far back into the Middle Ages that it is difficult to make these distinctions justly—that is whether the title is of courtesy or of right. Chaucer, in his works, speaks of his knight as having a maiden "to lady and to wife." Perhaps I should say for the benefit of the House that the word "to" is not used as a verb; it really means "for." What Chaucer says is this, that a knight has a maiden "for a lady and for his wife." The expression "my lady" was commonly used toward any one of gentle birth, whether married or unmarried. For example, in Chaucer's Prologue, the Prioress is addressed as "My lady Prioress." Knights, apparently, did not often marry out of their class, so that this form of address was not acquired by marriage, but simply continued. Occasionally, however, the old ballads speak of a knight marrying a girl not of gentle birth and "making her a lady;" in such a case the form of ad-

dress would naturally follow the change in class. All this tends to support the contention that, as far as a knight is concerned, his wife's title is one of courtesy, not of right. But when we come to the term "lady" as applied to the wife of a baronet, we are on entirely different ground. If the Prime Minister has the time and the inclination, if he will turn to the works of John Selden, who wrote a book, entitled, "Titles of Honour," published in 1614, he will find the following:

> The title of baronet became a new erected distinct title under our present Soveraigne,—

That was James I.

> —who, for certain disbursements towards the Plantation in Ulster, created divers into this dignity and made it hereditary. The particulars of the patent shall instruct you.

He goes on to give the Latin, evidently quoting from the patent. I translate:

> We have ordained, saith the King, built up, constituted and created the position, degree, dignity, name and title of a Baronet within this our Kingdom of England to last for all time . . . . And that he shall have precedence in all writings, sessions, and salutations before all Knights, as well of the Bath, as Knights Bachelors . . . . And that their wives and eldest sons respectively have like precedence. That they should be impleded and sue by the addition of Baronet. And that to the name of them, and the heirs males (sic) of their bodies, in English speech and in all English writings, this addition should be prefixed, namely in English, Sir. And that their wives have the titles of Lady, Madame, and Dame. And that neither our Heirs nor Successors shall ever build up, ordain, constitute, or create within this our Kingdom of England any other degree, order, name, title, dignity, or position less than or beneath the degree, dignity or position of Barons of this our Kingdom of England which will be or can be superior or equal to the degree and dignity of the aforesaid Baronets . . . .

That, I think, substantially proves that the title "lady," as given to the wife of a baronet, is a title of right, and that, therefore, the last clause of my resolution is founded on law and has merit, in that the baronet's wife enjoys that title as of right. If any member of this House is interested in securing within Canadian history an incident to prove that social jealousies have been engendered by titular distinctions, I would suggest that he refer to the "Reminiscences of Sir Richard Cartwright" published a short time ago, from which he will learn that a certain lady of royal birth at one time resident in Canada crossed the path of a certain Prime Minister of this country; there were differences of opinion as to whether the royal personage or the wife of the Prime Minister should have priority at certain social functions.

[Mr. Nickle.]

The Prime Minister, speaking on April 8th, admitted very frankly to the House that true worth in England was not shown by social priority, and he was equally emphatic in saying that great wealth was no advantage to a man If I understood the Prime Minister aright he made it clear to the House,—I am not saying he did it consciously,—that I had said I thought great wealth was of advantage to a man. Mr. Speaker, nothing in the world was further from my thoughts, and I do not think a reading of my remarks will convey that impression. What I laid down and endeavoured to emphasize was this: I feared that if we had a system of hereditary titles in this country it would lead to the practice of primogeniture. That is, a practice would grow up in this country by which the wealth of a rich man would be settled on the eldest son so that the title might be maintained with dignity, and I deprecated anything of that sort, and urged on this House that such a practice should not be the vogue, because I felt that wealth should be divided among all those who had the privilege of accepting it from the man who had gone before.

The Prime Minister also said in the remarks he made in reference to my speech that the time might come when if I attained the woolsack some talented and eloquent lady of this House might rise and make objections to my being addressed as "His Lordship." I remember a story told of Sir John Macdonald, who being desirous of getting rid of a certain colleague of his had him appointed to the Bench without the gentleman being aware of the promotion, and a few hours later meeting the gentleman on the street, he stopped him and congratulated him in these words: "I congratulate your Lordship upon your being appointed to the Bench." But I must say that when the right hon. leader of the Government spoke of my being addressed as "His Lordship," it was the first time I had reason to assume he was anxious that I should be translated from this House.

The Prime Minister, in alluding to my remarks on the 8th of April, I think resented something I had said in reference to the corruption in England that was attendant on the granting of titles. He took the position, if I correctly understood his remarks, that it was not the business of this House to pass any opinion on the political institutions of Great Britain. I have great respect for the judgment of the Prime Minister. I realize that we have in him one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in Canada, but, Sir, I cannot see eye to eye

with him in regard to this matter, because so long as we are united to the Empire as one of the overseas Dominions, and my fervent prayer is that we may be long united, it is a matter of the gravest interest to us how political institutions in the old country are managed, and if the Upper House in England is being strengthened—possibly I should not say strengthened—but if the Upper House is having additions made to it by men being appointed who secured their appointment in ways that are not proper, then I say that we as one of the overseas Dominions have a right to express our dissatisfaction with that method of procedure.

But, Sir, the Prime Minister, in replying to my remarks, was very careful how he expressed himself. I listened with great care to his remarks that evening, and I have read them since with greater care. He was careful not to say that he did not think what I had said was true. The position the Prime Minister took reminded me very much of the position of the Irishman who was charged with an assault. Two witnesses were produced who swore most emphatically to the details of the assault and made it abundantly clear to the court that the Irishman had committed the offence. When the Irishman was asked to stand up and say if he could give any good reason why sentence should not be passed upon him, the Court said to him: "Two witnesses have conclusively proved that they saw you commit the assault." To which the Irishman replied, "Be jabers, I could get you a hundred who didn't see it." That seemed to be the attitude of the Prime Minister. I had read from the record of the House of Lords' debates to show that corruption was rampant in England. I did not ask the Prime Minister to believe it on my say-so, but I asked him to believe it because I submitted this information as set forth in the record of the House of Lords' debates, and as I said a moment ago, the Prime Minister did not deny it, but he did seem to think I had gone a little outside the record. But for the reasons I have just given I think my remarks were not altogether out of place.

To-day the Prime Minister in speaking seemed, if I may use the expression without being offensive, to blow up a grotesque and hideous figure which he immediately proceeded to knock down. What he said, if I understood him correctly, was this: that the resolution of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) meant that titular distinctions were only to be given to those who had done army or naval service. He then directed attention to the horrible militarism of Germany, and asked the hon. member for Springfield if it was his intention to build up such a system in Canada. The Prime Minister emphasized that he was opposed to anything of that sort being done, but, Sir, I submit that an analysis of the resolution of the hon. member for Springfield will show beyond a shadow of a doubt that the resolution does not bear the construction the Prime Minister put on it this afternoon, probably, in his hurry, not having had the opportunity of giving to it the full consideration that it deserved. The resolution of the hon. member for Springfield reads as follows:

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any hereditary titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada, or any titles other than such terms distinctive of variations of naval and military rank as are necessary or customary for the purposes of Your Majesty's naval or military forces.

There is not one single word said in that resolution in regard to non-hereditary titles being confined to those who have done service in the military or naval forces. What the hon. member for Springfield laid down as a principle was this: That no titular distinctions should be conferred on any man, and that the only titles we should recognize are those that are expressed in such terms as to set out the different degrees of naval and military rank and which are customary for the purpose of His Majesty's military and naval forces; in other words, for the purpose of army and navy discipline men in the forces should be given the titles of Captain, Major, Colonel, and so on, but titles outside of these such as Knights or Barons should not be conferred. That is one angle from which criticism has been levelled at us, but I should like to draw attention for a moment to another angle.

Criticism has been levelled at us to this effect; that if titular distinctions were to be given naval and military in the other dominions and Great Britain, it would be unfair not to confer the same distinctions on Canadians in the naval and military forces. There is an interesting White Paper that was brought down in England a short time ago. I got this information from the April number of the Nineteenth Century, and the Nineteenth Century shows that that White Paper says:

A Parliament White Paper issued on the 29th of October, 1917, contains a return of all hereditary honours granted since the 4th of August, 1914:

(a) To members of the House of Commons 39
(b) To members of the Civil Service 5
(c) To officers of His Majesty's Naval and Military Forces who have been on active service during the war.. 7

Of the seven Naval and Military honours, three were accounted for respectively by the Duke of Teck, Prince Alexander of Teck, and Prince Alexander of Battenberg, while two more were given to military members of Parliament, viz., Major the Honourable E. E. T. W. Fiennes, M.P., and temporary Lieut.-Col. H. Webb, M.P. leaving only two which were granted to mere professional sailors and soldiers, whose sole claim to recognition was fighting for their country.

That would lead you to believe that the principle that military and naval men should have distinctions conferred upon them is not being recognized in Great Britain at this time.

The Prime Minister, in his address this afternoon, held up the horrible example of Germany. We hold up Germany as the horrible example in regard to everything. If I understood correctly the Prime Minister this afternoon, he laid down the principle that if military men were to get titles and all others were to be excluded, the militarism of Germany would be introduced into this country. But, before I leave that I want to make this point clear. I do not believe that, if titles are discontinued in respect to the civil population, titular distinctions should be given to those who have done great service to the country in the military and naval spheres of the war. All should be treated alike. If you are going to lay down a principle for one class, you should lay down exactly the same principle for another. In my judgment at the present time the whole thing should be swept away and we should not have any titular distinctions at all.

The Prime Minister alluded to the conditions in Germany, and I should like to read, for the edification of the House, a few words of Ambassador James W. Gerard from his book "My Four Years in Germany." It is an illustration of how the German nation has been managed by the aristocratic classes by the creation of titles and the granting of decorations. I will read from page 114 of Mr. Gerard's work:

> One of the most successful ways of disciplining the people is by the Rat system. Rat means Councillor, and is a title of honour given to any one who has attained a certain measure of success or standing in his chosen business or profession. For instance, a business man is made a commerce Rat; a lawyer, a justice Rat; a doctor, a sanitary Rat; an architect or builder, a building Rat; a keeper of the archives, an archive Rat; and so on. They are created in this way: first, a man becomes a plain Rat, then, later on, he becomes a secret Rat or privy councillor; still later, a court secret Rat, and, later still a wirklicher or really and truly secret court Rat to which may be added the title of Excellency, which puts the man who has attained this absolutely at the head of the Rat ladder.
>
> But see the insidious working of the system. By German custom the woman always carries the husband's title. The wife of a successful builder is known as Mrs. Really Truly Secret Court Building Rat and her social precedence over the other women depends entirely upon her husband's position in the Rat class. Titles of nobility alone do not count when they come in contact with a high government position. Now if a lawyer gets to be about forty years old and is not some sort of a Rat, his wife begins to nag him and his friends and relations look at him with suspicion. There must be something wrong in his life which prevents his obtaining the coveted distinction and if there is anything in a man's past, if he has shown at any time any spirit of opposition to the Government, as disclosed by the police registers, which are kept written up to date about every German citizen, then he has no chance of obtaining any of these distinctions which make up so much of the social life of Germany. It is a means by which the Government keeps a far tighter hold on the intellectual part of its population than if they were threatened with torture at the stake.

Then, at page 118, Mr. Gerard says:

> Besides the Rat system there is, of course, the system of decorations. Countless orders and decorations are given in Germany. At the head is the Order of the Black Eagle; there are the Order of the Red Eagle, the Prussian Order of the Crown, the orders, "Pour le Merite," states there are also orders, distinctions and many others, and in each of the twenty-five States there are also orders, distinctions and decorations. These orders in turn are divided into numerous classes. For instance, a man can have the Red Eagle Order of the first, second, third, or fourth class, and these may be complicated with a laurel crown, with an oak crown, with swords and with stars, etc.

That proves conclusively that if there is anything to be learned from the German system it is that we should keep free the democracy of this country from the granting of titular distinctions.

Now, Sir, I do not think there is much more that I should say on this question. In my original presentation of the case, I endeavoured to deal with the historic side of it. Before this House there are three propositions. The first is that introduced into the House by myself that all hereditary and reflective titles should be done away with and that by an humble address we should ask His Majesty to make no further grants of hereditary titles to people domiciled in Canada.

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps my hon. friend would allow me to ask a question——?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. BUTTS: I mean to put a question to the right hon. the Prime Minister.

Mr. NICKLE: You may ask me a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman for South Cape Breton and Richmond (Mr. Butts) certainly has no right to interrupt otherwise than to ask a question of the hon. member who has the floor, but with his permission.

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give me permission?

Mr. NICKLE: I am quite willing to answer any question the hon. gentleman cares to ask me.

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps if the right hon. the Prime Minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman is entirely out of order in asking a question of the Prime Minister at this stage.

Mr. BUTTS: I will not ask it then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NICKLE: The second proposition before the House is that laid down by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). He lays down the proposition that no titles of any class or kind shall be granted to domiciled Canadians. When I spoke on this question on the 8th of April, I said that in my judgment it would be wise to go as far as the hon. member for Springfield has gone, but I did not believe the House was sufficiently far advanced to warrant me in introducing such a motion. For that reason I did not introduce that motion, but I am prepared to say to-night that, if the amendment to the amendment moved by the Prime Minister is lost, it is my intention to vote for the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Springfield. The third proposition that is before the House is the amendment to the amendment moved by the Prime Minister. I am at one with the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in realizing the difficulties that confront hon. members in coming to an intelligent conclusion as to how they should vote on these conflicting resolutions. Perhaps each has in it something that will appeal to a member and each may have in it something that is objectionable to him. The third proposition, which is enunciated by the amendment to the amendment of the Prime Minister, is that the Order in Council passed by the Government be approved in reference to hereditary titles and that we shall establish the principle that there shall be responsibility on the part of the Prime Minister for any title granted, whether it is hereditary or otherwise. In other words, the Prime Minister, in his amendment, says the Government, by its Order in Council, has said that, if the Colonial Office and the British Government are willing, there shall be no further hereditary titles in Canada. But if the British Government are willing to go that far, we want them to go one step farther and say that the Canadian Government, through the Prime Minister, shall be responsible for all titles less than hereditary titles granted to any resident of this overseas dominion.

Therefore, it is my intention, in the first place, to vote against the amendment to the amendment as moved by the Prime Minister, when it comes to be voted on, because it does not go far enough, in my judgment, to purge from our system of government all titular distinctions. But if the amendment to the amendment as moved by the Prime Minister carries, then, when the Speaker puts the question to the House "shall the motion as amended have the concurrence of the House?" I intend to vote for it, because if I cannot get a whole loaf of bread I am willing to take at least a slice. And if I cannot get the abolition of all titular distinctions, then I want to have it established for this country that titular distinction is granted on the advice of the Prime Minister of the country, and is not granted on the advice of what I, with all respect, term an irresponsible Governor General. When I use the expression "irresponsible Governor General," I mean a Governor General not directly responsible to the people of this country. In other words, as far as my desire goes, it is that the resolution of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) be sustained. But if that resolution, or amendment, cannot be carried then my desire, as expressed by my vote, will be that the responsibility for titular distinction shall be on the man who, for the time being, is Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I regret that at this late hour I feel it necessary that I should say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NICKLE: Before making my speech I asked whether there was any other hon. member who wished to address the House. I was under the impression, when I rose to speak, that I was closing the debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is entirely mistaken; he is not closing the debate. The hon. gentleman has spoken upon the amendment, and the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) has a perfect right to be heard, as I understand it.

Mr. NICKLE: I only want to put myself right. Before I rose to speak I discussed the matter with Mr. Speaker, and if I misunderstood him it is my misfortune, not his fault.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think there can be any possible doubt at all in the matter. We are not speaking on the original motion, but on the amendment which has been moved. The hon. member who has just risen to speak is, therefore, perfectly in order.

Mr. MANION: I regret that I did not speak before the hon. member for Kingston made his remarks. I did not catch the meaning of the statement which he made at first, but I now understand from him that he thought he was closing the debate. However, I am not going to take up the time of the House for more than a very few moments. My reason for speaking at all is that I should like to put myself on record and explain the position that I intend to take in this vote.

In the first place, I think that in the speeches which I have heard to-day there has been a good deal of what I thought—I may be wrong—was confusion of ideas. I I submit that the word "title", the word "decoration" and the word "order" are not the same—that is, they have not the same signification. The Prime Minister in his remarks spoke, I think, as if he looked upon them in the same light—and he may be correct. I do not wish to differ from his judgment, which is a more mature judgment than mine. But I feel, and I have felt ever since the first debate on this subject took place in the House, that a great many mistakes had been made in the discussion of this question. A title, to my mind, is a name given such as the title "Sir" before the Prime Minister's name. That is, it is an appellation of honour given for some cause or other. The definition of the word "title" as given by the authorities—and I may say that I looked the matter up when the discussion on this matter first took place—is an appellation of dignity, distinction or preference given to persons. The definition of "decoration" is any badge, such as a medal, cross of honour, and so on, bestowed for distinguished service; and an "order" something akin to it though an order may confer a title. However, I am distinguishing particularly between decoration and title. For example, there are in this House to-day a number of men who have won decorations, and there are also in this House a number of men who have—I perhaps should say won—at any rate, who have been given titles. And yet, I think, they are two distinct things. Their title contains the "Sir". I believe that the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) deals particularly with the title "Sir"—that is, with baron or baronet or knighthood—but the decoration such as V.C. gives no title. Private Tommy Atkins, when he is given that decoration for particular bravery on the field, or for saving somebody's life, is still Private Tommy Atkins, although given the highest decoration in the power of the King. The same with the D.S.O., and the Military Cross, and a number of other decorations. I will try to prove my argument in this way: The Republic of France is perhaps as democratic a country as any country in the world. France confers no titles, but it confers many decorations, for instance, the croix de guerre, the legion of honour, and many other decorations, which are given for bravery. And yet the only titles in France to-day are the titles which have been bestowed under the old regimes, such as, count and countess. I have seen a few of those notabilities over there, but I think there are very few titles in France. I understand from inquiries made in that country, that many people take the title of count or countess without anybody caring whether they have them or not—they do not have to have such titles conferred upon them. However, I wished to make that point clear in the first place, because I do not think that the abolition of titles would be the abolition of decorations at all. I believe the great republic to the south allows decorations to be conferred upon its soldiers at the front, and already the republic of France, and I believe our own great Empire, has conferred decorations upon some of the American soldiers. Yet I have never heard, and I do not believe it is permitted, of any American being allowed to accept a knighthood from the Government of England.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think Mr. Gerard had a knighthood conferred upon him.

Mr. MANION: I do not think Mr. Gerard uses it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think he is referred to in his own country by the title of "Sir" but I believe he has had the distinction conferred upon him by the King.

Mr. MANION: The Prime Minister gives one exception, and I believe he is absolutely correct in his statement. But I do not believe that Mr. Gerard is given the title in his own country, and I do not believe that the United States permits its citizens to accept such titles, at any rate, not as a general thing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is the rule in every country—that no one is allowed to accept a decoration from another country except by permission of the executive authority of his own.

Mr. MANION: I believe that the Prime Minister will not state that there have been many cases such as Mr. Gerard's. I know of no other.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know of any others.

Mr. MANION: I do not believe there are any others. Now, a few words in regard to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I am afraid I am speaking at greater length than I intended, but I shall not occupy much longer of the time of the House. The Minister of Trade and Commerce mentioned that every man of this country, and every man in the world, who had any pride, desired approbation or appreciation for works that he had done. The minister said the man would hardly be a normal individual, or something to that effect, if he did not desire such approbation, and I heartily agree with him. But I do not agree that the approbation of the world is the same as the conferring of title, such as the giving of a baronetcy or a knighthood. The minister spoke of the different ranks in heaven. Of course, even the Minister of Trade and Commerce has to surmise in regard to the ranks in heaven, because many of us have different ideas from him in regard to heaven, and maybe many different views with respect to the ranks there.

Now before I close, let me say that I wanted to make my position clear on this question before the vote is taken. I regret very much that I felt it necessary to put myself right before this House as to why I intend to vote in a certain way when this vote is taken. I wish to say that, generally speaking, I agree absolutely with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) that not only hereditary titles but all knighthoods should be abolished in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: And the reason that hon. members on your left may not cheer me so heartily is because I am not going to support this abolition this year, because I do not think the problem has been sufficiently discussed and considered to have it properly solved at the present time. I believe the hon. member for Springfield is right. But I believe there should be a much greater discussion and consideration of the subject before a vote is taken to turn out this Government, which I believe this vote would mean.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MANION: I have heard "noes" from my right but not from my left. I repeat that I believe that this Government was elected for the purpose of carrying out the Military Service Act and sending soldiers to the front. I do not believe that it is the duty of this Parliament, of men who are elected as I was with that specific purpose in view, to turn out this Government on such a question as this without due consideration. If after due consideration this question comes up again, if it comes up in the next Parliament, I am willing to say here to-night, that if the hon. member for Springfield moves this motion I shall be willing to support it at that time.

Another point I would offer as a suggestion is this: that the Prime Minister should consider the question of not giving any more titles—I should not say giving, because he does not give them—but so far as he is able preventing the conferring of any more titles upon the people of this country until this subject has had further consideration in this House. That is a suggestion I lay before him for his consideration. There is one point I wish to make before I sit down, a point in regard to naval and military titles. I do not agree that there should be titles given only to naval and military men in this country. I agree absolutely with the Prime Minister in that. We should not make a

military caste to stand over and above the other people of this country. While we are fighting to put down autocracy in Germany, we do not want to create a military aristocracy or autocracy in our own country. I do not believe that the military should be given titles any more than any other class. But I do believe that for deeds of valour the military should be given decorations. I am going to support the amendment to the amendment as moved by the Prime Minister, for the reason that I do not think that the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield has been given sufficient consideration and discussion in this House to pass upon it. It would confuse us, and would confuse what the members of this House really wish to have done.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Could I get the unanimous consent to offer—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken on the sub-amendment. Is it the unanimous wish that the hon. member should speak?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I hear the word "no?"

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very sorry, but the hon. member for Springfield has not the unanimous consent.

Mr. RICHARDSON: A moment would have done.

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

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): A point arises from a statement made by the last speaker (Mr. Manion), which I think it is in the interest of the House to have cleared up. I do not know whether or not he was making the statement for the Government when he said that a vote against the amendment to the amendment meant a vote of want of confidence. And we all know what that would mean. I was pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, as to how I should vote on this subject for a long time before it was argued in this House. And I may say that my attitude towards the Government is also clear. It is in accordance with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) this evening. We do not wish to see a change at this time. We have confidence in this Government in connection with the general business they have in hand. But we think they have possibly made a mistake in taking such a definite part in this matter. The question now before the House, I understood, Mr. Speaker, is one introduced by a private member, and I have always looked upon it as a private matter, and that the Government would not be affected in any way by any vote on this question. If I am wrong, many hon. members share the same opinion. Consequently I think it is not out of place to ask that members in this House be advised definitely by the Government as to what is the significance of this vote. If it is in effect a vote of want of confidence I can do only one thing. There is, on the other hand, no question as to where I stand so far as the matter at issue is concerned. I am absolutely in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Springfield. We are, therefore, in a difficult position, and we should know, and we have a right to know, exactly where the Government stands on this question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If by the leave of the House I may be permitted to say a few words, I shall make the matter perfectly clear so far as I am concerned. The subject was taken very fully into consideration by the Government at different times. We spent three or four weeks in reaching a conclusion as to our recommendations through the Governor General to His Majesty the King and to the Government of the United Kingdom. We dealt with it according to the light that we had. And when the motion of my hon. friend the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) came before the House, I took the House absolutely into my confidence, told them of the discussion that we had had, and of the conclusion that we had reached. I said that the Government of the United Kingdom, regarding some of the matters in the Order in Council as of very grave import, had asked us for an opportunity to discuss the whole subject, because undoubtedly it has relation to its ultimate effect not only to this Dominion but to all the dominions of the Empire and to the United Kingdom as well. We reached a certain conclusion, and it has been stated frankly and clearly, as far as I was able to state it frankly and clearly, to the House. I can only say, so far as I am concerned, that if the House does not propose to accept the course which I have asked them frankly and with much respect to take, I should consider that I am relieved from my duty of carrying on any longer the Government of this country, and I should ask His

Excellency the Governor General to seek other advisers. It seems to me that a somewhat peculiar course has been pursued by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in inquiring of the leader of the Opposition as to whether or not this motion was to be treated as a motion of want of confidence. My understanding of the course to be pursued on such occasions is that the leader of the Government should be asked with regard to that question, and I cannot quite understand the reason why there should have been resort to my right hon. friend on the other side of the House to learn how I should regard a motion of this kind. However, the course has been taken, and it is entirely in the judgment of the House to determine what course they propose to pursue in the matter. So far as I am concerned my course is absolutely clear and open.

Mr. Nickle having risen,

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) has the floor.

Mr. NICKLE: With the unanimous consent of the House—

Mr. SHEARD: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the unanimous wish of the House that the hon. member have leave to proceed?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. NICKLE: With the unanimous consent of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not the unanimous consent of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Go on.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I understand that the Prime Minister is willing to let the member for Kingston make a personal explanation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am satisfied, yes. I would ask the House to permit it, if the hon. gentleman wishes to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member for Kingston have the privilege of making this explanation?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. NICKLE: When the Prime Minister was speaking he turned in my direction as if it were I to whom he alluded when he spoke of an hon. member on this side having this evening asked the leader of the Opposition if this were a party question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not referring to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. NICKLE: Then I have nothing further to say.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Was the Prime Minister referring to me?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was referring to the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) who stated that he had sought that advice.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I would not have taken part in this debate but for the fact that the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) was not allowed to say a few words that might have been said. I seconded the amendment of the member for Springfield because I believed that it was along right lines—and I am sure that eighty per cent of the members of this House hold the same view. I agree that the Government have some rights, but I do not think that the rights of private members should be entirely ignored, and if they have not been entirely ignored, they have been very much so. The member for Springfield offered a bona fide amendment and I, in bona fide manner, seconded it. This is a private matter, not a public matter; it has nothing to do with the carrying on of the war. This Government have been elected to carry on the war. I for one am certainly not going to vote any want of confidence in the Government; I am not going to vote against them in anything that they do to work out a plan for carrying on our part in the war, even though I think they are mistaken. I shall follow that course until I change the views which I now hold concerning the advisability of retaining this Government in power. If the amendment to the amendment is voted down it will not mean a change of Government, because even if the Government resigned they would come back again; they are the only Government that can command a majority in this House. But I do not think that we should be placed in a false position because in honour bound, and in order to be honest with ourselves and with the people, we vote against the amendment to the amendment. I do not think that we are being treated fairly. While I want to give the Government every bit of fair play that is coming to them, I do believe that private members also have the right to fair play, and I do not think

that the member for Springfield and myself are getting it.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): It may be worth while, Mr. Speaker, to go back to the conclusion of the debate when this matter was first before the House, so that we may understand exactly what we had a right to expect from the Government and what this House is now receiving from the Government.

When this matter was first brought before the House there were two motions on the Order Paper, one in the name of the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), and the other in the name of the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). By arrangement between those two hon. gentlemen the debate was initiated by the member for Kingston and upon his motion. As the debate proceeded and as the practically unanimous opinion of this House was voiced, the member for Springfield, in order to give expression to what seemed to be a stronger opinion within the House than that embodied in either of the motions to which I have referred, introduced an amendment. The Prime Minister asked the member for Springfield not to press his motion, in terms which gave the House to understand that the Prime Minister was in agreement with the general purpose of the amendment and, indeed, with the spirit also of the motions and of the speeches that had been made on that occasion. Then an agreement was entered into which the members of this House expected would be carried out, and the result of which we had a right to expect would be placed before us in terms to-day. Let me refer to the language of the Prime Minister on that occasion. He said:

> In view of the fact that we have had no notice until to-night of the proposal which has been put forward by the hon. member from Springfield, I think the House might very well consider the question a little more.

After the Prime Minister had made some further remarks, the discussion proceeded:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: If the debate is to be adjourned, will my right honourable friend give us a day to take it up again?
>
> Sir Robert Borden: Yes.
>
> Mr. Richardson: Probably the right honourable, the leader of the Government, would prepare a resolution worded in such a form as might be acceptable to the House, and if so, would be perfectly willing to accept it in place of my amendment.

There the matter ended for the time being. We had every reason to expect, in view of the terms of the debate which took place on the occasion to which I have referred and of the agreement that had been come to between practically both sides of the House and every hon. member in the House, that when the matter came up again a resolution would be placed before us embodying the unanimous opinion of the House. Such, in any event, was what I expected; such, I thought, was the resolution to be presented to-day. When the resolution was presented I inquired of the three pioneers of democracy in this debate, the member for Brome, the member for Kingston and the member for Springfield, whether the resolution as presented met their views. I was astonished to find not only that it did not meet their views, but that they had not been consulted, so far as I understood, regarding it. Hence the confusion—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend understood very erroneously if he understood that, because I discussed the matter with these three gentlemen during the forenoon.

Mr. MURPHY: Of to-day?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Prime Minister is correct; he did send us a copy of the resolution this morning.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And consulted with my hon. friends, too.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, and conferred with us.

Mr. MURPHY: Then, the intimation given to me was not exactly correct. In any event, whatever took place took place to-day. Be that as it may, the resolution presented to-day did not meet with the approval of the three hon. gentlemen who were the conspicuous figures in the debate on the previous occasion. The House, therefore, was thrown on its own resources and was not given the benefit of that leadership and direction which it had a right to expect. That, in view of the stage which we have reached in the session and of the business which we are supposed to have on hand, was bad enough. But the turn given to the debate this evening by the speech of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) surprised me still more. Up to the time that hon. gentleman spoke I thought that there was perfect agreement within this House as to the desirability of abolishing titles in general. But when that hon. gentleman spoke and took very strong ground against the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), it be-

came evident to me that, however the Ethiopian may have been concealed until this evening, there was a "nigger in the woodpile" somewhere, and the darky soon manifested himself in the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and later on in the speech of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion).

Mr. MANION: There was no "nigger in the woodpile" so far as my speech was concerned. I spoke absolutely off my own bat, without consultation with any one.

Mr. MURPHY: Then I exclude my hon. friend from the reference, but still I think it is remarkable that he was in such perfect unison with the two members of the Government, particularly in view of some hurrying and scurrying that we saw on the opposite side of the Chamber after the Minister of Customs had spoken. I, of course, accept my hon. friend's statement unreservedly.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY: I am perfectly serious. I would not take any exception to any statement that my hon. friend would make, because I have too much regard for him. The question resolves itself into this—Are we serious about this question of titles? Do we want to abolish titles, or do we not? My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson) said a few moments ago, and said truly, from his patriotic and unselfish standpoint, in meeting the ridiculous contention that this amendment is in the nature of a want of confidence motion, that this matter has nothing to do with carrying on the war, and I understood him to say, if he did not say so in as many words, that for that reason he would not be influenced by any argument of that kind. I am not so sure that this discussion has nothing to do with carrying on a certain phase of the war, as it is being carried on in this country. I am not so sure that a number of people, who play at carrying on the war for the sake of getting the titles that such play may bring them, are not responsible for the sudden volte face on the part of the Government. Therefore, I say to my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle and to other hon. members like him that, while from their point of view this matter certainly has not and cannot have anything to do with the carrying on of the war in the proper sense of the term, I am not so sure that it has not something to do with the methods pursued by some people who pretend that they are helping to carry on the war. Otherwise, I am completely at a loss to understand the attitude taken by the Government this evening. I do not want to say or do anything to prevent unanimity on this question. But what are we going to have if the Government persists in this course? What position are hon. gentlemen going to be placed in who have declared themselves as they have declared themselves upon this question? What position will the hon. member for Springfield, the hon. member for Kingston, and other hon. members occupy if the Government persists in taking the position they apparently intend to take? It is not treating the House properly; it is not treating the private members of the House fairly, to take this attitude upon an occasion of this kind. I would point out to my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) that, while he expressed the view to which he gave utterance a few minutes ago when he stated that if the matter came up next session he would vote for a motion similar to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield, there is nothing to prevent him from voting for it now, since he has said that he approves the principle of it.

Mr. MANION: I said, with proper discussion, which I do not think this subject has had in this House at the present time.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know what more discussion a subject could possibly have unless we were to devote unnecessary time to it. I have intervened only for the purpose of showing the point we had reached when the matter was up before, and the opinion that was general amongst the members of the House upon the adjournment of the debate upon that occasion, that it was the intention of the Government to bring in a resolution that would express the unanimous opinion of the House. If, however, the Government has seen fit to adopt other methods, then hon. members are left to their own resources and will have to take their course accordingly.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree that the subject under discussion is really regarded as one of primary importance in the country, nor do I think that it has merited the whole time of 235 men that has been given to it in this House. Naturally some one will retort: Why are you still further discussing it? I do not think members of this House will regard me as a prolific speaker, at all events this session, if I bore them for a few minutes to ex-

press my attitude towards this question. I would not have spoken had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) who moved the original motion and the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy). In the first place from all this discussion it is manifest that the House is unanimous in its opinion that hereditary titles are entirely repugnant to the genius of the people of this country. We have that at all events in common, nor do I think that this sentiment would find anything but the heartiest response from one end of Canada to the other. I wish to touch for a moment or two on some of the remarks made by one or two of the former speakers on this matter. The hon. member for Kingston took occasion to animadvert—I do not think that is too strong a term—upon the speech and arguments made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in the House to-night on this subject. To my mind his criticism and animadversions were entirely beside the mark. He seemed to assume that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was arguing that the only way to get great and good things done in this world or in any other world was to give a reward for them. I did not so understand my right hon. friend. I understood him to plead—and I think rightly so—as to the universality of distinctions of some kind in the human race, and I think any one will be very foolish to deny that. I did not understand him to lay such stress upon it, that he denied the doctrine that all of us who are men should hold that the greatest incentive to high work is a man's high purpose in life and not the hope of reward that may come to him from his fellowmen. I am quite sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce would, of all men, approve Seneca's saying that the best reward for doing a good thing is the having done it, and every man who is a man would assent to that without stopping to argue it for a moment. I will say this for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that I have never heard a man make a more manly statement on a subject which has been one of very great criticism and animadversion during the course of this debate, and take the manly stand that he has in regard to the personal relations of himself to this question of titles. I wish to say further, speaking my personal view, that as regards this one of our colleagues who has now reached three score years and ten—I am sure he does not mind my mentioning this—in the long and honourable service of his country, we think that not only has he a right to such distinction as his Sovereign has given him, but he gives as much honour to the title as the title gives to him. My hon. friend from Kingston hoped that the Prime Minister would have time to read some author in the sixteenth century on some various phases of this question. I presume my hon. friend must have some little conception of the enormous strain on the time and energies of the Prime Minister in this frightful time of war through which we are passing. If he has not, I can assure him that those of us who are working in close touch with the Prime Minister and who know something of the hourly and daily duties and anxieties that are sapping strength every month and every year, do not marvel that he has no time to read and study other things, but marvel that he has time and strength to attend to the pressing duties of the hour. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) was rather critical of the Old Country. He stated that in his view—if I am wrong, he will correct me—if we should see anything wrong in the institutions, methods and policies of the Old Country in regard to their domestic affairs it was eminently proper that we should step in and criticise and help put them right.

Mr. NICKLE: As my hon. friend asked me to correct him if he was wrong, I must say that he has not correctly quoted me.

Mr. BURRELL: If I am wrong I must retract.

Mr. NICKLE: What I said was that so long as we constituted a part of the Empire, and I hoped we should long so remain, we were within our rights in criticising the formation of other Houses that could pass legislation affecting us.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not wish to misquote my hon. friend or to misunderstand him. When we start a line of criticism on affairs that, after all, are primarily the affairs of the people of Great Britain, who are in very truth a democracy, we should remember that the people of this country would be the very first to resent criticism by people in the Old Country of our institutions and practices and policies. However, I shall not dwell on that.

It is certainly right that we should not encourage, and we are not encouraging, the bestowal of hereditary titles in this country. It is equally to be desired that we should discourage any form of special recognition in this country when that recognition is not properly and worthily

earned and lived up to. But I would like to say, and I think it is time somebody spoke a little on this subject, if we are to discourage these things it seems to me it is also time that we should discourage the tendency toward national and individual pharisaism in this country on some things. There is certainly ostentation and pride and meanness wrapped up with titles ill-earned, and everybody regrets that, but ostentation and pride and meanness and selfishness are not necessarily linked to titles, and we need only cast our eyes around the world and seach our own hearts to find a lot of other things of that kind which we might make as big an effort to discourage as we are making to discourage these other things. It is well, I think, that every one of us should bear in mind that good old saying of Butler's, and not

> Compound for sins we are inclined to,
> By damning those we have no mind to.

Amongst our national tendencies, there is a tendency to legislate ourselves into virtue. There used to be a time when a man could be honest without getting on the housetops and shouting to his neighbour that he was honest. We took it for granted that he was honest and I think it is just as well that we should look at ourselves and our methods and legislation to see if we are not going along that road in a somewhat dangerous manner.

Something has been said about this being a private matter, and some of the last speakers rather complained that the Government had not, perhaps, treated them quite fairly. I do not quite see how this can be considered a private matter, although I can understand the viewpoint which would regard an academic discussion as a matter for members' private or individual opinion, but the House I am sure will remember this. In the first place, the Prime Minister and the Government which he is leading were endorsed by the people on December 17 in a very clear and unmistakable manner to carry on all the national affairs of this country. There was no mistake about that mandate. Even my hon. friends opposite well recognize it, much as they lament it. The Prime Minister and his colleagues, since December 17, have had to give attention to a great variety of matters, and in spite of the special strain imposed upon them, and especially on the Prime Minister in these days, this question of titles was given that thoughtful, earnest consideration which the Prime Minister always gives to any question of public or semi-public character. It must not be forgotten that nine days before this House met, this matter had been discussed and the Order in Council referred to had been framed, and therefore it is so far from being an absolutely private matter that the Government officially through the Prime Minister had put itself on record to the British authorities in this particular matter of titles, and therefore it ceased to be any longer a private matter, and could not be regarded as private simply because a resolution on the matter was introduced by a private member. I would point out to the members of this House that never has any Government in this country or any Government in any of the self-governing dominions gone so far in expounding its mind and explaining its convictions to the British authorities in regard to this matter as this Government has gone. That being the position—this is not exactly in the realm of private questions on which any member, should or should not vote, just as he liked, but is rather one of those questions, perhaps of minor importance, of which the Prime Minister and his Government had taken official cognizance and had expressed their best mind to the authorities in the old country. Under such circumstances, and especially as the leader of the Government himself moved the amendment, an adverse vote, if carried, would jeopardize the larger question and policies which the supporters of the Government themselves stand for. I am sure that however much individual members may disagree on certain phases of this question, or whatever views they may hold, they will in the main believe that this Government has gone a long way towards clearing the air and expressing the views of the people of this country on this question, and that when the Prime Minister gets over to England, following the Order in Council that has already been sent, a great deal will have been accomplished to achieve the purposes for which in the main all the members of this House stand.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I had not the privilege of being in the House when this question was first under discussion on April 8, and nothing was further from my mind than saying anything on the subject as recently as eight o'clock this evening. But in view of some of the statements made I do not feel I could in justice to myself give a silent vote on this question. I have been sent here by the people of my constituency to support the Union Government in carrying on this

war. Consequently, there is no other course for me to follow but to support the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Government. I am sure, Sir, I little thought this question was going to assume the serious aspect it has, and that such serious consequence would result if this amendment were voted down by the House. Although I am in duty bound to support the Government, I think, in view of the statements that have been made by the right hon. Prime Minister and a number of the members of the Government, it was rather unfortunate this matter was not referred to in the speech from the Throne. We would then have had some intimation as to the attitude of the Government with regard to it. I do not consider the question of hereditary titles a very serious matter. It is one that has been in the minds of the people of this country for a great many years. But at this very moment a revolution is taking place throughout the world. Conditions are not what they were six months ago, and conditions will never again be what they have been in the past. It is only a day or so ago that we heard from members of the Government statements with regard to those engaged in the public service of this country. While I listened to the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) delivering his eloquent address here to-night and while he was pointing out the reasons why rewards should be granted for public service, I could not help but feel that perhaps the question of titles might have been relegated to the Civil Service Commission in whose hands we have placed so much responsibility. I am a little surprised, in view of the splendid results that are expected from that commission, that this question should not also have been handed over to them. As for myself, I am absolutely opposed to the granting of titles to people in this country as has been the custom in the past. It is something that is entirely foreign to the disposition and ideas of the people of Canada. It is not in keeping with the cause for which we are contending. Surely, when the civilization of the whole world is at stake, when the liberties and freedom of the people are so wrapped up in the issue for which we are fighting, the day for the conferring of titles, through the leader of the Government or through any other source, has passed. That is my attitude on the question. I wanted to say these few words in explanation of the vote which I will likely record in the course of a few minutes.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the abolition of titles of all kinds. I am also in favour of prosecuting the war to a finish. I am prepared to accept the promise of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) that this matter will be taken up at the Imperial Conference. I hope that in the meantime no titles will be conferred on any Canadian, and if any titles are granted before the next session of Parliament when this matter comes up my position may be entirely different. In the meantime, I think, with a well known labour member of the British Parliament, that it is our business to get on with the war.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything had it not been that my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) referred to the "pioneers" in this question of titles should be conferred upon residents of Canada to say a few words upon this subject. My attitude to-night is the same as it was at that time. I then suggested that no more titles should be conferred upon residents of Canada except for cause, and I am exactly in the same frame of mind now. In the old days titles were granted, when they were granted, for cause. They were granted for some national service, they were granted to outstanding figures in our national life. But it does appear to me that of late titles of all kinds have been conferred without any apparent reason. This even applies to the titles that are bestowed upon lawyers. In the old days it was regarded as a most distinct mark of approbation that one who practised law should be given the title of K.C. To-day the title of K.C. is granted not for merit by any manner of means, but wholly and solely for political purposes. I will not say that this distinction has entirely fallen into disrepute to-day, but it is valued much less than it was in former days. We have had titles turned out almost with a treadmill. Scores of men have been made knights, not for national service, not for service in any particular way that required the recognition of the state as a whole but for purposes entirely foreign to those considerations and for activities or achievements that do not deserve the slightest recognition or approbation. We are to-day engaged in the greatest war in history. Men have risen not only to the heights of national but of international fame, and they stand out in the world's history. I refer to Poincare, Wilson and Lloyd George, three of the greatest names that stand

before the people to-day. To-day these men are pre-eminent figures in the world's affairs. They, like that greatest of men, William Ewart Gladstone, were content with the simple title of English, French or American gentlemen. So it should be in this land of Canada. The whole spirit of the people of Canada is adverse to the granting of titles, unless, as I said before, it is for some national service. However, I am glad to know that the ball has been started, and that like a snowball it is increasing in volume and force. This Government and future Governments will know that the people of Canada are distinctly and entirely opposed to the granting of any more titles in the way that they have been granted in the past. The people of Canada will insist that if titles are to be granted they shall be granted for outstanding services to the State or in recognition of conspicuous ability. We have had the assurance of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) this afternoon, I am glad to know, that this matter will be taken up at the conference about to be held in England. Those of us who do not approve of what has been going on in the past have the distinct promise of the Prime Minister that the conference will deal with this matter, that they will inquire into it, and that the authorities who have to deal with the granting of titles will be given notice that, as far as the people of Canada are concerned, and as far as their representatives in this House are concerned, titles shall only be granted to those who have merited them.

Mr. H. P. WHIDDEN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us realize that titles will have to go in Canada. I am not sure that our disposition of titles is going to determine our final democratic spirit. I agree with the resolution before us; I agree with the amendment, and I agree with the amendment to the amendment. I cannot vote for them all to-night. I agree with the motion as an expedient beginning. I agree with the amendment as the goal to be reached, but not now. I believe in the amendment to the amendment as the natural thing to vote for, not by way of private members on this side of the House apologizing for the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden), but because the amendment to the amendment is suggested in view of the action taken prior to the assembling of this Parliament, in view of the fact that in war time, when democracy is reconstructing itself in the consciousness, not only of the Canadian people, but of all people who are alive to-day, certain prejudices, especially among the allied group of British nations included in the Empire of which we are a part, must be respected, and in view of the fact that we must not forget to recognize those true relationships which cannot be ignored in such a time as this.

I believe in supporting the amendment to the amendment, because we are assured by the right hon. gentleman who has submitted it to the House that a fair and full opportunity will be given for the discussion of this whole question within a few weeks—in which discussion the representatves of all the other dominions, and of the Motherland, as well as the worthy representatives of this country, will participate—and in that discussion the Canadian representatives will adequately state what we are thinking and what we are expecting, and what we hope to see a little later on. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when Parliament reassembles, and if more time is needed for the consideration of this question, it will be afforded in the interval and we shall be in an even better position to vote for the amendment which has been placed before us during the present session, or for some resolution which will carry out the purpose and the spirit of that amendment. There is no need to apologize for supporting a course that to-day is the only one to be pursued, and I wish to say that as a private member of this House, occupying a seat on the Government side, and as a Canadian democrat, and the representative of a democratic constituency, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I can conscientiously and intelligently support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (Calgary W.): I desire to say but a very few words upon this subject. First of all I think that the present Government should be congratulated upon the Order in Council which has been passed and the recommendations which have been made to the Imperial authorities in regard to the question of the bestowal of titles in this country. Strong feeling has been aroused in Canada, principally in connection with titles which were of an hereditary nature, and the people have placed the stamp of their disapproval against all such titles in this country.

Let me quote the third and fourth clauses of the Order in Council relating to this matter:

No hereditary title, of honour, shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.

Appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title of honour held by a subject of His Majesty, now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canda, shall be recognized as having hereditary effect.

I do not believe that it would have been possible two or three years ago in this country for any government to have taken such drastic action in regard to the conduct of the Imperial Government, or of the Sovereign, in connection with this matter. The Canadian Government have not only indicated their disapproval of hereditary titles in Canada, and placed themselves upon record in regard to it, but they have pledged themselves to enact the proper legislation, or take such a course as may be necessary to eliminate the hereditary feature from those titles in this country. I believe that public sentiment in Canada is moving very rapidly along this line, and that the country as a whole has no belief in the recognition of such titles. I believe that there are but few supporters of this idea in the Dominion. The Canadian people generally are educated and enlightened, and the conditions under which titles can survive and thrive are not to be found upon Canadian soil. While we congratulate the Government upon taking the steps which they have taken in connection with the matter of hereditary titles, we also think they must come to the realization that the whole sentiment of Canada, and more particularly the sentiment of Western Canada, from which I come, is absolutely opposed to the recognition of, or the bestowal of, titles of any kind upon any individual citizen. I think it is very fortunate that this discussion has taken place before the Prime Minister and the other members of his Cabinet go overseas. The result will be that when they come to discuss this question in London it will be with a full knowledge of the sentiment which exists throughout Canada, which they must have gathered from the debates which have taken place in this House. I believe that the day is not far distant when these titles will be banned from Canada. My view is that there is no room for such things in any part of this country. I intend to support the amendment to the amendment which was moved by the Prime Minister, but I think this matter can be safely left in the hands of himself and his colleagues when they come to take it up and discuss it with the Imperial authorities. My chief desire in speaking was to impress upon the Prime Minister again before he leaves the country, that, in my opinion, the whole sentiment of the Dominion is against the bestowal of titles upon Canadian citizens.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS: It is a little difficult for me to understand why this discussion should have taken up so much time. What difference does it make to the average person whether they call me "Sir Robert" Butts or "Bob" Butts? If His Majesty, or the Premier of Canada made me "Sir Robert," down among the coal miners I should still be called "Bob" Butts, so that, "a rose by any other name will smell as sweet." At the same time there is a serious side to this question. If a Canadian should so distinguish himself—if, for instance, the right hon. leader of the Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition have so distinguished themselves in the administration of the affairs of the country—that His Majesty the King sees fit to confer upon them the title of "Sir," what harm does it do? It is a distinction which lifts that man above the ordinary sphere of life; it recognizes his services to the State, and it hurts nobody. Then why in the world do we have all this loud talk about titles? I cannot understand it. Here we are over two hundred men assembled in Ottawa to legislate for this country, having a somewhat serious outlook, and yet we are spending hours talking about this trifling affair, when the world is in the greatest travail that it has ever experienced. Surely we ought to think a little bit more seriously about the situation that at present confronts the world.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, if the House would allow me a word of explanation—

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON: When I proposed this amendment I had no conception that it was a question which might in any way precipitate a crisis in the country. I had no conception that the Prime Minister of this country would stake the existence of the Government on the issue. I was elected as a supporter of the Union Government, and I would much prefer to resign my seat here to-night than to jeopardize the existence of the Government. In my parliamentary experience in the old days, I understood that when a private member introduced a resolution members of the House on both sides were perfectly free to vote for or against it according to how it appealed to them. It was in that sense that

I viewed this resolution of my friend the hon. member for Kingston, and I was thoroughly in favour of abolishing, particularly, hereditary titles. But when I observed the general opinion of the House that all titles should go on the scrap heap, I thought to myself: "Here is your opportunity, member for Springfield, just throw the monkey wrench into the works." And I must confess that, after all the fuss that has been raised over this, I will be disposed to hesitate before mature consideration of the consequences of an apparently entirely innocent and well-meant action. There is one thing, however, that I am well satisfied with. Member after member has arisen in this House and declared that titles must go. Where would that place myself and other hon. members if we forced the issue by voting against the Prime Minister's amendment? I think we are absolutely safe in concluding from this time forth that they are on the scrap-heap, and on the scrap-heap they go. The point I wish to emphasize is this: the right hon. leader of the Government has stated that if the amendment to the amendment moved by him fails to carry, his resignation will be in the hands of the Governor General. I was elected by an immense majority to come down and support the Win-the-War Government. I am free to say that there is no man in this country, in my judgment, as fit to lead this Government as is my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I am free to say that I have sat behind this Government during this session with the greatest satisfaction. I have seen this Government implement its promises to this country one after the other —prohibition, Civil Service reform, Woman Suffrage, and so on all down the line. And I am delighted with the record that this Government has made. But I do not wish as a member, misunderstanding what the result of a simple amendment regarding titles would be, to take the responsibility of driving this Government out of power, and I do not think any member on this side of the House would desire that responsibility, and if I did so, I could not go back to Manitoba and face my constituents who elected me by such a tremendous majority to come here and support Sir Robert Borden and the Win-the-War Government, a Government composed of the best elements of both parties of this country.

I have come down here to support that Government, and I am delighted with the record that it has made. But when my right hon. friend the Prime Minister stands up in this House and before this country and says on this question of titles: if my amendment to the amendment fails to carry I shall resign—and the Government would be out, and the country thrown into chaos as a result. I am not prepared to take the responsibility. I am perfectly willing, in view of the promises that have been made, that titles from this time forward are as dead as Julius Caesar, to withdraw my amendment, with the consent of my seconder.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has the right to withdraw his amendment without the unanimous consent of the House? I am not willing to give my consent.

Mr. SPEAKER: It requires the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I refuse to give my consent.

House divided on the proposed amendment to the amendment of Sir Robert Borden:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Maclean (Halifax),
Anderson,	McCurdy,
Andrews,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Argue,	McGregor,
Armstrong (Lambton),	McIsaac,
Arthurs,	McLean (Royal),
Ballantyne,	McQuarrie,
Ball,	Maharg,
Bolton,	Manion,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Marshall,
Boyce,	Martin,
Boys,	Meighen,
Brien,	Mewburn,
Buchanan,	Middlebro,
Burrell,	Morphy,
Butts,	Mowat,
Calder,	Munson,
Campbell,	Myers,
Carvell,	Nesbitt,
Casselman,	Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Chaplin,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Charters,	Pardee,
Clark (Bruce),	Porter,
Clarke (Wellington),	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Cockshutt,	Rowell,
Cowan,	Scott,
Crerar,	Sexsmith,
Cronyn,	Shaw,
Crothers,	Sheard,
Crowe,	Sifton,
Currie,	Simpson,
Davidson,	Smith,
Davis,	Spinney,
Doherty,	Steele,
Elkin,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Finley,	Stewart (Lanark),
Foster (Sir George),	Sutherland,
Fraser,	

Fripp,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Glass,	Thompson (Hastings),
Green,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Guthrie,	Tolmie,
Harold,	Turriff,
Harrison,	Tweedie,
Hay,	Wallace,
Henders,	Whidden,
Keefer,	White (Sir Thomas),
Knox,	Wigmore,
Lang,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Long,	Wright.—104.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Boivin,	Lavigueur,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Boyer,	Leger,
Brouillard,	Lemieux,
Bureau,	Lesage,
Cahill,	McCoig,
Cardin,	McCrea,
Casgrain,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Copp,	McKenzie,
d'Anjou,	McMaster,
Déchêne,	Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Murphy,
Denis,	Nickle,
Desaulniers,	Pacaud,
Deslauriers,	Papineau,
Duff,	Parent,
DuTremblay,	Pedlow,
Ethier,	Pelletier,
Euler,	Power,
Fafard,	Prevost,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fontaine,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fortier,	Robb,
Foster (York),	Ross,
Fournier,	Savard,
Gauvreau,	Seguin,
Gervais,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Gladu,	Tobin,
Jacobs,	Trahan,
Kay,	Truax,
Kennedy,	Turgeon,
Lafortune,	Vien,
Lanctôt,	White (Victoria).—71.
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	

PAIRS.

The chief whips announce that there are no pairs on the foregoing division.

Mr. ROBB: I desire to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) who is in the House, has not voted.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The reason why I did not vote was that the House declined to accept the withdrawal of my resolution, and the Government had an abundant majority without my vote. I was not quite sure what position I should take, and when I do not know what position to take, I do not take any.

Mr. TREMAIN: I was paired with the member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment to the amendment.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is now on the amendment as amended.

Mr. FIELDING: May we have the amendment in its present form read? We are a little muddled as to how the matter stands.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment of Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Thomson, is as follows:

> That the word "hereditary" be struck out from resolution and that the third paragraph thereof conclude with the word "Canada" in the ensuing line.

The amendment to the amendment, having been adopted by the House, now stands as part of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: Including the words which you have just read from the original amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. The amendment to the amendment is now added to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The resolution of the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is in the following words:

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any hereditary titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada—

I understand that that resolution is now affirmed, and that the words of the Prime Minister's resolution are added thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: The word "hereditary" is omitted, and superimposed on that are the words of the amended amendment.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to, and motion (Mr. Nickle) as amended agreed to.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 106, to amend The Companies Act in various particulars—Mr. Burrell—was read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean for Committee of Supply:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is nearly twelve o'clock. Does the Prime Minister not think that we should adjourn?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have not accomplished very much; I thought that we might go on for a while.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have accomplished a great deal. It is understood that to-morrow the first Order will be the motion of the member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) on going into Committee of Supply?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should be glad if he would go on to-night. If he does not, we will move the House into Committee of Supply to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: To-morrow morning?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, if he does not care to go on to-night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Mr. BUREAU: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister to what hour he intends to keep the House sitting?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not know; it will depend upon how we feel. If we continue to be as fresh as we are at present we might keep on until half past twelve or one o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU: We sat until twenty minutes past one this morning. Hon. gentlemen opposite can obtain some relief by taking three shifts, but we are here all the time. I think we should adjourn at twelve or half past twelve.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will say half past twelve, if my hon. friend does not feel in good form.

Mr. BUREAU: I feel in good form, but I do not feel like being imposed upon because we are less numerous on this side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) in his seat, but I wish to give notice that at the earliest opportunity I shall direct the attention of the House to the expropriaion case of the King v. Belanger in the Supreme Court.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Allowance to J. B. Challies, a member and secretary of the Lake of the Woods Technical Board for services rendered since March, 1914, $500.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Challies has performed very efficient services, and this allowance has been recommended by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), who is the Chairman of the Board.

Arts and Agriculture—towards the encouragement of cold storage warehouses for the better preservation and handling of perishable food products, $25,000.

Mr. PARENT: About May 8, I put on the Order Paper a question which was answered yesterday. From that answer I found that Mr. Philippe Furois, of the city of Quebec, had apparently been appointed to a very important position. That position, from the answer given on Hansard was that of secretary and organizer for increased conservation in the province of Quebec. The position is apparently an important one, because Mr. Furois receives a salary of $250 a month for that work. I have nothing to say against Mr. Furois personally. Probably the Government found that it was necessary to give him remuneration of some kind for his services, because, in the last election—he was a candidate for the Union Government in the constituency of Bonaventure—but that I shall leave aside. The term "secretary and organizer for increased conservation in the province of Quebec" is not quite clear to me, and I should like to get some information as to his duties. As I did not find that out in the answer that was put on Hansard, I tried to secure some information outside. I have discovered that Mr. Furois is attending particularly to the conservation of fish and is endeavouring to popularize the consumption of fish, especially in the province of Quebec. Whether that information is correct or not, I do not know, but that is my information. The minister, I think, might have answered my question somewhat more clearly. The duties of Mr. Furois, as I understand it are as follows: First, to see that a good supply of fish is maintained;

12 m.

secondly, that the fish is reasonable in price; thirdly, that the fish is in good condition and kept in a sanitary manner. If that be the case, possibly Mr. Furois has all the qualifications necessary for fulfilling the duties imposed upon him. He has run in a constituency the shores of which are washed up by the river St. Lawrence. The county of Bonaventure touches the Gulf of St. Lawrence, in which any quantity of fish can be found. More than that, he has been in the real estate business all his life, so he probably knows all about fish, so it may be a good appointment. But what I want to call the particular attention of the minister to is this, that in the city of Quebec for the last two or three months the attention of the department and of the Food Board has been especially directed to the

fact that the price of fish in that city and its environs has been so high that it has been practically impossible for any man of ordinary means to attempt to buy it. The department and the Food Board have had offers from men like Mr. Carroll, of the Daily Telegraph of Quebec, who, acting in a truly patriotic fashion, offered his services gratuitously to the department and to the country with the view of popularizing the consumption of fish, not only in Quebec, but throughout the rest of Canada. Further, Colonel Talbot, who for a good many years represented the constituency of Bellechasse in this House, and who is well known to a few hon. members, offered his services without remuneration for the very purposes that I mentioned a moment ago. At one time the Food Controller said that Col. Talbot's services would be welcomed and that he would receive word one day or another that his services were required; but there was so much delay that that gentleman, after a while, got so tired of corresponding with the Food Controller that he thought fit to send the following letter, which I would like to place before the minister so that he will know the feeling of a man who has offered his services without remuneration, when the minister has seen fit to appoint a man like Mr. Furois at a salary of $250 a month:

Sir,

I have been waiting in vain for your many proposals and offers to mature into facts. I am now thoroughly convinced of what I surmised from the beginning and what I told to Mr. Carroll on our return to Quebec about the composition of your Board of Control and Fish Committee. You are a bunch of well selected four flushers paid according to your ability at bluffing. Your game costs the country $200,000 a year. What a lot of fish this amount would buy for the poor people. With such a government of autocrats and millionnaires as this country is now cursed with one should not be surprised at anything. It is quite evident that besides talking, the only work you do is reading letters, dictating answers and giving advice gathered from different points where you have found good men patriotic enough to do your work for nothing. The 34 stenographers you employ, being no doubt overworked, you can save yourself the trouble of answering this letter as you cannot even follow a correspondence properly.

This letter was written by a man who is experienced in public life, is well known to a good many members of this House, and has been overseas. He offered his services without remuneration to the Canada Food Board with a view to increasing the fish consumption in this country, but his services were declined and Mr. Philippe Furois, the defeated candidate in the last election in the county of Bonaventure, was appointed in his stead at a salary of $250 a month. I am not complaining about Mr. Furois, and I know that having given the facts to the minister he will take them into his consideration and I can leave the matter to him.

Mr. CRERAR: The appointment of the gentleman referred does not come within the Department of Agriculture. He was appointed by the Canada Food Board, I understand. I did not know there was such a gentleman in existence until a question on the Order Paper was brought to my attention a few days ago. I do not know what the capabilities of Mr. Furois are for the position he holds, but I presume the chairman of the Canada Food Board would satisfy himself that he was well qualified. I shall look into the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Had patronage anything to do with it?

Mr. CRERAR: I knew absolutely nothing about the appointment, but as I have already said I shall be glad to bring this matter to the attention of the chairman of the Food Board.

Mr. PARENT: I am quite convinced the minister knew nothing about it personally, or I should probably never have brought the matter up in the House. The gentleman this letter is addressed to is Mr. H. B. Thomson, Food Controller, Ottawa, and I believe the Food Board is under the administration or supervision of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CRERAR: The Food Board reports to Council and carries on its business with Council through the Minister of Agriculture, and that is about the extent of the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. McMASTER: The minister does not suggest that he is not the minister responsible to this House for the dealings of the Food Board?

Mr. CRERAR: Oh, no.

Exhibitions, $25,000.

Mr. KAY: What exhibitions are included?

Mr. CRERAR: As hon. gentlemen are, perhaps, aware, it has been the policy of the department for a good many years to be represented at international exhibitions in various parts of the world, the last one in which we took part being at San Diego, I believe. This work has largely ceased since the war broke out, but the vote is retained to keep in existence the organization

that was built up during several years to carry on this work. This money is required to pay the salaries of the officials.

Mr. PEDLOW: While the war is on could not this branch be dispensed with, or the officials be engaged in some other branch of the Service?

Mr. CRERAR: It is really a question of policy. It has been thought wise for a good many years now for Canada to be represented at these exhibitions, and I think it would be unfortunate to break up an organization that is skilled in the handling of this work.

Mr. KAY: Do I understand there will be no grants to exhibitions this year?

Mr. CRERAR: I was stating that the members of the staff are practically all engaged in other branches of the Service, but their salaries are still paid out of this vote.

Mr. PEDLOW: That is carrying out the suggestion I made a moment ago, but the salaries are still charged up to the Department of Agriculture. Why not charge them to the departments in which the men are working?

Mr. CRERAR: That is merely a matter of book-keeping.

Mr. PEDLOW: But why not show the true state of affairs?

Mr. PARENT: Has the minister received a request from the corporation of the city of Quebec for a grant to the annual exhibition held in that city in September?

Mr. CRERAR: I believe such a request has been received, but any money granted for that purpose would come out of the vote under the Live Stock Branch.

Mr. PARENT: It is immaterial to me what branch it comes out of, but I wanted to know whether a grant would be made by the Government to the Quebec exhibition this year.

Mr. CRERAR: No such grant would be made out of this vote, which is to pay the salaries of the exhibition staff.

Mr. KAY: In previous years, under this vote, there has been a grant made to special exhibitions. I am glad to hear the minister state that it is not to be continued this year. I had, earlier in the session, a resolution on the Order Paper urging the Government to prohibit the holding of exhibitions this year for the purpose of increasing and conserving labour on the farm. Unfortunately, this resolution was not reached and it was withdrawn. I put that resolution on the Order Paper because I was firmly convinced that production was of paramount importance during the war and that there was a great expenditure and loss of time and labour in attending exhibitions. I calculated that at least 5,000,000 days of labour are lost on the farm by farmers attending fall exhibitions in this country, by the transportation of livestock and by the travel of the people in order to attend exhibitions. But inasmuch as the Government, by their recent Order in Council affecting the Military Service Act, seem to indicate that production is not of paramount importance, I will have nothing further to say in this regard at the present time. I am very strongly in favour of exhibitions in normal years. They have done a great deal for agriculture and for promoting the livestock industry. But I think that in the interest of greater production they should not be held during the war. I offer that suggestion, although it will not be possible to carry it out this year. In case, next year, the Government should decide that production is of paramount importance, I would suggest that they prohibit the holding of fall fairs.

Mr. GLASS: I cannot see it from the same angle that my hon. friend (Mr. Kay) does. I do not agree with him in what he said with reference to any reduction in the assistance or support given to the holding of fairs throughout the country. He says that the object of withholding or reducing the grant is to enable the farmers to increase production. I do not think his reasoning is at all logical, because I do not know of anything that has done more to stimulate production or to encourage intensified farming than the fall fairs. I think the House and the country can be congratulated on the fact that the resolution that the hon. gentleman had on the Order Paper has not been presented and that his wishes have not prevailed. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the experience of recent years in extending these fall fairs, even to the pupils in the schools, has proved most effective in stimulating the agricultural industry and increasing production. I refer particularly to township fairs where the competitions have been among the younger element and the school children. We have had competitions in production in my part of the country which have brought out products that have outclassed anything that the farmers have been able to produce in this country. On

one occasion we had an acre production competition. The object of this competition was not to see who could grow the best potatoes, fruit, or products of other kinds, but to see who could produce the greatest amount of value from an acre of land. In connection with this competition, three boys, side by side, in the township, produced an average of about 500 bushels of potatoes to the acre. They produced that at 40 cents per bushel, and they had a profit of over $168 per acre over labour and everything else. The results obtained by those boys demonstrated to the farmers the fact that they were not getting the greatest production out of the ground. School children, in connection with these little exhibitions that are held, are being taught how to organize and to work their small plots of ground set apart for them on certain portions of the farm. Since these fairs have been established they have had a most stimulating and encouraging effect upon production and intensive farming. I should be sorry to see the Government take any steps that would result in withdrawing any encouragement from these exhibitions. I did not understand the minister to say that it was the intention to reduce these grants. There has been for a number of years past a grant given by the Dominion Government to exhibitions which have a prize list aggregating a certain maximum—I think, $10,000. I hope it is not the intention of the Government to reduce that encouragement to exhibitions.

Mr. BOYCE: It would be a very great mistake to do anything that would offer any discouragement to the agricultural industry at the present time. There never was a time when it was so necessary to get all we possibly can out of the soil. This applies not only to crop production but to the live stock industry as well. Nothing stimulates the live stock industry like the competitions at these exhibitions. I am not speaking as one who is not interested, because I have been a farmer all my life; I have attended these exhibitions, and I think they are a very great benefit to the country generally. If you break them down now you will be put to a great deal of trouble and expense before you can revive them and put them on the footing that they at present occupy. I must congratulate the Government generally on the great assistance that they have given to the agricultural and live stock industries. I trust the Government will give very serious consideration to the question before favouring any proposal that will result in the discouragement of these exhibitions, because they are the very best agencies we have in stimulating production and encouraging the development of the resources of this country.

Mr. MOWAT: While it may probably appear presumptuous of me to intrude on the domain of agriculture, I would like to felicitate my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) upon dropping his motion. However well known my hon. friend may have been in Ontario before he introduced his motion, I can assure him that he became even better known in all quarters of the province after he had given notice of it. We have in Toronto an exhibition which we look upon as a liberal education for the people of Ontario, and when it is learned that that hon. gentleman has abandoned his resolution the many people who are interested in that exhibition will be very pleased.

Mr. KAY: I do not wish to sail under any false colours. The hon. member from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) must thank the Government, and not me. It is only because the Government does not favour production that I have withdrawn my resolution.

Publications Branch, $30,000.

Mr. GLASS: I suppose this item is for the publication of pamphlets in connection with the department. I sometimes think, in reference to the publication of information given out by the department, that very much more effective and speedy work would be accomplished if the agricultural press were used. For example, in connection with the regulations which have been promulgated by the Food Board in reference to the matter of food, I had the situation illustrated to me when the farmers' delegation were here a short time ago. In the district from which I come dairying and generally mixed farming is carried on. The farmers in that district, responding to the urgent demand of the Government to increase the production of hogs, had made arrangements for increasing that production this year, and they were guaranteed that an ample supply of feed would be available. However, we know that in all parts of the country great difficulty has been experienced in that regard, and the facts have already been given to the House, that in some places the farmers were compelled to take a percentage of flour from the millers in order to get a certain quantity of bran and shorts. In fact, the situation is reaching the stage that in some localties in the West

the farmers cannot get either bran or shorts; they have the stock on their hands and cannot feed them. The farmers whom I met wanted to know where they could get corn and oil cake. As a matter of fact the Dominion Government have made every provision for putting the farmer in touch with the market for corn, and they also had under their control supplies of oil cake, but the farmers did not know anything about it. Announcement of the Government's plans was made in an Order in Council, or in some other way, but it was of no use to the farmers because they did not know anything about it. If matters of that kind were published in the agricultural press, and that press was more generally used for the publication of announcements that are designed to quickly reach the farmers, much better results would be accomplished, and a good deal more speedily. The Agricultural Gazette which has been published in the past, I think might well be dispensed with altogether. I do not think it reaches those that it is intended to reach, because it is not producing any beneficial effects. I wish to impress upon the minister that the reports which are intended to reach the farmers quickly do not reach them through the ordinary bulletins as now published and circulated and, as I say, more effective results would be achieved if the agricultural press were used for the publication of matters of this kind.

Mr. PARENT: I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that in the province of Quebec the farmers are not generally aware that there are such publications as the department is distributing. I would suggest to him that he publish an advertisement in every newspaper in the province announcing that bulletins will be supplied to any one who asks for them. In that way he is likely to secure very beneficial results. I have no complaint to make of the bulletins which he issues—they are very interesting and very much appreciated—but the trouble is that they are only distributed by members to their constituents in very small numbers, whereas if they were more largely circulated, greater benefit would result to the country at large.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister would consent to item No. 59 with respect to the administration and carrying out the provisions of the Agricultural Instruction Act, being allowed to stand so, that a general discussion might take place upon it in the event of any member wanting to talk upon the subject of agriculture, it would be well to pass the rest of the items.

Mr. DAVIS: Advertising in publications, in my opinion, would not be as effective as the sending of educative pamphlets to every public school throughout the Dominion.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall be very glad to keep in mind the suggestions that have been made by hon. gentlemen to-night, with respect to the distribution of these pamphlets, some of which suggestions, I think, have a good deal of merit.

Mr. KAY: Would the minister tell us what is the cost of publishing the Agricultural Gazette?

Mr. CRERAR: It is $25,000 a year.

For the development of the live stock industry, $600,000.

Mr. McCREA: The Department of Agriculture has an office in Sherbrooke in which I think some five or six individuals are employed, and I would like to ask the minister if he is thoroughly informed as to what these people are doing. I think it would be well for him to inquire into the running of that office and see if full value is being given for the money spent. I am of the opinion that the staff there is supposed to buy and distribute thoroughbred stock but the class of stock they have been handling has been of a very poor class, and I think there has been more speculation going on than anything else. I am not here, however, to make charges; I simply call the attention of the minister to the fact that it would be wise to look into the running of that office and ascertain whether he is getting full value for the money expended.

Mr. CRERAR: I stated last evening, when we were considering some other items in the Estimates, that I have not yet had an opportunity to go very fully into the work of the department. As hon. gentlemen will appreciate if they reflect for a moment, it is a very large department, and embraces a great many activities. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCrea) that the matter which he has brought to my attention will be closely scrutinized. I aim, as far as possible, at getting efficiency in this department. And I do not intend for one moment that officials shall hold jobs unless they are giving service for the money they are getting.

Mr. McCREA: I appreciate very much the distribution of a good class of live-stock, but I also am aware of the damage that can be done by distributing livestock

that is not very good. And I am inclined to believe that there is speculation going on.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I notice that there is a decrease of $100,000 in this item as compared with last year, and the cost of pure-bred animals has increased fully one-third during that time. I am afraid the hon. gentleman who has just spoken will not be getting the quality of animals he expects if the distribution is to be kept up while the estimate is being reduced by $100,000. I think that is the reason why the animals in many cases are not as satisfactory as he would like them to be. You may get a pure-bred animal, but it is impossible to get one of high standard and really up-to-date from a progressive farmer at the price that has been fixed. The department has set a fixed price for pure-bred animals. Consequently, you cannot expect to get animals of a high standard, with the estimate being cut down by $100,000 and the price going up. In many instances, the prices are almost double what they were two years ago. What proportion of these animals are distributed in the various provinces? For instance, can the minister give any estimate as to the number of animals placed in the province of Ontario during the past year?

Mr. CRERAR: I shall give the hon. gentleman the information; it is available.

Mr. KAY: Do I understand that this amount is entirely devoted to the purchase of pure-bred sires?

Mr. CRERAR: No. It is for the general livestock industry, the purchase of livestock, cattle, horses, swine and sheep; grants to agricultural fairs, which were referred to a short time ago, are also included in this vote.

Mr. KAY: How much is to be applied to agricultural fairs this year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not ask the minister to supply the information now but any time in the near future will do just as well.

Mr. CRERAR: The appropriation for agricultural fairs for this year is $80,000 for the whole of Canada.

Mr. KAY: How is it to be distributed and where?

Mr. CRERAR: It is distributed to the fairs throughout Canada which qualify under the regulations governing the grant laid down by the department. The principle on which it is operated is that the local fair board shall contribute a certain amount of money; if they reach that amount then the department will supplement it with an additional grant.

Mr. KAY: Does that apply to any fall fair throughout Canada?

Mr. CRERAR: It applies to any fair which will meet the conditions laid down by the department.

Mr. PEDLOW: This grant is on the same basis which has obtained heretofore? There is no change in the basis?

Mr. CRERAR: No. The conditions under which this grant will be given this year are the same as last year with the exception that the general grants are cut down twenty-five per cent.

Mr. KNOX: I would like to put myself on record as saying that the grant to the fall fairs is made to those that have previously paid out $6,000 in prizes for livestock. That means that large fairs have no difficulty in complying with the regulations, whereas the smaller fairs cannot come up to that. I suggest that some other system be adopted, whereby the small fairs shall be given some assistance.

Mr. PEDLOW: What is the idea of cutting down the grant twenty-five per cent?

Mr. CRERAR: Economy.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does the hon. minister think that is wisdom in view of the fact that these fall fairs are an encouragement to greater production? I think it is wise to increase, rather than decrease, these grants, if you want to encourage the farmers to produce.

Mr. CRERAR: There are quite a number who agree with the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) that these fairs should be cut out altogether. We have tried to strike the proper medium and balance between the two ideas.

Mr. CAHILL: How does the number of animals this year compare with previous years. Has the department as many horses or cattle for distribution, and are they buying any this year?

Mr. CRERAR: The department anticipate that there will not be as many distributed this year as in former years. Of course, the distribution has been going on for a number of years, and the demand to a certain extent has been met. In addition there is difficulty in getting sires of the proper type.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: There were some left in Dorchester county.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The appropriation for fall fairs uses up only $8,000, consequently there is $592,000 of this vote left.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Agriculture said $80,000 was set aside for fairs.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is a decrease of $100,000 in this item compaired with last year, and the minister says this is done for the sake of economy. In view of the condition of the livestock industry of Canada at this time, if there is one place where economy should not be exercised it is here. I do not think this is the right time to practice economy so far as the livestock industry is concerned. This industry was never in a more critical condition, in our country or in the world than at the present time. If there is one item in the Estimates which should not be reduced, it is this one. It should be increased.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The vote is for the same amount as the actual expenditure under this item last year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That would indicate that the whole amount voted in the previous year has not been spent. As the increase in the cost of these animals is so much greater at the present time, even with the amount of last year's expenditure not nearly so many animals can be distributed this year as last year.

This is one branch of the department that ought to be encouraged. Splendid results have been obtained through the distribution of male animals throughout the country. Few of these animals have been distributed throughout the older districts, but settlers in the newer districts who, perhaps, have not the means of purchasing these animals welcome the opportunity of getting them in this way. A great stimulus is thus afforded to the live stock industry, which was never so much in need of a stimulus as it is to-day. After the war there will be greater demands for pure-bred live stock than there ever was before, and the encouragement of the live stock industry will amply repay the Government for any expenditure they may make in that line. I regret that there has been a reduction of $100,000 in the estimate for this purpose this year.

Mr. CRERAR: While the vote last year was $700,000, of that amount $105,000 was not expended. Consequently, the estimates for the present year are about equal to the total expenditure of last year.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why do you make a reduction of twenty-five per cent in the grant you give to the fall fairs?

Mr. CRERAR: In order that we may have more money to meet the request of the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) with regard to the purchase of higher-priced sires.

Mr. KAY: If this item carries, may we discuss the live stock industry when the estimates come up again?

Mr. CRERAR: It may be discussed on the Supplementary Estimates.

To enforce the Seed Act, to test seed for farmers and seed merchants, to encourage the production and use of superior seeds, and to encourage the production of farm and garden crops, $165,000.

Mr. VIEN: I move that we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: It is customary for the hon. member leading the Government or the hon. member leading the Opposition to move such a resolution as that. But, if the hon. member (Mr. Vien) insists, I will put his motion that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. VIEN: I do not insist.

The CHAIRMAN: There was an agreement with the hon. gentleman who is leading the Opposition that item 58 should be passed before the committee rises.

Mr. McKENZIE: I propose that we put everything through except item 59, which had better stand so that there may be a general discussion on it.

Mr. GLASS: Yesterday I attended a convention of the flax growers in Toronto. When the subject of flax was under consideration in the House on a previous occasion, I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that seed imported into Canada—some say from Siberia, some say from Japan—was being distributed by Colonel Wayland under the direction of the British Government for the purpose of growing seed to reproduce flax in Ireland and in Great Britain next year. In Ontario, Quebec, and all the other provinces where fibre flax is grown, a reputation has been built up for the production of high-grade flax fibre seed. Nobody knows anything about this seed which comes from Siberia, or from Japan, as the case may be; we do not know whether it is pure seed; we do not know whether it can grow fibre; we do not know whether it will be good even for linseed oil; it is simply a gamble, an experiment. This seed is being distributed throughout Ontario,

Quebec and the western provinces and is grown side by side with our own product by the farmers who are growing seed from Ontario flax. The seed to which I have referred is distributed free on the understanding that the recipient shall return the amount given him for seed, and when the crop is harvested he is guaranteed $4.50 a bushel for the balance. If a farmer is growing a ten-acre field of Colonel Wayland's seed and, alongside of that, a ten-acre field of our own fibre seed, and Colonel Wayland offers him $4.50 a bushel for the former and the Irish market offers $10 a bushel for the latter, what is to prevent the farmer from mixing these two seeds in order to get the larger price, thus damning the reputation which it has taken years to build up? Our standard fibre seed should be kept separate from any other and, when sold in the British market next year, should be sold for what it is—Canadan flax fibre seed; and this other seed, which nobody knows anything about, should also be sold for what it is. This matter was thoroughly discussed at the meeting yesterday afternoon. The flax men of the country are greatly alarmed at the possible results of the distribution of this seed. They have passed a resolution which will be sent to the minister to-day, setting forth their views and urging that he take such steps as may be necessary to protect the reputation that the Canadian people have built up with regard to their flax fibre seed.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. J. D. REID: On the Order Paper there are two or three small Bills that should take only a very short time to pass this House. There is one Bill, No. 70, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act. A good many hon. members from the West; in fact, members on both sides of the House say that this Bill should remain over until next session. If the House wishes this Bill to remain over, it should take but a very short time to pass the other three Bills. There are quite a number of Estimates yet to be passed. From what I can judge, it is the desire of hon. members on both sides of the House that we should, if possible, prorogue on Thursday, the day before the Queen's birthday, and I simply wish to suggest that perhaps after our debate on Wednesday, we might sit late in the evening and get the Estimates through if possible. If we could agree on both sides of the House about working late Wednesday night, we might be able to prorogue late on Thursday evening. So far as the Government are concerned, we would be very willing to facilitate matters, if members on both sides of the House would agree to that proposition.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should not like to commit the Opposition. I understand the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition have some sort of an agreement. In the morning, before the Orders of the Day are called, if the minister will renew his request, we might come to some agreement.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House adjourned at 12.55 a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, May 22, 1918.

The House met at Eleven o'clock.

RETURN OF MEMBER FOR YUKON.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Alfred Thompson, Esq., for the electoral district of the Yukon.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE—SUPPLY OF LABOUR.

Mr. R. C. Henders (Macdonald) presented the following report from the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization:

> Your Committee have had before them for further consideration the question of labour in connection with agriculture, and how it best can be applied until the end of the war. Sub-committees appointed to consider the matter have gone very carefully into it, as well as other matters of equal importance, and have made their several reports which your Committee adopted and agreed to report the same herewith for the information of the House.

CONCURRENCE IN ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved that the Orders in Council laid on the table of the House on the 2nd April, 1918, be concurred in. He said: The Orders in Council which have been issued and laid on the Table form a long list of two pages. They are formal to a certain extent, but the law requires that these Orders in Council when passed shall be laid on the table of the House within a certain time. I think they are not law until they are so laid on the Table of the House, and thereafter if approved by the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: These Orders in Council, as I understand the law, have

to be submitted to the House and ratified by the House.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So I would suggest that my hon. friend allow his motion to stand until to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

OFFICIALS OF THE HOUSE.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. MARCEL GABARD AS OFFICIAL REPORTER.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That the recommendation of his honour the Speaker, laid upon the Table of the House on the 21st instant, respecting the appointment of Mr. Marcel Gabard to the position of official reporter of the Debates of the House of Commons, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of Order in Council P.C. 1129 dated 11th May, 1918, Amendments of Defence of Canada, Order 1917, section 22A re Ships' Lights.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Copy of Order in Council P.C. 1102, dated 10th May, 1918, Amendments of Defence of Canada, 1917, section 23C, re Fitting and Supplying Vessels registered in Canada with defensive armaments.— Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Annual Report of the Trade of Canada, 1917.—Sir George Foster.

Return of amounts paid the Toronto Globe and the Toronto Star respectively from January 1, 1917, and April 1, 1918, for all services between said dates.—Hon. Martin Burrell.

Return of quantity of bran, shorts or mill feed exported to the United States by and without license between August 1, 1917, and February 2, 1918; also the firms in Canada to which licenses have been granted and the quantity in each case.—Hon. Martin Burrell.

BILL RESPECTING THE YUKON ELECTION.

On motion of Hon. Hugh Guthrie, Bill No. 112, respecting the election held in the electoral district of Yukon, was introduced and read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said Bill be read a second time—now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 113, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act.

He said: This is a very simple amendment, but it is considered of very great importance from the point of view of the banking business of the country. It is to amend the present provision to the effect that no protest of a bill of exchange can take place until three o'clock in the afternoon by substituting half-past two. It is represented by the bankers generally that as a result of the large number of their employees who have been called away for military service, it is very difficult for them indeed to have the necessary work after the closing hour of the bank done in the day by the employees who are with them, and that it would mitigate that inconvenience very greatly if it were possible for them to close banking hours at half-past two instead of three o'clock. If the House would be disposed to give consent to the introduction of the Bill without notice—which, of course, would imply the waiving of the rules as to the different readings—I would beg for leave to introduce Bill No. 113, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act. Of course, I understand that if it cannot be dealt with in that way, it cannot be dealt with at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that the Bill of which my hon. friend has given notice of his intention to introduce, is, as represented, a very important one. It has been represented to me also that the banking staffs have been so depleted by the necessities of the military service that it is impossible for them to do their work within the usual hours. Therefore the Bill becomes a public necessity. It can inconvenience nobody. It is simply to provide that bills of exchange may be protested at half-past two instead of three o'clock.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does it make half-past two the closing hour of the banks?

Mr. DOHERTY: That would be the practical effect.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

EXTENSION OF LEAVE TO BANK CLERKS.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): I desire to ask the Government, in view of

the reply given the farmers regarding the exemption of their sons of ages twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two, if it is true that an arrangement has been made whereby bank clerks of these same ages, who were to report for military service on June 1, or July 1, have been granted exemption up to January 1, 1919, and if it be true that the reason for granting such exemption to these bank clerks is that these boys will be required to help in the next Victory Loan?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Minister of Militia is not at present in his seat. I will confer with him, and give my hon. friend the information he asks for at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MURPHY: Later in the day?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): In The Ottawa Journal this morning I observe two articles, I do not propose to read them, pointing out a charge that in the Naval Service Department the Military Service Act has not been properly administered. I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the Government to this matter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In what respect?

Sir SAM HUGHES: That officers are exempted who should go. The articles speak for themselves. I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the Government to this fact, that nothing will break up the Military Service Act quicker than any attempt not to give even-handed justice all round.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With regard to the same subject of the application of the Military Service Act, the Minister of Militia some days ago informed the House that conscripts would be allowed leave of absence to complete seeding. I have to represent to the Government that at the present time in certain parts of the province of Quebec, and I presume also in the Maritime Provinces, seeding is now at its most active period. Men are being required to report at Ottawa, coming say from the county of Labelle, which compels these men to travel via Montreal necessitating four days to make the trip. This, of course, means that they lose very valuable time in the seeding season. I call the attention of my right hon. friend to the matter.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall consult with the Minister of Militia with respect to this matter, which is one of detail, and information will be given later on in the day.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Naval Service): In answer to the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) in reference to the editorial that appeared in this morning's Journal, respecting a clerk in the Department of the Naval Service, I wish to say that I shall have the matter very carefully looked into, and I shall be glad to-morrow, or possibly this afternoon, to give the hon. member the information for which he asks.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle): Is it the intention of the Government to have the only support of a widowed mother, and the only son of a family, exempted from military service? Is it also the intention of the Government to send new instructions to the registrars, especially to the registrar of Military District No. 3, where farmers and sons of farmers have been called up at the same time as men from the cities and towns? I am speaking particularly of the county of Labelle, where hundreds of farmers have been called up at the same time as men from the cities and towns, and have been obliged to report, and have actually reported, to the great detriment of the farming interests of that county?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall have to make to my hon. friend the same answer as I made in regard to the other two questions. When I have an opportunity to see the Minister of Militia, I shall draw his attention to the question, and the information will be given later on.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—MEMBER TO VOTE WHEN IN CHAMBER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, by your leave I want to call your attention to a point of parliamentary procedure which was called to your attention yesterday, but on which you did not give any ruling. Your attention was called to the fact that the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) did not record his vote. The rule of the House is that, if the Speaker's attention is drawn to the fact that a member did not vote, the Speaker will call upon him to record his vote. I was quite familiar with the rule, but I did not have it under my hand, and it would have taken some time to find it. As the House was rather im-

patient, I thought I would defer the matter until to-day. In Bourinot, fourth edition, at page 381, there is this statement:

> If a member of the Commons who has heard the question put does not vote and the attention of the Speaker is directed to the fact, the latter will call upon him to declare on which side he votes; and his name will be recorded accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question had not previously arisen in my experience as a member of the House or as Speaker. I am inclined to the belief that the authority as cited by the right hon. member has reference to the practice in the British House of Commons. I am not at the moment in a position to give a positive, considered decision upon the point of order, but I shall take the earliest opportunity of consulting the authorities and of advising the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There are not many such cases, but I recollect one case which the rule was applied. I do not know if the Minister of Trade and Commerce recollects it. I cannot state the precise occasion, but the division was that rule applies in Canada as well as in Great Britain.

MARINE TRADES STRIKE IN MONTREAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the Minister of Labour any information to give to the House in regard to the strike in Montreal?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): The leader of the Opposition yesterday asked me concerning a labour dispute in the firm of Fraser, Brace Company, Montreal. I was not at that time prepared to give him a detailed statement of the situation. I find that we were advised Monday evening of the strike, and we at once instructed our fair-wage officer there to take the matter up. He had succeeded in settling a similar dispute with the Canadian Vickers Company, and getting an agreement signed. We are now advised that the only point in dispute with the Fraser, Brace Company is that while they have agreed by word of mouth to adopt the substance of the agreement made with the Canadian Vickers Company, they have refused to sign an agreement to that effect. That is the only matter that is left unsettled. Our man is doing the best he can to effect an agreement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Have the men yet resumed work?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think not.

THE WINNIPEG STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): As the newspapers announce that a member of the Government has gone to Winnipeg in connection with the strike there, I would like to ask if the Minister of Labour has any information to give to the House in regard to the matter.

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS: I have nothing from Winnipeg this morning except what appears in the public press. I have had for several days two influential labour leaders working in co-operation with the civic committee and the members of the city council, and I am in hopes that they will succeed in effecting an adjustment. The last advice I had from one of them was yesterday morning when he said that progress was slow, but that he had hopes they would succeed in reaching a satisfactory settlement.

Mr. MURPHY: Where is that co-operation in progress—here or in Winnipeg?

Mr. CROTHERS: In Winnipeg.

RESOLUTION RE SUSPENSION OF HABEAS CORPUS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I do not know whether I am in order or not, but there is on the Order Paper a resolution, No. 4, standing in my name. I do not expect that resolution will be reached during this session, and I wish to drop it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not competent for the hon. member to do so except on motion of the leader of the Government. It would be advisable for the hon. member to confer with him.

CIVIL PAY OF CIVIL SERVANTS OVERSEAS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council): The Prime Minister stated yesterday that an announcement would be made to-day with reference to the civil pay of civil servants serving overseas, and I now wish to read to the House the operative part of an Order in Council passed on the 21st of May dealing with this matter. The members of the House will recall that there are three classes into which the civil servants who are now serving with the military forces might be divided: Those who went overseas in the early part of the war received both their civil pay and their

military pay. At a later day an Order in Council was passed providing that those who enlisted after that date should receive whichever pay was the larger of the two, civil or military, and then, when the Military Service Act came into operation, an Order in Council was passed providing that civil servants enlisting after that date would receive their military pay only. By the Order in Council of the 5th of April, 1918, those Orders in Council were all modified so as to provide that, after the date fixed in that Order in Council, civil servants would receive only their military pay. The present Order in Council repeals the last Order in Council and substitutes the following provisions:

1. The above mentioned Orders in Council—

Those are, the first Order in Council which provided for both civil and military pay for those who enlisted in the earlier part of the war; the second Order in Council which provided for the larger pay of the two for those who enlisted subsequently, and the third Order in Council which provided simply for the military pay:

1. The above-mentioned Orders in Council shall continue to apply in respect of any person in the civil employment of the Government absent upon service with the forces of His Majesty or of any of His Majesty's Allies and who

(a) is now serving in any theatre of actual war outside of the United Kingdom, so long as so serving, or

(b) is now or who may be hereafter in the United Kingdom and who has served in such theatre of actual war outside thereof and is there detained by reason of wounds or disease received or contracted in such service, so long as so detained, or

(c) is now or who may be hereafter in the United Kingdom and who has served in such theatre of actual war outside thereof and has suffered from wounds or disease received or contracted in such service and is undergoing preparation in a reserve battalion for return to said theatre of actual war, or

(d) is now in the United Kingdom and who has served in such theatre of actual war outside thereof for at least one year and has been brought back to the United Kingdom for military duty and is still required for military duty there.

2. A prisoner of war shall be deemed to be serving in a theatre of actual war outside of the United Kingdom and shall come within the provision of Clause (a) of section 1 of this Order.

3. All other persons in the civil employment of the Government absent upon service with the forces of His Majesty shall from and after the 15th day of July, 1918, receive only military pay, anything in the above recited Orders in Council to the contrary notwithstanding.

4. Any person in the civil employment of the Government absent upon service with the forces of His Majesty, or any of His Majesty's Allies, shall be entitled upon the conclusion of the latter service, to be restored to his position in the civil employment of the Government, if he remains qualified to discharge the duties appertaining to that position.

5. The Order in Council of April 5th, 1918, (P. C. 811) is hereby revoked and cancelled.

The net result of this Order in Council is to continue the existing Orders in Council in force in respect of all civil servants now serving in the forces of His Majesty or His Majesty's Allies except those in Canada and those in the United Kingdom who have not seen real service at the front.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Those who are at the front continue to receive their civil pay?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, and also those who have been wounded at the front and are in hospitals in Great Britain; those who have been wounded and have been discharged from hospital and are preparing to return to the front, and those who have served a year at the front and are now in the United Kingdom on military duty and are required to remain there.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is this a new Order in Council?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, repealing the one passed on the 5th of April.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would suggest, for various reasons, that the word "honourable" be placed before the word "wounds" in the Order in Council so that it will read "honourable wounds or disease."

Mr. BUREAU: How many men who enlisted with the direct promise of the Government that they would receive both their civil and their military pay will be affected by this Order in Council? How many will be deprived of their civil pay and how many will continue to receive both civil and military pay as was promised them by the Government when they enlisted?

Mr. ROWELL: I think about 1,500 enlisted and came under the operation of the first Order in Council entitling them to receive both civil and military pay. I should think that the great majority of these will, under this Order in Council, continue to receive both civil and military pay. If they do not, it is because they are serving in Canada or Great Britain and have not served at the front for a definite period. The order clearly covers all who have rendered real service at the front.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not an answer to my question. Knowing the great care with which everything is done by the President of the Council, I want to know how many

men will be affected by this order? It is the number that I want to get at.

Mr. SPEAKER: I remind the House that we are on the Orders of the Day, I have allowed extreme latitude to hon. members in the putting of questions and even entering upon a discussion, owing to the fact that we are approaching the end of the session. But there is a limit to all things, and I ask hon. gentlemen not to widen the breach unduly.

Mr. BUREAU: I did not intend to infringe on the rules. It is only the shiftiness of the President of the Council, who refuses to answer, that causes the insistence.

THE ANTI-LOAFER LAW.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I desire to direct the attention of the Government to an abuse which is occurring in connection with one of the numerous Orders in Council—that whereby the idle are to be impressed into work. It has come to my attention that in Montreal recently the police have been rounding up those idlers, and, among them, have taken in the net a number of returned soldiers who have only lately come back from the front. It would appear to be just that these men should not be regarded in that fashion; that if they have recently returned from the front they should be allowed to remain idle for a few weeks without subjecting themselves to the danger of being put in jail and herded with criminals and other undesirable idlers. Instructions might be given to those who are enforcing this Order in Council that soldiers recently returned from the front should be given a few weeks' grace, so to speak, in which to readjust themselves.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): It is regrettable if mistakes are made by those charged with the enforcement of this law, as of all laws generally, and if innocent persons, such as returned soldiers, are arrested. I may point out, however, that the enforcement of this law, as of all laws of that nature rests in the hands of provincial, and, through their delegated powers, of municipal authorities. If the police of Montreal are exercising any undue zeal or making mistakes of that kind, it is a matter to which the attention of those in authority over them might very well be called. I shall make inquiry, however, whether there does exist on the part of these gentlemen any such undue zeal, or whether any action has been taken by them that it would be proper to draw to the attention of those in authority over them.

CANCELLATION OF SEPARATION ALLOWANCE AND ASSIGNED PAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Militia to a matter of public importance respecting the policy of his department. A soldier overseas, on the complaint of his wife, who lives in this country, was charged with bigamy and was sentenced by the overseas authorities to two years' imprisonment. I wish to read a letter which his wife received from General J. H. Langton. I am purposely omitting the names, but I want to read the letter so that the minister will have—

Mr. SPEAKER: If this is an individual case I would suggest that the hon. member send the letter to the Minister of Militia in the ordinary course and have the matter attended to in that way. No question of policy is involved?

Mr. MORPHY: With all due deference, I submit that an important question of policy is involved. The Government have cancelled the separation allowance and assigned pay of this woman and her children because her husband happened to make a mistake. If that is not a matter of public importance I do not know what is. I should like the Minister of Militia and Defence to make a note of it and let the woman have her pay and allowance.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

MILITARY POLICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): I would ask the Government whether military police have been substituted for federal police in the rounding up of draftees in the district of Montreal. I have been informed that an Order in Council has been passed transferring this work from the Department of Justice to the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. DOHERTY: There has been no such Order in Council as my hon. friend mentions.

PURCHASE OF FARM TRACTORS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): A few days ago the leader of the Opposition inquired if there had been any report from the Hon. Mr. Dunning in respect to the purchase of farm tractors through the Canada Food Board. While no formal report has been made, Mr. Dunning has orally reported the results of this work The whole one thousand tractors purchased have been sold, and a few additional ones have been secured to fill orders that have come in over and above the one thousand. The reports we have received from the district where a good many of these tractors have been in operation are to the effect that they are proving satisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would suggest that it would be well for the House to have a full report as to the application of the money expended.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall be glad to have such a report prepared and submitted. The tractors have been mainly distributed in Ontario and the three prairie provinces.

CIVIL PAY OF CIVIL SERVANTS OVERSEAS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: In reply to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) I have no further information beyond what I have given as to the number of men who would come under this Order in Council. The fullest possible information has been given my hon. friend, and may I thank him for the courteous and characteristic way in which he is in the habit of putting his questions?

Mr. BUREAU: It is very easy for my hon. friend to say that he does not know the number, instead of telling the House how many men will come under the Order in Council. The hon. gentleman, by simply repeating what he has already said, implies that I did not understand him, which I did. I thank him for his reference to my courtesy, and will have the pleasure of calling again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE FARMERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): In common, I suppose, with other hon. members, I have received many telegrams from the farming community which would lead one to suppose there is going to be some modification of the recent Order in Council drafting young men between the ages of twenty and twenty-two inclusive. These communications urge us to bring pressure to bear on the Government, the farmers apparently having the idea that there is to be some modification of the Order in Council. I would ask the leader of the Government if that is so or not, so that we can answer these communications intelligently.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just as soon as information on the question preferred by my hon. friend can be given, it will be announced to the House. The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AND JOURNALS.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I remind my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that yesterday he presented the report of the special committee appointed to consider and report upon the question of consolidating the Votes and Proceedings and the Journals of the House of Commons. I would remind my hon. friend that if he does not make some motion with regard to it, the report will simply be pigeon-holed.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The House in Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

THE UNITED CANADIAN INSURANCE COMPANY.

Bill No. 107, to incorporate the United Canadian Insurance Company—Sir Herbert Ames—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—incorporation:

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the Chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee, to which this Bill was referred, to give an explanation?

Sir HERBERT AMES: By the unanimous consent of the House, in order to ensure the passing of this Bill, it has been placed on the Orders of to-day. It was passed by the Banking and Commerce Committee this morning, having been unduly delayed because of the necessity of changing the name of the company as it first appeared asking for incorporation, namely, the British Canadian Insurance Company, as that name had

already been appropriated by a company authorized by the legislature of the province of Quebec. Hon. members who were in this House four or five years ago will remember that there was what might be called a model or standard Insurance Bill passed by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and afterwards ratified by this House, and since that time the condition has always been imposed upon any company desiring incorporation that their Act of Incorporation should conform with the model or standard Bill. The Bill before us does not deviate by a single word from the model Bills which we have passed through this House on many occasions during the last two or three years incorporating new insurance companies. The only thing that would strike any one is the fact that section 1 incorporates a firm of Ottawa lawyers as an insurance company.

Owing to the illness of one of the incorporators and the difficulty of getting the signatures, it was found impossible to get the signatures of the men who are really behind this Bill in time for it to pass this session. I am informed that the real promoters of the Bill are H. S. Durkee, P. F. Wright, J. Kendall, O. S. Wood, and A. G. Creelman, all well known citizens of Vancouver, whose signatures could not be obtained in time. Consequently, the formality has been adopted of putting the Bill through in the name of the firm in which Mr. W. L. Scott, K.C., is a chief member. That was the only point of criticism. The Banking and Commerce Committee and the department were satisfied on that point and the Bill was unanimously passed this morning without amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that this incorporation is sought to replace another company and was there any objection to the name? Do I also understand that there was no objection before the Banking and Commerce Committee and that it went through unanimously?

Sir HERBERT AMES: The hon. member (Mr. Bureau) does not quite understand what happened. The Bill, as it was first passed in the Senate was to incorporate the British Canadian Insurance Company. Before the Senate it was pointed out that there was already a company under that name that had been incorporated by the Legislature of Quebec. Objection coming from that source, the original promoters of this Bill undertook to alter their name. That has caused the delay. This Bill would have been through the House before this had it not been for that fact.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would the hon. gentleman (Sir Herbert Ames), who is the chairman of the committee, be good enough to give us any reason why the House should take up this Bill without a copy of it in our hands or any other information? I do not think this Bill should go on for a second.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Copies of the Bill are procurable and may be distributed if desired.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think these gentlemen ought to know what the rules are with regard to signatures and, if they have not got them in, this House should not be asked to adopt the procedure that is proposed here.

Sir HERBERT AMES: The main object of the Bill is to incorporate this company to enable it to do hail insurance before the present heavy crop in the western provinces is subject to danger of destruction by hail.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thought these gentlemen came from Vancouver?

Sir HERBERT AMES: That is the excuse offered for asking that this company be immediately incorporated. I understand from the promoters that there is British capital ready to be placed behind the company to the necessary extent to enable them to do a hail insurance business.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thought this was a Vancouver company?

Sir HERBERT AMES: It is.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What has it to do with crops?

Sir HERBERT AMES: There is no reason why any Vancouver, Toronto, or Halifax company should not be incorporated to do hail insurance or many other lines of insurance in the Dominion. The members of the committee understand that there is a great variety of insurance business, and that when a new insurance company is incorporated, it is compelled to indicate the order in which it shall do the different classes of insurance; for instance the first, the second, the third, the fourth and so on. It is compelled to have a certain amount of capital subscribed and a certain amount of capital paid up before it can undertake the first class of insurance business, a certain amount of capital paid up before it can undertake the second class of insurance,

and so on with regard to the third and the fourth classes of business. A company oftentimes does six or eight different kinds of business, and it increases the amount of subscribed capital and the amount paid up in proportion to the increase and extent of the business carried on. This company, at present, desires to engage in hail insurance. It will be extended, if it can secure the necessary capital, to fire insurance, cyclone insurance, and other classes of insurance. The promoters are anxious to be incorporated early so that the company can take advantage of the very large crops which are expected in the West, to engage in hail insurance.

Mr. MORPHY: Is this company now doing any other insurance than hail insurance?

Sir HERBERT AMES: The hon. gentleman will find that in clause 5 of the Bill.

Mr. MORPHY: I have just got a copy of the Bill now.

Sir HERBERT AMES: My hon. friend will find that it is incorporated to do ten classes of insurance, one after another as its capital and deposits increase.

Mr. MORPHY: May I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not there are companies in the West doing what is known as an exclusive hail insurance business? If so, I would like to know whether he thinks it is fair to put in competition with them a company dealing in various classes of insurance. The reason I ask that question is that complaints have come from well known insurance companies that American insurance companies have come into this country and employed the profits they are making on other branches of insurance to enable them to give lower rates than the Canadian insurance companies can give for hail or weather insurance. I just raise the point as to whether there would be anything unfair in that clause as affecting the rights of thoroughly weather and hail insurance companies operating in the west.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I am informed by the promoters of the Bill that the first board of directors will all be Canadians and that the shareholders will be Canadians and persons residing in Great Britain, where they expect to secure a portion of their capital. As to the other question of hail insurance, perhaps some of the ministers from the West, probably the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), or the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton), or the hon. the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder), could explain better than I about hail insurance in the West.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Do I understand that this company is now in existence and has been carrying on business in any of these capacities?

Sir HERBERT AMES: No.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think it is most extraordinary that a firm of lawyers in the city of Ottawa should get a charter like this. What is to prevent them from going out into the open market and selling or hawking about that charter? It is a very peculiar transaction and I do not think the House should agree to it.

Sir HERBERT AMES: We were assured in the committee this morning by Mr. W. L. Scott, who is a well known and responsible lawyer of the city of Ottawa, that he had no direct interest in it further than a lawyer working for his clients, that he had no intention of selling the charter or doing anything of the kind, and that he was securing it for these gentlemen whom I have mentioned at their request. He put before the committee proof of the fact that he was acting merely for them in his capacity as a parliamentary agent.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did he show urgent need for this Bill?

Sir HERBERT AMES: He convinced the committee to that effect.

Mr. FIELDING: Do the rules of the House require the signatures of the applicants for a charter?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it not possible to get by telegraph the authority of these gentlemen to use their names?

Sir HERBERT AMES: That authority was put before the committee this morning in the form of telegrams from Vancouver. The signatures of these five gentlemen whom I have mentioned were all in the petition and everything is perfectly regular as far as that is concerned. We were shown this morning telegrams from these five gentlemen that I spoke of, authorizing the use of their names as directors and shareholders of the company.

Mr. FIELDING: It might meet the point raised if, in place of the names of the legal gentlemen, the names of the actual promoters were inserted. What is to prevent that?

Sir HERBERT AMES: There would be no objection if the House deems it advisable to put in the names of the five Canadian gentlemen whose names I have given. That was discussed in the committee this morning, the only objection being that it would require the Bill to go back to the Senate, and it might possibly fall by the wayside before prorogation. It would be quite in order for the House to insert the names of the five gentlemen, thus making ten altogether, of whom five, at least, are well known Canadian citizens.

Mr. FIELDING: It is the practice in the case of letters patent under the Joint Stock Companies' Act for solicitors to take out charters and only the names of the solicitors, their clerks and stenographers are used. But I think that in the case of a parliamentary application it has generally been considered advisable that the real promoters of the enterprise should have their names in the Bill. I have no doubt that the proceeding is all right, and I am quite sure that the name of Mr. Scott is a guarantee of good faith, but if the names of the real promoters were put in the Bill it would be desirable. I do not say any more than that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand that facts have been brought out this morning that were not disclosed before the Banking and Commerce Committee. The statement that the chairman has given about a change in the name of the company was never presented to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Yes, it was.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am informed it was not.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Everything mentioned by me this morning was brought out before the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. NESBITT: What is complained of may be irregular, but it is a very common practice in taking out letters patent and no harm has resulted from it, and no harm will result in any event. I did not raise any objection in the Banking and Commerce Committee and I do not propose to do so now. I do not see why the Bill should be delayed at all for the reasons assigned.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 carry?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, lost.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

On section 2--Provisional directors.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Surely, Mr. Chairman, you are going to accept the proposition of the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) in regard to the substitution of these gentlemen's names. It is a very dangerous practice to insert the name of a firm of lawyers into a Bill in the manner proposed. This jobbing in parliamentary charters is an old practice round Ottawa, and I certainly think it should not be encouraged by this House in the closing hours of the session. The crop might be hailed out anyway before these gentlemen are ready to operate this year, and we may possibly save money by not passing this Bill. It strikes me, and has always done so, that proceedings such as this at the tail-end of the session are very peculiar—they resemble a deathbed repentance. I think this Bill should stand over until next session, and in any event the names of the other gentlemen interested should be added. I would go further and say substitute their names for the names of the lawyers which appear in the Bill. The lawyers in question form a large firm and it takes a lot to keep them going.

Mr. CALDER: I might say that, speaking for the province of Saskatchewan, in so far as hail insurance is concerned, it does not make any difference whether this Bill goes through or not. If the Bill passes, the provincial authorities will see to it that the company is properly organized, has the proper standing, and afford the necessary capital proper security before they will allow it to do business in that province.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the rule of all the provinces.

Mr. CALDER: It is the rule in Saskatchewan, and I understand it is also the rule in the province of Alberta. In some of the western provinces they have had somewhat unfortunate experiences with regard to these hail insurance companies, as a result of which the law was put into such shape that no company can do business unless it has proper standing and provides the proper security.

On section 6—increase of capital:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the Minister of Immigration and Colonization read clause 6 of the Bill, and is he satisfied with it?

Mr. CALDER: I have not seen the Bill.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It strikes me that the increase of capital provided for in that clause for each line of business is rather light.

Sir HERBERT AMES: The increases are such as appear in other Bills that have been adopted, with the single exception of burglary insurance, where the capital is made $20,000 instead of $10,000, since the liability is regarded as slightly greater than it would otherwise be. With that exception, the increases are the same as have been granted in the case of about a score of other Bills.

Mr. CURRIE: I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, and I would like to say further that this Bill does not seem to have been distributed to all the members. I also wish to call the attention of the Clerk of the House to the fact that the Printing Bureau appears to have sent an insufficient number of Bills and papers to the House in certain cases. For example, the other day when the Supplementary Estimates arrived there were not sufficient to place a copy of each in the box of each member, as custom and usage requires. In the present case there are apparently only a few copies of the Bill obtainable, and there has not been one placed on my file. If, as has been stated, this Bill was at first given a wrong title, the proper procedure would have been to send the petition to the committee, where the change could have been made and the Bill would then go through in proper form. I have in mind the case of a number of gentlemen in British Columbia who got into trouble over an insurance Bill, in consequence of which the Bill in question was thrown out by the committee. I would like to know whether those gentlemen are associated with this Bill, and if so, whether they are trying to get through an objectionable Bill in the dying hours of the session? If we are going to adhere to parliamentary procedure I think the objections raised to this Bill will be fatal to it. Had the proper procedure been adopted in respect to this Bill the names of the promoters would have remained on it. Instead of that the Bill was withdrawn for some reason, and a new measure introduced, which contains the names of certain lawyers. I hardly think that is fair to the House.

Sir HERBERT AMES: The hon. gentleman is under a slight misapprehension in this matter. This Bill was considered by the Private Bills Committee and the Banking and Commerce Committee of the Senate when it was pointed out that the name of this company had been already used in another case. The Banking and Commerce Committee of the Senate thereupon arranged for a new title and reported to the Senate that it was advisable to have the existing name changed. That necessarily caused some delay in the Bill coming from the Senate and accounts for it arriving here at a somewhat late period. When the Bill reached this House its title was exactly as printed, "United Canadian Insurance Company" (E2). There has not been any change in a word or a syllable of the Bill since it first appeared in this House.

Mr. CURRIE: What is the reason the names of the original promoters do not appear on the Bill?

Sir HERBERT AMES: The names of the original promoters were not attached to the original petition, owing to the illness of the person to whom that petition was entrusted, when it was presented to the Senate in sufficient time to appear in the Bill. This is the explanation that is given to us.

I may say that the Banking and Commerce Committee were unanimously satisfied of the bona fides of Mr. W. L. Scott and his associates and felt that there would be no danger in granting a Bill of this character. It was shown to us that there was very urgent need of additional hail insurance facilities in the western provinces this summer, where the crop is the largest and most valuable ever put in the ground; and that it would be advisable to permit another company to do business there this summer along these lines.

Mr. McKENZIE: It strikes me that this very important Bill comes to us in a very hasty way, and at a time when we are not able to give very much consideration to it. It may have been very seriously considered in the Senate, and it may be all right. But the insurance business is a very important business, second to banking, I suppose, perhaps the most important business that any body of men are permitted to carry on in this country. When we are authorizing people to carry on insurance business in this country, we should know something about it. I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Finance in whose department these matters particularly lie, if he is satisfied that this concern is a strong, reliable set of men, and that if busineess is put in their hands the interests of the country are safe? The hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization has suggested a point of law on which I am not at all satisfied. He says that there is a guarantee for the people of Alberta against the operations of such companies by reason of the protections that local laws give them.

As a lawyer, I am not satisfied that the local legislature could estop an insurance company chartered by this House from doing business in the province of Alberta. If there is a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada to that effect I shall be very glad to hear it. But it strikes me that there is no jurisdiction in the local legislature to estop the operations of a corporation chartered to do business by this House all over the country. There may be, but I am not familiar with it. And if that is the only protection which the people of Alberta and the different provinces have, I am not satisfied. And I am not satisfied that sufficient time has been given to this Bill. I agree entirely with the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) that there is no such haste about it, and that this Bill could very well stand over.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to hold up the Bill except on square lines. I call attention that it is not printed in French. And as an ardent lover of the French language, the House is entitled to have this Bill printed in French. Furthermore, I would ask the opinion of the Minister of Customs, who is reputed to be a shrewd lawyer, well up on matters affecting this class of insurance in the West, and upon the question of rates. I would like an opinion from him in that regard.

Mr. SIFTON: The Minister of Justice gives the legal advice for this Government, and I would not for a moment wish to infringe upon his prerogatives. I have no legal advice to give in regard to the constitutional privileges as they are affected by this particular Act. I do not think it will lower the rate of insurance any. I do not think it will make any difference so far as that is concerned. There are lots of hail insurance companies in the western provinces. However, I have no objection to any new company. I have never known any of these companies who are prepared to do business with farmers on any better terms than the others. They are all alike when it comes to doing business.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In answer to the question put to me by the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), I have given no personal attention to the Bill; but I am assured by the officers of the department that it is in no respect objectionable. The Bill in its terms follows the standard clauses usually inserted in Bills incorporating insurance companies. Some Bills have been introduced in the past in the very same terms. I do not see any objection to this Bill.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it a bona fide company, that is the point? Where is there any evidence that this is a bona fide company? A firm of lawyers may wish, inasmuch as the law business is not very brisk now—

Mr. McMASTER: Louder.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am glad to see my legal friend pricking up.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to hear what the gallant member is saying about the profession.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The point I want to make is this. I am only looking at one aspect of the case—we must look at it from every aspect. Business being a little dull in law offices possibly, a legal firm might take up the incorporation of such a company. They get up a charter of this kind. We have had instances in Canada where charters have been passed in this House and hawked around for sale. This Bill has all the earmarks of that sort of a charter. Surely if a number of gentlemen —I did not catch the names; they were muttered in an undertone,—from Vancouver are so solicitous in looking after the farmers of the Western prairies, why did they not get this Bill down in time? They have had all summer to look into this matter. They are coming down at the eleventh hour, without even the signatures of the parties, and the legal firm are getting them by telegraph. The thing looks fishy on the face of it. It can very well stand over for another session; there is no great rush. Furthermore, the number of functions inserted would require a considerable amount to be put up for going into classes of insurance other than hail insurance. These things, to my mind, are altogether insufficient.

Mr. McMASTER: I was a member of the Banking Committee which sat on this matter this morning. I would tell this Committee that Mr. Scott, who is a lawyer of standing in Ottawa—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are not all lawyers lawyers of standing?

Mr. McMASTER: No, they vary. There are, sad to say, lawyers who do not rise to the general high level maintained by the profession. I have heard of newspaper men of the same sort, and doctors of the same sort.

An hon. MEMBER: And soldiers.

Mr. McMASTER: Oh, no. Soldiers are always noble and great, of the very highest calibre. I would like to say this: I do not see why we cannot pass this Bill. Mr. Scott assured us that it was a bona fide Bill, that his clients in Vancouver and Victoria were bona fide people of responsibility. He showed correspondence to that effect. Under these circumstances, I would ask the hon. and gallant member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), with that disregard of red tape which was a distinguishing characteristic of his in days gone by, not to insist on red tape now, but as we are all desirous of going on with more important business we might possibly be allowed to pass this Bill and get on to other matters. I speak with all of the deference and respect due from a young member of this House to an old member like my hon. friend.

Mr. MORPHY: I would ask the hon. member in charge of the Bill if the preliminary proceedings, the notices in the Canada Gazette, were taken in the names of these men, or the names of the proposed bona fide promoters?

Sir HERBERT AMES: I understand they were issued in the name of W. L. Scott and his associates.

Mr. MORPHY: That is a rather suspicious circumstance to me.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the answer—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MORPHY: If the original proceedings and notices were put through in the names of these incorporators, it does not look very feasible that men who really were the bona fide incorporators at the inception of the movement would lend the scheme out to the use of other names. That is suspicious to my mind, and makes me wonder if somebody has been putting one over on the hon. member who is in charge of the Bill. I think Mr. Scott is a reputable gentleman, but it must be noticed that he is one of the promoters, and it sounds a little like a man praising himself in a measure, when all the information the Banking Committee receives has been received from one of the promoters himself. If the Bill from its inception was put forward in the name of this firm of solicitors, it is a strange thing to me; it does not show good faith. The excuse is given that the actual signatories could not be obtained because the men in question are in Vancouver.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Signatories to what?

Mr. MORPHY: The petition. These pretended incorporators must have made up their minds weeks ago with regard to this matter. They must have entered into a memorandum of agreement to form the company; their names must be on all the preliminaries. Yet the names of Ottawa lawyers are given here as the promoters of the company. It does not look like good faith; it looks like a policy of huckstering charters.

Mr. CURRIE: If the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) had been in the House for several years he would have known that some trouble has been experienced with companies from Vancouver. Last session we had a very bad case. A charter was obtained some years ago in this form and the parties who received it started out to get a large number of subscriptions. It was ascertained that a large amount that had been paid in as subscriptions had been taken by way of commissions. Nothing was left but a shell for the creditors of the company; and the company never went into operation. I do not object to charters being granted to promoters in Vancouver but we should look into the bona fides of these cases. The member from the section of the country in which this company is to operate should be in his place to speak on behalf of these incorporators and to say that they are all right. If any member from Vancouver or British Columbia does that I will withdraw all objection.

Sir HERBERT AMES: The member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is really the promoter of the Bill; but he is not here to-day.

Mr. CURRIE: His name does not appear on the Bill.

Sir HERBERT AMES: It is a matter of record that he is the promoter of the Bill in this House.

Mr. CURRIE: Somebody ought to be here to explain the matter, because the case of last year, to which I referred, was a flagrant one. There is also the principle of charter-mongering, to which I object. This is a very important insurance company; their powers are almost as wide as Lloyd's, and we should not be obliged to accept simply the ipse dixit of the Ottawa lawyers whose names have been given. If the Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Burrell) will say that the Bill is all right, we will let it go at that

Mr. BURRELL: Frankly, I know nothing whatever about the Bill. If, however, the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) knows the promoters of the Bill, I should think that would be sufficient.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the public receive any greater protection by the fact that the member for Vancouver is the sponsor of the Bill? What difference does that make? The public must be protected by the insurance laws of the country and their proper administration by the Insurance Department.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We have rules in this House that we are asked to observe, and I always observe them to the utmost limit of the law, even when they are stretched beyond the point of endurance. This is one case in which the rules should be carefully observed. I know the business men of Vancouver pretty well and I should like to hear again the names of the promoters and to know what business they are engaged in. It looks fishy, to use a not very decorous expression; it looks peculiar to see the names of the promoters of this Bill furnished from a law office in Ottawa. The names of the men from Vancouver are telegraphed, not sent by letter; the whole thing looks peculiar, to say the least.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I shall be glad to give the names again. H. S. Durkee, who, I understand is a railway man; P. F. Wright, grocer; J. Kendall, whose designation I cannot give; O. S. Wood, who, I think, is a lawyer, and A. G. Creelman, contractor. If the hon. member will refer to the Orders of the Day of May 20th he will find that Bill 107 (letter E of the Senate) an Act to incorporate the United Canadian Insurance Company was introduced that day by the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). The Bill was unanimously passed this morning by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and I am in charge of it for the member for Vancouver Centre.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the Secretary of State know whether these gentlemen are in good standing in Vancouver?

Mr. BURRELL: I know Mr. Creelman; I do not know the other gentlemen, although I have heard their names occasionally. I knew Mr. Creelman as a contractor in the Kootenay railroad district; he is a man of some substance.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I remember the Bill referred to by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), which came before the committee last year. Some men from Vancouver—apparently in good standing, so far as the committee knew—had applied some years ago for a charter to do an insurance business. The charter was renewed once, and they came back for another renewal last year. It was brought out at that time that the company had secured $70,000 or $72,000 in subscriptions and has squandered $63,000 or $64,000 of that in commissions. They were insisting on having the charter renewed in order that they could prosecute some of the stockholders for certain amounts which the company claimed were due them. That application was thrown out of committee. No evidence has been furnished this morning to satisfy this committee that the Bill now under consideration should be passed this year, in the dying days of the session. No doubt it has been applied for in the ordinary way, but I do not see why the promoters could not have had their names in long before this. Now, in the dying days of the session, it is asked that this Bill be put through. I do not think we should stand for it; I think it should be laid over.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I observe that an hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Crowe) has entered the chamber. Perhaps he can give us some light on the status of these gentlemen. A Bill has been introduced in the dying days of the session; it is not yet even printed in French.

The promoters of this Bill are a firm of lawyers in Ottawa. At the last moment, we are informed that a number of gentlemen in Vancouver, who had not time to send their names here by letter, telegraphed their names, being anxious that they should be put in as the promoters of this Bill. The whole thing is irregular, and I am anxious to know the status of these gentlemen. Their names are: H. S. Durkee, P. F. Wright, J. Kendall, O. S. Wood and A. G. Creelman. Are these the men who are now supposed to be the promoters of the Bill, but who had not time to mail their application to get it here so as to comply with the rules

Mr. CROWE: I do not know anything about the Bill before the House, but I know several of these gentlemen, and I can vouch for them. Mr. Creelman is a large contractor in Vancouver, a very wealthy man. Mr. Wood is a man of A1 standing. Mr. Durkee is in the jewellery business, but I do not know what standing he has. Mr. P. F. Wright is in the furniture business. I can vouch for three of these gentlemen;

the other two I cannot vouch for because I do not know them.

Preamble agreed to, and Bill reported.

On motion of Sir Herbert Ames for the third reading of the Bill.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does not the rule of the House require that this Bill shall be printed in French?

Mr. SPEAKER: That objection cannot be taken at this stage. It has to be taken at an earlier stage.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I raised the objection at an earlier stage.

Sir HERBERT AMES: At the opening to-day the House gave its unanimous consent that this Bill should be placed upon the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

WAR TRADE BOARD.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Is Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Chairman of the War Trade Board?
2. If so, did he select and appoint the members and the staff thereof?
3. If not, by what other members of the Cabinet were these selections and appointments made?
4. What are the names, salaries and ordinary places of residence of the members and staff of the War Trade Board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The members of the War Trade Board were selected and appointed by the Governor in Council, of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce is one. The staff were selected by the board, the certifications made by the Civil Service Commission and appointments made by Order in Council.

4. Board: Sir George Foster, Chairman; F. P. Jones, Vice-Chairman, Montreal; J. W. McConnell, member, Montreal; J. H. Gundy, member, Toronto; C. B. McNaught, member, Toronto; Jos. Gibbons, member, Toronto; C. A. Magrath, ex-officio member; H. Laporte, ex-officio member.

General: Wm. K. Trower, General Secretary, $500, Montreal; J. H. Wilkie, General Secretary, $250, Montreal; Miss G. Odlum, accountant, $100, Woodstock.

Filing: W. P. Murphy, chief file clerk, $125, Montreal; Miss R. McFadden, file clerk, $50, Carleton Place; Francis Hallinan, file clerk, $70, Ottawa; J. H. Arbick, file clerk, $65, Ottawa.

United States Import License Department: John A. Clift, Chief Imports from United States, $200, Ottawa; Geo. H. Ince, Chief Imports from United States, $125, Ottawa; R. A. Pettigrew, Chief Imports from United States, $100, Montreal; Paul Michaud, Chief Imports from United States, $100, St. Barthelemy; Miss F. Varcoe, stenographer, $60, Ottawa; Miss O. Goth, stenographer, $60, Carleton Place; Miss M. Vallillee, stenographer, $60, Ottawa; Miss A. Jones, stenographer, $60, Ottawa; Miss F. Casey, stenographer, $70, Ottawa; Miss G. Evans, stenographer, $60 Ottawa; Miss J. Dunbar, stenographer, $75, Toronto; Gerald Latreille, messenger, $30, Ottawa.

Canadian Export Department: W. P. McKay, chief, $200, Ottawa; F. D'Ornellis, assistant, paid by Customs, Ottawa; M. H. Ryan, assistant, $125, Renfrew; J. Byce, stenographer, $80, Ottawa; G. V. Jamieson, stenographer, $90, Ottawa; B. Roberts, stenographer, $75, Montreal; D. Casey, clerk, $70, Montreal.

Metals Department: H. D. Bayne, chief, paid by Customs, Toronto; E. M. Russell, assistant, $175, Montreal; T. C. Hosking, inspector, $150, Montreal; Wm. Gilchrist, inspector, paid by Customs; Henry B. Timleck, stenographer, paid by Customs, Brockville.

British Priority Department: A. E. D. Holden, chief, $200, Montreal; Miss M. Morel, assistant, $60, Ottawa; Miss L. Owrid, stenographer, $70, Almonte; Miss M. A. Jones, stenographer, $65, Ottawa.

Telegraph and Telephone Department: G. H. White, telegraph operator, $238.66, Montreal; I. Rusland, telephone operator, $55, Ottawa; Albert Guneau, messenger, $30, Ottawa.

Members' stenographers: Miss E. Imerie, $80, Westmount; Miss W. P. Corner, $90, St. Lambert; Miss L. McMurty, $80, Kinburn; Miss C. T. Henderson, $80, Ottawa; Mrs. A. M. Keats, $80, Ottawa.

Messenger Department: Frank Randall, $40, Ottawa; Henry Albert, $30, Ottawa; Jos. De Granpré, $30, Ottawa.

War Economies: Lester M. Green, $300, Toronto.

Inspection Department: T. M. Forrest, $208.33, Montreal; C. L. Wise, $200, Toronto; Miss E. H. Tomkins, stenographer, $80, Ottawa.

The former residence of each official is mentioned. The present residence of each

official is shown, except Mr. Wise, who is in Toronto.

The members of the board are allowed travelling expenses, and in addition a living allowance at the rate of $10 a day for the days spent in Ottawa.

HALIFAX DISASTER CLAIMS.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to pay, in the near future, the workmen who have worked at Halifax, and for whom a statement of wages due has been lodged with the Department of Finance on the 26th of March last?
2. If so, when will the Government pay said wages and thus relieve a situation that is causing great inconvenience to many of these workmen?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. The Department of Finance is not aware of any claim such as is mentioned in this question having been filed.

2. The Government disclaim any liability as to the payment of wages in connection with the Halifax disaster, and accordingly they do not propose paying any such claims.

WELLAND CANAL PAYMASTER.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Is it true that serious discrepancies were found in the accounts of the paymaster of the Welland Canal?
2. If so, what was the amount of money involved?
3. What reparation has been made, and by what means?
4. How far back have the defalcations extended?
5. By what means were the defalcations carried out?
6. Were other persons involved with the paymaster? If so, who?
7. Does the department intend to take action?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This question has been standing for some time, and to-morrow is the last day when we shall have an opportunity of having questions answered.

Hon. J. D. REID: I shall have the answer to-morrow.

Question stands.

QUEBEC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Who secured the contract for carrying the mails from St. Odilon de Frampton to Mount Fir Grove, Robson and Poulin?
2. When was the contract given, and how much is it for?
3. Were there any tenders called?
4. If so, what were they, and how much were they for?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. In order to cover the post offices mentioned, it is necessary to give the particulars of two mail contracts, namely: Fir Grove and Frampton (via Mount Robson and Poulin), contractor, D. Lacasse; and Fir Grove and St. Odilon (via Cranbourne), contractor, A. Laflamme.

2, 3 and 4. Fir Grove and Frampton contract awarded after invitation of tenders to D. Lacasse in November, 1912, at the rate of $930 per annum. The tenders received were: Joseph Audet, Frampton, $935 per annum; Damase Lacasse, Frampton, $939 per annum; Desiré Audet, Frampton, $940 per annum; Hector Lacasse, Frampton, $945 per annum. Damase Lacasse subsequently reduced his tender to $930 per annum. Fir Grove and St. Odilon contract was arranged in August, 1915, with A. Laflamme at the rate of $174 per annum without tenders being called for.

EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Have all the judges presiding at Exemption Tribunals in Chicoutimi and Lake St. John been paid?
2. If not, who are those who have not been paid?
3. When will they be paid?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. All accounts received have been paid.
2. Benjamin Boudreau, l'Anse St. Jean, and L. Bouchard, l'Anse St. Jean.
3. Accounts when received will be promptly passed for payment.

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Has the Government expropriated the Ross Rifle Factory in Quebec?
2. If so, at what cost was the expropriation?
3. What was the object of the Government to expropriate the said Ross Rifle Factory?
4. What does the Government intend to do with the said factory?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. The cost has yet to be determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada.
3. For reasons fully given by the Government to Parliament at the time, February 2, 1917, and contained in an Order in Council then presented.
4. Under consideration.

SENATOR BRADBURY.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

Referring to the answer given by Mr. McCurdy to a question reported on page 1169 of Unrevised Hansard for 1918:—

1. In what rank did Lt.-Colonel G. H. Bradbury serve in France?

2. In what regiment did he serve in France?
3. Under whose command did he go to France?
4. Was he wounded? If so, what is the nature of his wounds?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: Definite information is not available in Canada, but is being requested by letter from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—MR. ALLEYN TASCHEREAU.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What salary or remuneration is Mr. Alleyn Taschereau, Registrar for the application of the Military Service Act, entitled to for his services as Registrar?
2. How much has the said Registrar received to date for such services?
3. Is the said Registrar entitled to a fixed sum for travelling expenses? If so, how much?
4. Is the said Registrar entitled to the use of an automobile at the expense of the country for the performance of his duties as Registrar?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. $300 per month.
2. Total of $280 for service from 3rd to 30th April, 1918.
3. No. Any actual disbursements are refunded on presentation of a proper account and vouchers.
4. No.

OTTAWA NAVAL ENLISTMENTS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

How many have enlisted for service in the Navy, from the city of Ottawa, since April 1, 1918?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON: Seven.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—DENTISTS.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Is it a fact that appointments are being made to the Dental Corps of persons who are not graduate dentists and have had no experience in dentistry?
2. Are such appointments made for the purpose of evading the military service regulations and to secure Safety First positions?
3. Has the Minister of Militia received any complaints on this score? If so, were they from Ontario?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. All officers appointed as operators are graduate dentists. Quartermasters are not graduate dentists, but men who have had special training in supplies. Other than these, there are no officers in the Canadian Army Dental Corps. Non-commissioned officers and men are not graduate dentists.
2. Non-commissioned officers and men are men who have special training, or else men not in the classification for overseas service.
3. No.

[Mr. Burrell.]

VICTORY LOAN.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. In connection with the Victory Loan, was there any commission paid directly or indirectly to what was known as the "Special Names Committee"?
2. If so, what amount was so paid, and to whom?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

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

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—EXEMPTION OF FARMERS.

*Mr. SAVARD:

1. What interviews were had, or communications exchanged with Mr. Justice Duff, prior of his judgment as Central Appeal Judge in the test case of the farmer applicant in December last immediately following the declaration by the Minister of Militia, that farmers would be exempted from military service?
2. Will such correspondence be produced?

Hon.Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The only interviews or communications exchanged with the Central Appeal Judge in relation to his decision in the Rowntree case, decided on December 6, 1917, were in the ordinary course of official business. No communication passed directly or indirectly between the Central Appeal Judge and the Minister of Militia or any other member of the Government on that subject; and if the Minister of Militia did make any declaration such as that described in the question, before the date of the decision, no such declaration and no declaration by any member of the Government entered into the considerations upon which the decision was based.
2. Yes.

159th and 227th BATTALIONS.

*Mr. SAVARD:

1. Have the 159th and the 227th Battalions been recruited in the Sudbury districts?
2. Are the said battalions composed largely of French Canadians and Catholics?
3. Of the 262 men of No. 3 (O.C.) Company of the 227th Battalion who left for Camp Borden were 212 enrolled as Catholics?
4. In the two battalions mentioned how many command officers are Catholics?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Headquarters of 159th and 227th Battalions were Haileybury and Hamilton, respectively. Enlistments from Sudbury districts were included in each.

2 and 3. Information as to denominations was not maintained by Battalion formation.

4. Neither of the Commanding Officers of the Battalions mentioned above were Roman Catholics.

LIEUT.-COL. A. T. THOMPSON.

*Mr. CAHILL:

1. Is Lieut.-Col. A. T. Thompson, enlisted with the 114th Battalion, as a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?
2. If so, when did he join, and where has he since been located?
3. Has he since his appointment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force been under pay to this date?
4. If so, what amount of pay per day does he receive?
5. Has he since the date he joined or was appointed to the Canadian Expeditionary Force been continuously under pay?
6. What is the total amount of pay to date received by him, or still owing to him?
7. Since he joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or was appointed thereto, has he been granted leave of absence without pay? If so, for what purpose, and between what dates?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Unless he has been struck off in England, and this department has not been notified, he is still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.
2. 29th February, 1916. Canada and Overseas.
3, 4, 5, and 6. This information is not available in Canada, but it is being requested, by letter, from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.
7. No record of his having been granted leave of absence without pay.

MAJOR EDMUND SWEET.

* Mr. CAHILL:

1. Is Major Edmund Sweet, enlisted with the 215th Battalion, a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?
2. If so, when did he join, and where has he since been located?
3. Has he since his appointment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force been under pay to this date?
4. If so, what amount of pay per day does he receive?
5. Has he since the date he joined or was appointed to the Canadian Expeditionary Force been continuously under pay?
6. What is the total amount of pay to date received by him, or still owing to him?
7. Since he joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or was appointed thereto, has he been granted leave of absence without pay? If so, for what purpose, and between what dates?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Unless he has been struck off in England, and this department has not been notified, he is still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.
2. Sixth of March, 1916. Canada and Overseas.
3, 4, 5 and 6. This information is not available in Canada, but is being requested by letter from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.
7. No record of his having been granted leave of absence without pay.

DR. BURCHARD'S REPORT.

Mr. J. F. REID:

1. Has the Board of Grain Commissioners forwarded to the Government any report from Dr. Burchard, Dominion Chemist, re investigation of milling values of grain, and other matters connected therewith?
2. If so, when will report be ready for distribution to members of this House?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Board of Grain Commissioners have forwarded to the Government a report from Doctor Burchard, and it is being considered whether that report should be made public at the present time. Before it would be safe to give the conclusions to the public, investigations extending over a large area and occupying a considerable time would have to be made.

FORESTRY BATTALION OFFICERS.

Mr. FAFARD:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to weed out the officers of the Forestry Battalions and to send them overseas for service in France?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: There are no forestry units at present in Canada, the battalions having proceeded overseas, the depots having been demobilized, and the officers disposed of.

ALLEGED EVASIONS OF MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

* Mr. LEDUC:

1. Is the Minister of Militia and Defence aware that a number of people are trying to evade the Military Service Act by enlisting in the Overseas Training Corps of the University of Toronto, where they remain six, eight and even twelve months before being sent overseas?
2. Is the minister aware that men have been at Burwash Hall Overseas Training Corps Barracks in Toronto since October last and are not yet ordered to leave for the front?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1 and 2. No; will inquire.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. How many officers of the Permanent Corps, Canadian Militia, are employed in Militia District No. 11?
2. How many of such officers have seen overseas service in the present war?
3. What is the pay and allowance of these officers?
4. Has the officer in charge of the School of Instruction at Work Point seen overseas service in this war?
5. Must officers returning from the front who have received their promotion in the field, take a course of instruction under the officer referred

to in Question 5, before their commission can be confirmed in the Canadian Militia?

6. How many officers now on the Establishment of the 5th Regiment have seen overseas service in the present war?

7. Is it the intention that such officers who have not seen overseas service shall be given an opportunity of seeing such service and that their places filled by returned officers?

8. How many (a) Warrant Officers, (b) Non-commissioned Officers, (c) Privates, in the Permanent Corps of the Canadian Militia employed in Militia District 11 have not seen overseas service in the present war?

9. Has the Assistant Judge Advocate General in Militia District 11 had any military experience?

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Registrar under the Military Service Act, in Quebec?

2. What is the salary, and what are the duties of each member of the staff?

3. To what town does each member of said staff belong?

4. How many, if any, of these persons have commissions in the Militia, and how many have been at the front or have offered to go to the front, what is the name of each employee and the date of his appointment?

5. Upon whose recommendation have the members of said staff been appointed?

* Mr. LEDUC:

1. What positions or appointments have been given to Mr. F. H. Chrysler, K.C., of Ottawa, by the Union Government, and how much has been paid him to date?

2. What position does Mr. Chrysler hold in connection with the Military Service Act? What is his salary?

3. How much money was paid Mr. Chrysler by the Liberal Government from July, 1896, to October, 1911?

MR. WILLIAM K. TROWER.

Mr. MURPHY: The Minister of Trade and Commerce, in reply to the question by my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Proulx), as to the names and salaries of the members and staff of the War Trade Board, to-day handed in a list in which the name of Mr. William K. Trower appears as general secretary of the board at a salary of $6,000 a year. May I inquire who William K. Trower is?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He is the secretary of the War Trade Board.

Mr. MURPHY: Who was he before his appointment?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He was Mr. Trower.

Mr. MURPHY: What occupation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He was a business man of good repute.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. MURPHY: He must have been, to receive such a salary. Where was he in business?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In Montreal.

SUPPLY.

THE TAKING OF THE SOLDIERS' VOTE AT LAST ELECTION—AMENDMENT BY W. COPP.

On the motion of Sir George Foster that the House go into Committee of Supply:

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): The question I propose to discuss has reference to the taking of the soldiers' votes during the last general election, both in Canada and overseas. Those of us who were in this House during the sessions of 1915 and 1917 will well remember the attention that was paid to the Act giving the soldiers in Canada and overseas the right to record their votes at any general election in the Dominion, whenever that might be held. In the year 1915 there was a strong probability that a general election might be brought on before another session, and the Act I have referred to was passed giving the soldiers the right and privilege of exercising the franchise. The election was not held that year, and in 1917 a new Act was passed, amending the Dominion Elections Act and giving the soldiers the right to vote for or against the Government and for or against different candidates. As I propose to refer to a number of instances bearing on the different sections of the Military Voters' Act of 1917, I shall put a few sections of the Act on Hansard. Section 3 says:

(1) Every military elector shall be qualified and entitled to vote at a general election.

(2) If he can state the electoral district wherein he last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding his appointment, enlistment, enrolment or calling out on active service, or so particularly specify a place or places within an electoral district whereat during such period of time he so resided that such electoral district can therefore be ascertained, he shall be deemed an elector of the electoral district so stated or to be ascertained, and his vote shall be supplied thereto.

(3) If he cannot state or so specify an electoral district or place wherein he has so resided for the time and within the period mentioned in subsection two but can state an electoral district or so specify a place within Canada wherein he has at any other time resided, he shall be deemed an elector of the electoral district so stated or made ascertainable and his vote shall be applied thereto.

(4) If he cannot, because of non-residence or otherwise, so state or specify, he shall be deemed an elector of, and his vote shall be applied to, such electoral district as he may indicate.

(5) No person shall be entitled, because of anything in this Part contained, to vote more than once at any election.

Section 5 says:

(1) Whenever the Secretary of State of Canada shall so direct, a sufficient supply of ballot-papers in the form A of the Schedule, and of envelopes for holding the same, with certificates in the form B of the Schedule printed thereon, and of all such forms and instructions as are ordinarily supplied to returning officers, modified to conform to the provisions of this Part, shall be delivered, (a) by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the officer in command of any Canadian forces in Bermuda, or in any other place without Canada but in North America, and to such Presiding Officers as shall have been appointed to arrange for the holding of polls in Canada; and, (b) by the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to such Presiding Officers as shall have been appointed to arrange for the holding of polls in the United Kingdom or on the continent of Europe.

(2) Such ballot-papers and envelopes shall be safely held by such officers in command, respectively, until receipt from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of notice of the appointment of Presiding Officers for the camps under such officers' command, whereupon they shall deliver such ballots and envelopes to such Presiding Officers in such quantities as may be necessary, and return any surplus, with a statement in writing of the disposition of all thereof, showing names and quantities, to the General Returning Officer at Ottawa.

(3) The printer shall, upon delivering the ballot papers to the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, file in his hands an affidavit setting forth the description of the ballots as printed by him, the number of ballots supplied by him, and the fact that no other ballot papers have been supplied by him to any one else.

Section 9, in part, reads as follows:

(1) The manner of voting without Canada under this Part shall be as follows:—

(a) Voting shall be by ballot;

(b) The ballot-paper shall be in the form A in the Schedule;

(c) The voter shall answer under oath, before the Deputy Presiding Officer, the questions set forth in the certificate which is form B in the Schedule. Such certificate shall be endorsed on the envelopes referred to in section five of this Part;

(e) The ballot-paper shall be marked in the presence of the Deputy Presiding Officer and deputy scrutineers present, or military electors acting in their stead, but in such manner as not to disclose to them or to any other person any marking thereon. The voter shall fold the ballot, place it in the envelope, securely close the same and hand it to the Deputy Presiding Officer, who shall then and there, in the presence of the voter and deputy scrutineers present, or military electors acting in their stead, place it in the ballot-box;

Now, I want to refer to the form of oath as contained in Form B and which is as follows:

Form B.

Certificate to be Endorsed on the Ballot-Envelopes.

1. What is your name?.....
2. What is your rank?.....What is your number?.....
3. In what force or service are you?.....
4. Are you a British subject?..... Have you previously voted at this election?....
5. Were you in Canada when you were appointed, enlisted, enrolled or called out on active service?.....
6. Specify the names of the place or places in Canada (giving streets and numbers where possible) whereat you last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding your appointment, enlistment, enrolment or calling out on active service.....
....
....
7. State if you can the electoral district wherein such place or places in which you so resided are situate.
Electoral district .....
Province .....
8. If you cannot specify as required by question No. 6, or state as required by question No. 7, then state in what electoral district or place within Canada (giving street and number where possible) you have resided at any other time than is referred to in question No. 6.....
....
....
9. If none of your answers to questions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 specify or state as required thereby, to what electoral district do you desire your vote to be applied?.....
....
Electoral district .....
Province .....

I certify that the above named military elector did this day make to me under oath the preceding set forth answers to the preceding set forth questions.

Dated this .....day of .....1917.

Deputy Presiding Officer.

Form A is the ballot:

1. I vote for.....
2. I vote for the Government.....
3. I vote for the Opposition.....
4. I vote for the Independent Candidate.....
5. I vote for the Labour Candidate.....

These are the sections of the Act and the forms to which I proposed to refer in my observations in regard to the taking of the soldiers' vote during the last election.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland) resuming: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at one o'clock I had just placed before hon. members of this House the sections of the Military Voters' Act to which I purpose to refer particularly during my argument. We all remember that at the time of the passing of that Act it was unanimously agreed by

all the hon. members of this House that every effort should be made to give to the soldiers who were fighting for our country the opportunity of voting in the election that was about to be held. We all remember also that during the discussion that took place in committee hon. gentlemen on both sides carefully considered each clause of the Bill, and it was unanimously agreed that every safeguard that could be framed should be thrown around the measure to prevent the possibility of any fraud occurring in connection with the taking of the soldiers' vote. I well recall, Sir, the feelings that I entertained during that discussion, when certain of my hon. friends who are to-day on the other side—particularly my hon. friend from the county of Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), now the Minister of Public Works in the present Government—took a very active part in that discussion. I am bound to admit that, while I had a very high regard for the acute and ingenious legal mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) I was somewhat convinced that he was over apprehensive as to the frauds that would be attempted in connection with the taking of that vote. But, Sir, now that I am in possession of the facts, I am satisfied that my hon. friend instead of being too careful and over apprehensive, did not foresee one-tenth part of the frauds that actually could be committed in connection with polling the soldiers' vote. I shall not occupy the time of the House by quoting, on the present occasion, the remarks of my hon. friend and of other hon. gentlemen on the occasion referred to. I would suggest, however, to those who want to get the facts of the matter, and who now do me the honour of listening to my remarks, that if they will turn to the Revised Hansard of 1917, pages 4796 to 4870, they will learn what was in the minds of hon. gentlemen when the Military Voters' Act was being discussed in this House in Committee of the Whole.

After the Bill in question had been passed through committee and moulded into law the soldiers' vote was duly taken in this country, as well as overseas, and allocated, and, Sir, quite a large number of hon. members of the House now occupy their seats by virtue of the soldiers' votes cast on that occasion. For that reason it is only fair to ask the House to listen to some facts which I propose to lay before it as reasons why an inquiry should be instituted, and investigation made into the circumstances under which the soldiers' vote was taken, and that the results of that investigation should be placed before the country. While the vote was being polled in Canada it came to my knowledge that irregularities were occurring. Shortly afterwards, and after the soldiers' vote had been taken overseas, I received numerous letters from soldiers who furnished me with information which convinced me that frauds, irregularities and election crimes had been committed. On the receipt of that information I deemed it to be my duty to make further inquiries and endeavour to learn, as nearly as I could, the nature of those frauds. I started my inquiries and have received information, affidavits and statements, of the truth of which I have not the slightest doubt, and which convinces me that such irregularities were practised in connection with the taking of the soldiers' vote in Canada and overseas. I therefore venture to take up the time of the House this afternoon in order to place before Parliament and the people of the country the nature of those irregularities and frauds which, to my mind, prove beyond peradventure that a conspiracy existed in connection with the allocation of those votes with the object of destroying the effect of the elections that were being held. Accordingly I have prepared some charges which I now propose to present to the House in proof of my contention that grievous irregularities and frauds were committed.

From information which I have received I have reason to believe, and do believe on my honour as a member of Parliament:

1. That in the recent election a carefully organized conspiracy existed by which extensive frauds were perpetrated in connection with the soldiers' votes.

2. That the aforesaid fraudulent conspiracy was particularly operative in the electoral districts of Kings and Queens, Prince Edward Island; Cape Breton North and Victoria, Richmond and Cape Breton South, Cumberland, Digby, Annapolis and Pictou, Nova Scotia; Westmorland, Restigouche and Madawaska, Kent and Northumberland, New Brunswick; Brome, Sherbrooke, Chambly-Vercheres, St. Ann's, Montreal, St. Antoine, St. Henri, St. Lawrence and St. George, Stanstead and Wright, Quebec; Algoma East, Bruce North and South, Essex North and South, Hamilton East and West, Huron South, Kent, Leeds and Brockville, Lennox and Addington, London, Middlesex West, Nipissing, Ontario South, Ottawa, Oxford South, Peel, Prince Edward, Russell, and Welland, Ontario; Calgary, Edmonton, and the Yukon.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (Perth, N.): I did not hear the hon. gentleman mention his own county where he got a majority of the soldiers' votes. Does the hon. gentleman claim there was fraud committed in that case?

Mr. COPP: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I mentioned Westmorland, my own county.

Mr. MORPHY: I did not hear the hon. gentleman read it.

Mr. COPP: I have that county on my list and I read it. (Continues reading.)

3. These frauds were directed and practised by responsible officers of His Majesty's Canadian Forces, co-operating with Deputy Presiding Officers and poll clerks appointed under the authority of the Crown.

4. That military electors were officially advised how to fill in Form B on the back of the envelopes containing their ballots in order to successfully and fraudulently place their votes in constituencies other than those in which they were legally entitled to vote.

5. That evidence will be submitted by me to a Commission of Inquiry establishing the fact that there was an organization to transfer a large fraudulent vote to certain selected constituencies in order to overcome the legitimate vote of the said electoral districts.

6. That in certain of the said constituencies a fraudulent soldiers' vote was polled largely in excess of the legitimate military franchise.

7. That throughout camps in Great Britain the answers to questions in Form B on the back of the ballot envelopes were filled in by commissioned officers and non-commissioned officers outside the polling booths instead of being filled in by the military electors, or the presiding officers inside the polling booth, and the said envelopes were given to the officials recording the votes without the said questions being addressed to the said voters by the presiding officers.

8. That Opposition scrutineers were prevented from attending certain polling booths while the military vote was being recorded.

9. That the representative of the Opposition was forcibly removed from a polling booth and arrested and confined in a camp prison during the period when a large fraudulent vote was being recorded in the said polling booth.

10. That ballot envelopes partially filled in, signed and sealed by the Deputy Presiding Officer, and each containing a ballot marked in favour of the Government, were in circulation with the blank space left open for the insertion of the name of a military voter, as a means of facilitating the perpetration of the frauds hereinbefore mentioned.

11 That military electors were canvassed by superior officers in direct contravention of the King's regulations and orders, and were directed how they should mark their ballots.

12. That military electors in non-combatant regiments were threatened with transfer to fighting line regiments if they did not mark their ballots for the Government in the presence of and in the manner prescribed by the Deputy Presiding Officer.

13. That military electors who at first refused to vote as they were directed, but afterwards did so under compulsion, were, nevertheless, removed to regiments proceeding to the fighting line.

14. That military electors were not afforded facilities for the proper observance of the secrecy of the ballot as provided by Section 9, Subsection E, of the Military Voters Act.

15. That scrutineers appointed on behalf of the Government were sworn in as scrutineers for the Opposition by Deputy Presiding Officers in polling booths where extensive frauds were practised owing to the Opposition not having bona fide representatives therein.

16. That election campaign literature which was dishonest and untruthful was circulated among the military electors with the authority and by the direction of Lord Beaverbrook, and that the said Lord Beaverbrook was an active participant in the hereinbefore mentioned fraudulent practices.

17. That Lord Brooke formerly Commander of the Canadian Forces was also a participant in the said fraudulent practices.

18. That letters mailed through the Canadian Army Branch of the British Post Office, addressed to military electors in which was enclosed campaign literature on behalf of the Opposition, were opened, and the said literature was removed therefrom before the said letters were delivered to the military electors, to whom they were addressed, and the delivery of the said letters were also systematically delayed by the said Post Office authorities.

19. That ballot boxes and bags contained a number of ballot envelopes tightly folded together in parcels or wads too large to have been inserted in the said bags or boxes through the proper aperture, and, in addition, bearing dates showing that the votes had been polled not on the same day, but at intervals of time.

20. That the contents of these ballot boxes or bags which thus appeared to have been fraudulently tampered with were, contrary to the provisions of the Election Act, allocated and counted in the United Kingdom to the number of 15,000 votes under instructions from the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

21 That several thousand ballot envelopes were fraudulently endorsed and the votes allocated to constituencies other than those in which the said military electors were entitled to vote.

22. That military electors were systematically persuaded to give answer for endorsation on their ballot envelopes setting forth residence in constituencies in which they did not reside, and upon which declaration of domicile their qualification to vote was based.

23. That fraudulent votes were recorded for the electoral district of Cumberland, N.S., by Captain H. M. Burke, Deputy Presiding Officer at Ashford, County of Kent, Eng., in which voters declared their residence to be Springhill, Tignish, Joggin Mines, Shulie and Nappan, Pugwash, Oxford and Amherst, whose domicile was, in fact, in some one of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec.

24. That similar conditions to those referred to in the preceding paragraph prevailed in the polling booth presided over by Lieut.-Col. C. M. R. Graham, of the 156th Battalion, Whitley, in which military electors whose domicile was in other parts of Ontario and Manitoba, together with a number of subjects of the United States were induced to falsely declare their residence to be in Brockville, in the electoral district of Leeds.

25. That at the said polling booth in the presence of the said Lieut.-Col. C. M. R. Graham, Deputy Presiding Officer, it was arranged that the votes of the military electors whose surnames commenced with the letters ranging from A to H should be polled in the electoral district of Grenville, and the said votes were so polled after the said electors had been induced to falsely declare their domicile to be

in the town of Prescott, in the electoral district of Grenville.

26. That a large number of citizens of the United States voted in the electoral districts of Peel, Digby and Annapolis, St. Annes, Que., Prince Edward County, Ont., North Essex, Bruce North, Edmonton, Cape Breton South, and Richmond, St. Lawrence and St. George, Ottawa, Brome, Renfrew, Laurier and Outremont, Wright, Cape Breton North and Victoria, Pictou, Westmorland, Cumberland, Leeds, Yarmouth, Hants, St. Antoine and Port Arthur and Kenora.

27. That military electors voted twice in the same polling booth.

28. That Deputy Presiding Officers gave military electors two ballots in direct violation of the Election Act.

29. That military electors voted on behalf of and personated other military electors.

30. That after military electors had voted ballot envelopes were fraudulently re-endorsed so that the votes of the said electors were transferred to electoral districts other than the constituencies indicated by the said electors in their reply to questions 6 and 7 in Form B.

31. That persons were fraudulently allowed to vote by Deputy Presiding Officers with knowledge that such persons were not qualified under the Election Act.

32. That a large number of Canadian officers fraudulently voted in electoral districts other than where they were entitled to vote.

These are the charges I make and which I propose to discuss, and I shall give some facts and evidence to the House to prove the truth of them. The House will readily understand how meagre is the opportunity afforded to a member of the Opposition to gather up information. But I have made endeavour to get sufficient information to establish to this House a prima facie case of a conspiracy which I believe existed on the part of some person or persons to illegally and improperly elect members of the Unionist Government to Parliament in certain constituencies.

I wish now to refer to charge No. 3: that these frauds were directed and practised by responsible officers of His Majesty's Canadian forces co-operating with Deputy Presiding Officers and poll clerks appointed under the authority of the Crown.

I hold under my hand the nominal roll of voters at headquarters No. 51 district C.F.C., Inverness, England. The name of the deputy presiding officer is given as Lieutenant-Colonel J. Glenn, address Indian Head, in the province of Saskatchewan, whose signature is attached to this list, certifying to the post office addresses given. Lieutenant-Colonel Glenn himself voted in Prince Edward county, Ontario, although his home address is given as I have stated. I give a list of persons who voted in Prince Edward County, Ontario, together with their home addresses, as endorsed by Colonel Glenn:

[Mr. Copp.]

799446, Pte. R. Armstrong, Toronto, Ward 6, Toronto.

2297938, Pte. C. T. Barrett, Sydney, N.S., Cape Breton.

690345, Pte., J. H. Brain, Hamilton, East Hamilton.

81127, Pte., H. M. Butterworth, Indian Head, South Qu'Appelle.

434059, Pte., W. Dean, Calgary, Calgary.

447082 A/Cpl. E. T. Girling, Calgary. Calgary.

811518, A/Sgt. P. Greenwood, Ft. Sask., Sask.

1037305, Pte., R. Honeybone, Regina, Sask.

108308, A/cpl., A. R. D. Jarvis, Medicine Hat, Alta.

629384, Pte., C. Lewes, Vancouver, B.C.

802061, Pte., C. M. Lowe, Parkhill, Ont., W. Middlesex.

297486, Pte., W. W. Mercer, Edmonton, Ward 4 West.

2250686, Pte., D. Osborne, Windsor, Ont.

766905, Pte., H. Paley, 195 River St., Toronto, E. Toronto.

297103, A/Sgt., J. Todd, Westboro, Ont. Carleton Co.

1013, Pte., G. Thomas, Winnipeg.

37279, Pte., H. C. Trotter, Peterborough, Ont. W. Peterborough, Ont.

441585, Pte., H. Wills, Star City, Sask., Humboldt Constituency.

Mr. CURRIE: Were these votes counted? What is the use of bringing in a complaint if they were not counted?

Mr. MURPHY: That is not the point. The fact that the fraud was prevented does not excuse those in the conspiracy who perpetrated it.

Mr. COPP: I am not discussing that phase of the subject at this moment. I am giving to the House a list of the officials and persons, according to a signed statement whose home addresses were as I have read them, but who voted in Prince Edward constituency, Ontario.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman is giving the House the impression that these men voted and that their votes were counted. Everybody knows that these votes were not counted. A man may give his address as Ottawa, being the place where he enlisted, whereas his actual home may be in Prince Edward Island. That is no evidence that his vote was not correctly given.

Mr. MURPHY: Thirteen thousand of them.

Mr. COPP: If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) wishes to put a question I shall answer it to the best of my ability. I am trying to give the facts to the House clearly and honestly, feeling that it is my duty to do so. I shall discuss later the aspect of the question referred to by my hon. friend. Lieutenant-Colonel Glenn, the deputy presiding officer, had this signed list before him when the vote was taken and must have known that the votes of the persons

to whom I have referred were placed in a constituency in which they had no right to be placed.

I want to show the extent to which deputy presiding officers in England ignored the Act and permitted envelopes containing soldiers' votes to be placed in the ballot boxes with several of the answers required by the law not given.

Lieutenant R. R. H. Beaton, deputy presiding officer, Sunningdale, Ontario, permitted 133 envelopes, with questions 6, 7 and 8 not answered—one envelope only gave an answer to question 6—to be alloted to Prince Edward county, Ontario.

Lieutenant-Colonel G. G. Corbett, deputy presiding officer, permitted 274 envelopes to be placed in his ballot box for various constituencies in Ontario, out of which 174 did not answer questions 6, 7 and 8.

Major Cecil M. Roberts, deputy presiding officer, Bramshott camp, England, voted 609 envelopes. With the exception of 36, the entire poll was marked "cannot state" in reply to question 6. These votes were allocated to the constituencies of Essex, Bruce, Middlesex and Nipissing.

Lieutenant J. T. Allen, deputy presiding officer, permitted 237 votes to be polled for Ontario, out of which approximately 160 did not reply to questions 6, 7 and 8.

Captain H. J. Dennis, deputy presiding officer, polled a total of 808 votes, out of which 513 did not reply to questions 6, 7 and 8.

Out of a total of 589 envelopes placed in the ballot box of Major A. P. Gillis, deputy presiding officer, in only 314 were answers given to questions 6, 7 and 8.

Lieutenant-Colonel Malone, deputy presiding officer, 208th Battalion, polled a total of 766 envelopes, out of which 541 did not have answers given to questions 6, 7 and 8.

Under the supervision of Lieutenant J. R. Hayden, deputy presiding officer, 1,240 envelopes were polled at the regimental depot, practically all of which represented English-speaking soldiers. Out of this number, 1,200 did not answer questions 6, 7 and 8. 999 of these envelopes were placed in Quebec constituencies.

The following are among the deputy presiding officers in whose polling subdivisions election frauds were conspicuously and systematically perpetrated, as is clearly established by documentary evidence now in my possession:

Major McGowan, Bramshott.
Captain C. E. Louth, Bramshott.
Captain W. B. Metcalfe, Bramshott.
Major C. M. Roberts, Bramshott.
Lieutenant C. S. Macpherson, Bramshott.
Lieutenant J. A. P. Hauden, Bramshott.
Major S. G. Chown, Bramshott.
Captain H. J. Dennis, Bramshott.
Captain D. R. Taylor, Bramshott.
Lieutenant P. Redpath, Bramshott.
Captain G. P. Hudson, Bramshott.
Captain J. D. Black, Bramshott.
Major C. H. Mackenzie, London.
Captain W. W. Muir, London.
Major Rogers, Epsom.
Lieutenant G. E. Oxley, Forestry Corps.
Major J. McCuaig, Forestry Corps.
Lieutenant Colglen, Forestry Corps.
Major C. Rosseau, Forestry Corps.
Major F. M. Walker, Forestry Corps.
Lieutenant J. R. H. Beaton, Forestry Corps.
Lieutenant H. Proctor, Forestry Corps.
Lieutenant R. Brassay, Forestry Corps.
Captain E. A. Mitchell, Forestry Corps.
Captain J. D. Cameron, Forestry Corps.
Captain H. J. Wilson, Forestry Corps.
Captain D. J. Perry, Forestry Corps.
Captain G. A. McNaughton, Forestry Corps.
Major D. J. Perry, Forestry Corps.
Major Burnett, Buxton.
Major V. J. Hastings, London.
Lieut.-Colonel J. A. Shaw, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel W. Simpson, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel R. Mudie, Witley.
Major A. P. Gillies, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel G. G. Corbett, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel J. A. Cooper, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel H. P. Malone, Wiley.
Captain S. P. South, Witley.
Major J. H. Brownlee, Witley.
Major L. T. Allan, Witley.
Lieutenant W. T. Foster, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel C. M. Graham, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel M. E. B. Cutcliffe, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel T. P. Rowlands, Witley.
Major C. S. Stafford, Witley.
Captain A. Fenton, Witley.
Major L. E. Harris, Witley.
Lieut.-Colonel B. M. Green, Witley.
Major F. E. Allen, Witley.
Lieutenant J. B. Maxted, London.
Lieut.-Colonel W. F. Kemp, Seaford.
Lieut.-Colonel R. E. Woodhouse, Woking.
Captain White, Basingstoke.
Lieutenant A. Rowley, London.
Captain W. M. Burke, Ashdown.
Lieut.-Colonel Balfour, Seaford.
Major H. P. Gorst, 72nd Battalion.
Captain McLean, Buxton.
Lieutenant C. H. Field, Buxton.
Captain A. G. Gordon, Buxton.
Major S. M. Fisher, Orpington.
Lieut.-Colonel W. D. Macpherson, Orpington.
Captain G. D. Blackadar, Knockando.
Lieut.-Colonel R. L. Christie, Seaford.
Lieut.-Colonel D. A. Clarke, Seaford.
Lieut.-Colonel W. L. Watt, Taplow.
Major E. S. Rogers, Epsom.
Major Woolly-Dodd, Epsom.
Lieutenant H. A. Fraser, 160th Infantry.
Major W. M. Hart, Lenham.
Major H. M. Cherry, London.
Major E. D. Hale, Shorncliffe.
Lieutenant J. G. Hayward, Shorncliffe.
Major J. M. McKinley, Shorncliffe.
Lieut.-Colonel A. L. Young, Shorncliffe.
Major W. L. Hutton, Shorncliffe.
Major Stayner-Ellis, Buxton.
Captain C. A. McDiarmid, Hospital.
Lieut.-Colonel W. T. McKinnon, Hospital.
Lieut.-Colonel McQueen, Hospital.

I have placed these names on Hansard in order to show that it was not in an

individual or isolated case that those frauds were committed, but that they were committed in practically every camp in which the votes of soldiers were taken. Deputy presiding officers, if my information is correct and I have no doubt of its correctness, —committed frauds and conspiracies simply to defeat the will of the people of the Dominion of Canada in the election held on the 17th of December, 1917.

I want to refer to the statement I made in regard to Charge No. 7. To prove that charge, I am going to read to the House some affidavits which I hold in my hand. The first is an affidavit made by Louis Edmund Guillet:

1, Louis Edmund Guillet a captain in the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the fifth division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—

1. I was duly appointed in writing Deputy Scrutineer by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters' Act 1917.

2. At or about 11.30 a.m. on Monday the 3rd day of December, 1917, I attended at the polling booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 125th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian election. I attended in my capacity as deputy scrutineer and I duly presented to the deputy presiding officer the document appointing me deputy scrutineer.

3. Prior to the military electors entering the said polling booth for the purpose of voting they had already received from some person in some place other than the polling booth the envelopes with the questions printed thereon known as form B of the Military Voters' Act, 1917, and in nearly every instance the answers to the said questions in the said envelopes had been filled in when they entered the said polling booth to vote.

4. The military electors handed the envelopes so filled up and signed, to the deputy presiding officer who administered the oath and took the vote. I called the attention of the deputy presiding officer to the fact of the envelopes being filled in before the voter entered the polling booth and I asked the deputy returning officer where the answers were being written out and signed and he replied "in the company's offices". He also stated to me that after reading over the Act he considered this way of proceeding to take the vote to be the correct one.

5. On the same day, Monday the 3rd December, 1917, I attended at the polling booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 156th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the same election. The same proceeding was being carried on at this polling booth namely, the military electors entered the said polling booth with envelopes already filled in outside the said polling booth, the oath was administered and the votes taken. I saw amongst others Lieut. Mason of the 156th Battalion attached to the 14th Canadian Infantry Brigade enter the polling booth with the answers to the printed questions on his envelope already filled in outside the said polling booth.

[Mr. Copp.]

6. On the same day, 3rd December, 1917, I attended as deputy scrutineer at the polling booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 14th, 15th and 16th Canadian field ambulance sections were to register their votes for the said election, I saw several military electors enter the said polling booth with the answers to the questions on their envelopes already filled in and this had been done in another room and not in the said polling booth, I pointed out to the deputy presiding officer the votes were being taken not in compliance with the Act of Parliament and objected to his acting in this manner. The deputy presiding officer then called in two clerks who then proceeded to write out the answers of the military electors on their envelopes. The deputy presiding officer then asked the military electors the questions and read out the written answers himself.

7. On the same day 3rd December, 1917, at about 3 p.m. I attended as deputy scrutineer at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised the 208th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the said election. I remained until 3.30 p.m. when the polling booth was closed. During this period about twenty military electors recorded their votes, they all brought into the said polling booth their envelopes with the answers to the printed questions thereon filled in outside the said polling booth and the deputy presiding officer in each case administered the oath and recorded the votes.

8. On the following day the 4th December, 1917, I again as deputy scrutineer attended the last-mentioned polling booth and the military electors were voting in the way described in the preceding paragraph hereof. I then asked the deputy presiding officer to put the following questions to each military elector, "Were you in Canada when you enlisted" and "How long have you lived there" but the deputy presiding officer refused to put the questions to the said military electors who afterwards came in to record their votes.

9. On the morning of Monday, the 3rd December, 1917, I attended at the polling booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 160th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the said election. I attended as deputy scrutineer and produced the document appointing me deputy scrutineer. No voting took place during the forenoon of that day. I attended at the same polling booth on the 4th December, 1917, when voting was being carried on in the following manner. Each military elector was handed his envelope with the printed questions thereon which he took out of the said polling booth and filled in the answers in an adjoining room or office and he then returned to the said polling booth when the deputy presiding officer administered the oath and recorded his vote. Shortly before 1.30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 4th of December, 1917, accompanied by the said William Thomas Rochester Preston, I again attended at the said polling booth. I identified the said William Thomas Rochester Preston to the said Lt.-Col. W. P. Malone as the person appointed as scrutineer by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Canadian Opposition but the said Lt.-Col. W. P. Malone denied the right of the said William Thomas Rochester Preston to remain in the said polling booth during the polling and ordered the said William Thomas Rochester Preston to leave the said polling booth which

the said William Thomas Rochester Preston refused to do and thereupon the said Lt.-Col. W. P. Malone called into the said polling booth the sergeant of the special guard and ordered the sergeant to bring in the guard and remove the said William Thomas Rochester Preston from the said polling booth and thereupon the said sergeant requested the said William Thomas Rochester Preston to leave the said polling booth which the said William Thomas Rochester Preston refused to do and thereupon the said Lt.-Col. W. P. Malone ordered the said sergeant to take the said William Thomas Rochester Preston to the guard house which he accordingly did assisted by the guard.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835.

(Sgd) Louis Edmund Guillet.

Declared at Witley Camp in the county of Surrey this 17th day of December, 1917, Before me,

Mr. Arthur Heywood,

A Commissioner for Oaths, etc., for use in Province of Ontario.

The next affidavit is as follows:

I, the undersigned, No. 417601, Eugene B. Bastien, R.Q.M.S. in the 150th Battalion C.E.F., Witley, declare the following knowing that the said Declaration has the same effect as one taken under oath:

The third day of December of the year nineteen hundred and seventeen (3. 12. 1917) acting as electoral agent for the polls of the 5th Division, I visited the following polls: Batt's 156, 161, 198, 208, 185 and A.S.C.

I first went to the 156th Battalion and notified the electors' agent, S.S.M. McKinnen, that the envelope containing the ballots were sealed in advance, before entering the poll, or at least filled in advance after the information I had. S.S.M. McKinnen told me that he knew about it and that an order had just been given to correct that mode of proceeding.

In poll of the 198th Battalion I, myself, noticed a soldier handing to the O.C. an envelope sealed before entering said poll the O.C. taking and putting said envelope in the bag placed there to that effect.

In the polls of the 158th and 208 Battalions, I could not get access to those polls and was told to get away.

DECLARED at Westminster in the County of Middlesex in the United Kingdom this nineteenth day of December, A.D., 1917.

Eugene B. Bastien.

Before me,

W. T. R. Preston,

A Commissioner for Oaths, etc., for use in the Courts of Ontario.

Mr. SHEARD: Can the hon. gentleman tell me where the 150th Battalion came from and who its commanding officer was?

Mr. COPP: I cannot say, but I could get the information for my hon. friend. It was a Canadian regiment, at all events.

Mr. SHEARD: Is it not a fact that the 150th Battalion was from the province of Quebec and was commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Barre?

Mr. GAUVREAU: That does not alter the case at all. We know what you have in your mind.

Mr. COPP: I do not know where the battalion came from, and I do not care. I am simply giving the facts.

Mr. CURRIE: Before whom were these oaths taken?

Mr. COPP: Before Mr. N. Arthur Heywood.

Mr. CURRIE: These are not affidavits under the law.

Mr. COPP: I will leave that legal point to my hon. friend.

Mr. CURRIE: I am lawyer enough to know that.

Mr. COPP: The other affidavits are as follows:

In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act as amended and affected by the War-time Elections Act, 1917, and the Military Voters' Act 1917.

And in the matter of the Election (1917) for the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purpose of the above Election.

I, William Brennan, a Corporal in the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—

1. I was duly appointed in writing Deputy Scrutineer by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters Act, 1917, to the 134th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

2. On Monday, the 3rd December, 1917, I attended at the Polling Booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the Military Electors comprised in the 134th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian election. I attended in my capacity as Deputy Scrutineer and I duly presented to the Deputy Presiding Officer the document appointing me Deputy Scrutineer.

3. I attended at the same polling booth on the 4th, 5th and 6th days of December, 1917.

4. Prior to the Military Electors entering the said polling booth for the purpose of voting they had already received from some person in some place other than the said polling booth the envelopes with the questions printed thereon known as Form B of the Military Voters Act, 1917, and in every instance on the said 3rd, 4th and 5th days of December, 1911, the answers to the said questions on the said envelopes had been filled in outside the said polling booth. On the said 6th day of December the answers had only been partially filled in when brought by the military electors into the said polling booth for the purpose of voting.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and

by virtue of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835.

DECLARED at Witley Camp, in the County of Surrey, this 17th day of December, 1917.

Wm. G. Brennan.

Before me,

N. Arthur Heywood,

A Commissioner for Oaths for use in the province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Dominion Election Act as amended and affected by the War-time Elections Act, 1917, and the Military Voters' Act, 1917.

And in the matter of the Elections (1917) for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above elections.

I, William Brennan, a Corporal in the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Force do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows, being supplementary to my previous declaration made on the 17th day of December in this matter.

At the polling booth referred to in my aforesaid declaration on the first three days of the voting, December 3rd, 4th and 5th, the deputy presiding officer or his clerk asked no questions of the men as provided for in Form B of the said Military Electors Act but simply swore them and handed them their ballots, but after that date, December 6th, 7th and 8th, questions were asked by the deputy presiding officer of the voter, as to his name, regimental number and whether the voter was a British subject, but these questions had been previously filled in outside the polling booth.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declaration Act, A.D., 1835.

DECLARED at Westminster in the County of Middlesex this 8th day of March, 1918 .

901401, William G. Brennan.

Before me,

W. T. R. Preston,

A Commissioner for Oaths for use in the Courts of the province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act as amended and affected by the War-time Elections Act, 1917, and the Military Voters' Act, 1917, and in the matter of the Elections (1917) for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada and in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above elections.

I, Wilfrid Docity Gaston Patenaude, a Sergeant in the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I was duly appointed in writing a Deputy Scrutineer by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters' Act, 1917.

2. On Monday the 3rd of December, 1917, I attended at the polling booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 161st Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian elections. I attended in my capacity of Deputy Scrutineer and I duly presented to the deputy presiding officer the document appointing me a Deputy Scrutineer.

[Mr. Copp.]

3. Prior to the military electors entering the said polling booth for the purpose of voting they had already received from some person in a place other than the polling booth the envelope with the questions printed thereon known as Form B of the Military Voters' Act, 1917, and afterwards the envelopes were brought in by an orderly from some outside office, three at a time, all filled in and handed by the orderly to the deputy presiding officer, who then signed them before the military electors came into the polling booth The secretary who was sitting near the deputy presiding officer examined the envelopes and made some entries on a sheet of paper. The military electors were then called in by name and each asked to swear that the answers to the questions were true. During the time I was at the polling booth about 750 voters recorded their votes in this way, and out of that number only about six looked at their answers written on the envelope before taking the oath. In several instances the military elector was handed his ballot and envelope while he was being sworn and in these cases he had no time to read over his answers on the envelope before taking the oath.

4. The deputy presiding officer in one case only asked any question of the military elector, viz: that of Private R. P. Garvey, No. 844495, who stated in answer to a question that he was an American citizen. I made an objection, and the deputy presiding officer then asked Private Garvey if he had enlisted in Canada, to which no reply was given, and the deputy presiding officer then turned to me and said, "Any one enlisted in the Canadian Army has a right to vote."

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Statutory Declarations' Act, 1835.

DECLARED at Witley Camp in the County of Surrey this 17th day of December, 1917.

W. D. Patenaude, Sgt.

Before me,

N. Arthur Heywood,

A Commissioner for Oaths for use in the province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act as amended and affected by the War-time Elections Act, 1917, and the Military Voters' Voters' Act, 1917.

And in the matter of the Elections (1917) for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada,

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above elections.

I, William McCoy, a Sergeant in the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I was duly appointed in writing a Deputy Scrutineer by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters' Act 1917.

2. At 9.30 on Monday, the 3rd day of December, 1917, I attended at the polling booth at Witley Camp, at which polling booth the Military electors comprised in the 125th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian election. I attended in my capacity of Deputy Scrutineer and I duly presented to the deputy presiding officer the document appointing me a Deputy Scrutineer.

3. Prior to the military electors entering the said booth for the purpose of voting they had already received from some person other than the polling booth the envelope with the questions printed thereon known as Form B of the Military Voters' Act 1917, and in nearly every instance the answers to the questions on the said envelopes had been filled in by the military electors when they then entered the said polling booth to vote.

4. The envelopes were then handed by the said military electors to the deputy presiding officer, who thereupon administered the oath as provided by the Acts, merely asking if the questions on the envelope were truly answered. The deputy presiding officer, after administering the oath, handed to each military elector his ballot paper. Each military elector then marked his ballot paper on the top of a box which was placed on the opposite side of the desk at which the deputy presiding officer sat, and which box was the only accommodation provided for the purpose, resulting in the fact that the voting of the military electors was not secret but was visible to those present in the polling booth.

5. About 11:30 a. m. on the said 3rd of December and whilst the said poll was proceeding in manner hereinbefore described, Captain Guillet, a deputy scrutineer, came to the said polling booth and in my presence pointed out to the said deputy presiding officer that the procedure hereinbefore recorded did not comply with the Act of Parliament, but notwithstanding the said objection the said deputy presiding officer continued to conduct the said polling in the manner hereinbefore recorded.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations' Act 1835.

DECLARED at Witley Camp, in the County of Surrey, this 17th day of December, 1917.

W. M. McCoy, Sgt.

Before me,

N. Arthur Heywood,

A Commissioner for Oaths for use in the province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act as amended and affected by the War Time Election Act 1917 ad the Military Voters Act 1917.

And in the matter of the Elections (1917) for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above elections.

I, Murdoch Edward Faulkner a Quarter-Master-Sergeant in the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I was duly appointed in writing a Deputy Scrutineer to the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters Act 1917.

2. On Monday the 3rd December 1917 I attended at the Polling Booth at Witley Camp at which Polling Booth the Military Electors comprised in the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian Election. I attended in my capacity as Deputy Scrutineer.

3. I attended at the same polling booth on the 4th and 5th days of December 1917.

4. Prior to the Military Electors entering the said polling booth for the purposes of voting they had already received from some person in some place other than the said polling booth the envelopes with the questions printed thereon known as Form B of the Military Voters Act 1917 and in every instance on the above dates the Military Electors brought in their envelopes with the answers completely filled up and this had been done outside the said polling booth.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Statutory Declaration Act 1835.

Declared at Westminster in the County of Middlesex this 19th day of December 1917.

(Sgd) M. E. FAULKNER.

Before me W. T. R. Preston, a Commissioner for Oaths etc. for use in the Courts of the Province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Dominion Election Act as amended and affected by the War Time Election Act 1917, and the Military Voters Act 1917.

And in the matter of the Election (1917) for the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above Election.

I, Thomas D. Macfarlane of 17 Victoria Street, London, S.W. Manufacturers Agent do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follow:

I was duly appointed in writing Deputy Scrutineer by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters Act, 1917, to act for and on behalf of him in the Polling Sub-division throughout the United Kingdom.

On Monday the 3rd December, 1917, I attended at Polling Booths in Whitley Camp particularly at the polling booth wherein the 156th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Reserve were to register their votes for the pending Canadian election, and I attended in my capacity of Deputy Scrutineer at the said polling booth.

On my arrival at the outside of the polling booth I saw officers and non-commissioned officers canvassing the men who were paraded in line waiting to vote and filling in the envelopes Form B for and on behalf of Military Electors and I found that a number of electors were entering this said 156th Battalion polling booth with the envelopes in their hands duly filled up. I accordingly entered the polling booth and announced to the Deputy Presiding Officer, Lieut.-Col. Graham, that I attended in my capacity as deputy scrutineer for the Opposition and I immediately directed his attention to the improper procedure then in vogue at that polling sub-division whereby the envelopes being part of the ballots were being improperly completed out of his possession and in the possession of persons outside the polling booth who were filling in the answers to the questions for Military electors who proposed voting thereon.

While I was present in the said polling booth one voter who had entered with his envelope duly filled up as hereinbefore stated was in the act of voting when I protested that the statements contained in the envelope must be filled in in the presence of the Presiding Officer and the scrutineer who was present for the purpose of learning and knowing what statements were being sworn to. The Presiding Officer informed me that this was unnecessary and voters were being sworn that the statements contained in the envelope were correct. I then requested

the scrutineers for the Opposition to make a note of all such votes recorded under these conditions and to enter a protest in each and every case, and demanded from the Presiding Officer that he note the protest of the official scrutineer for the Opposition.

I afterwards proceeded to the headquarters of the camp to interview the General Officer Commanding, Brigadier-General Hughes, who was not present. I therefore informed Colonel Parson who was acting on his behalf, and protested against this violation of the law which I had witnessed at said polling booth of the 156th Battalion. I also called upon the General Officer Commanding, General Meighan, of the Bramshott Camp, and informed him of what I had witnessed at the Whitley Camp. He at once issued an order that no such procedure would be permitted within his district and each Deputy Returning Officer was notified accordingly. I immediately communicated with the said William Thomas Rochester Preston the facts concerned with this improper procedure at this polling sub-division as well as others within the Whitley Camp area.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be correct and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835.

Declared at Westminster in the County of Middlesex this 22nd day of December, 1917.

(Sgd) T. D. Macfarlane.

Before me

(Sgd) W. T. R. Preston,

A Commissioner for Oaths for use in the Courts of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. SHEARD: Is the W. T. R. Preston, who, I understand, appointed the gentleman who made that affidavit the same W. T. R. Preston before whom the affidavit was sworn to?

Mr. COPP: I want to give my hon. friend (Mr. Sheard) all the information I have. Mr. Preston was appointed as agent for the Opposition to look after the interests of the Liberal party in connection with the overseas vote and he appointed different scrutineers to be present at the military polls when the vote was being taken.

Mr. SHEARD: They swore to the affidavit before the same gentleman?

Mr. COPP: The same gentleman. (Continues reading):

In the matter of the Dominion Election Act as amended and affected by the War Times Election Act, 1917, and the Military Voters Act, 1917.

And in the matter of the Elections (1917) for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above elections.

I, Hugh Patrick McKinnon, a Quarter-Master-Sergeant in the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I was duly appointed in writing a Deputy Scrutineer to the 156th Canadian Infantry Battalion by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters Act, 1917.

2. On Monday the 3rd December, 1917, I attended the polling booth at Witley Camp at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 156th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian election. I attended in my capacity of deputy scrutineer and I duly presented to the Deputy Presiding Officer the document appointing me a Deputy Scrutineer.

3. I attended at the same polling booth on Tuesday and Wednesday the 4th and 5th December, 1917.

4. On each day prior to the Military electors entering the said polling booth for the purposes of voting they had already received from some person in a place other than the said polling booth the envelopes with the questions printed thereon known as Form B of the Military Service Act, 1917, and in nearly every instance the answers to the questions on the said envelopes had been filled in by the military electors or some one on their behalf when they entered the said polling booth to vote. After objection was raised by Mr. Macfarlane and myself on the 3rd December, the questions relating to residence were asked by the Deputy Presiding Officer but in a few instances the answers had been only partially filled in.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835.

Declared at Westminster in the County of Middlesex this 19th day of December, 1917.

(Sgd) H. P. McKinnon.

Before me

(Sgd) W. T. R. Preston,

A Commissioner for Oaths, etc., for use in the Courts of the Province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Dominion Election Act as amended and affected by the War Time Election Act, 1917, and the Military Voters Act, 1917.

And in the matter of the Elections (1917) for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the Military Voters for the purposes of the above elections.

I, Duncan Syd Carmichael, a Lance-Corporal in the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I was duly appointed in writing a Deputy Scrutineer to the 104th Canadian Infantry Battalion by William Thomas Rochester Preston under and for the purposes of the Military Voters Act, 1917.

On Monday 3rd December, 1917, I attended at the polling booth at Witley Camp, at which polling booth the military electors comprised in the 104th Canadian Infantry Battalion were to register their votes for the pending Canadian election. I attended in my capacity of deputy scrutineer and I duly presented to the Lieutenant at the door of the polling booth the document appointing me a deputy scrutineer. He took this said document into the polling booth and he refused to allow me to enter the said polling booth and the voting continued without my being allowed to be present as a scrutineer on behalf of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Opposition. The reason given to me by the

said Lieutenant for refusing me admittance was that the Deputy Presiding Officer of the said polling booth had no official information of the appointment of the said William Thomas Rochester Preston as Scrutineer.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835.

Declared at Westminster in the County of Middlesex, this 19th day of December, 1917.

(Sgd) Duncan S. Carmichael.

Before me

(Sgd) W. T. R. Preston,

A commissioner for Oaths, etc., for use in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed these affidavits before the House for the purpose of showing that these cases were not a few individual and isolated ones, and to demonstrate the manner in which the taking of the soldiers' vote was conducted in the Mother Country—those soldiers whom we spent our time here pledging ourselves to protect, and that advantage was taken by officials appointed by somebody—whoever was responsible for that election—to commit these wrongdoings. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House for its consideration, and I feel that the time occupied in doing so is amply justified when I present such facts as these.

Now I wish to refer to clause 8 of the charges alleging

That Opposition scrutineers were prevented from attending certain polling booths while the military vote was being allocated.

That has been covered in part by the affidavit of Mr. Guillet which I have already read, and also in the last clause of Mr. Carmichael's declaration which I have just finished reading:

I want to place before the House another affidavit dealing with the charge that the scrutineer of the Liberal party was forced out of a polling booth and the vote taken in said military polling booth without any representative of the Opposition being there, as provided by the Military Voters Act:

In the matter of the Dominion Election Act as amended and affected by the War Time Election Act, 1917, and the Military Voters Act, 1917.

And in the matter of the election (1917) for the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada.

And in the matter of the military voters for the purposes of the above election.

I, William Thomas Rochester Preston of "Kempshott", London Road, Norbury, in the county of Surrey, England, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—

1. Pursuant to the Military Voters Act 1917 I was appointed scrutineer for and on behalf of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Canadian Opposition in respect of the military voting to take place in the United Kingdom of Great Britain for the pending election of members to the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada, and I have duly complied with all the provisions of the said Act appertaining to a scrutineer.

2. Notice of my said appointment was duly published in the General Military Orders issued by General Turner, commanding the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in London, and as scrutineer I have visited the polling booths at Witley Camp on several occasions with the approval of the commandant of the said Fifth Division, Brigadier General Hughes.

3. Pursuant to the power vested in me under the said Military Voters Act, 1917, I duly appointed (inter alia) the following persons as deputy scrutineers:

(a) Sergeant Patenaude of the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(b) Lance-Corporal D. S. Carmichael, of the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(c) Q-Master H. L. McKinnon, of the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(d) Corporal M. D. Kennedy, of the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(e) Corporal W. C. Brennan, of the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(f) Q-Master M. E. Falkner, of the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(g) Captain L. E. Guillet, of the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

(h) Sergeant McCoy, of the 185th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

4. From each of the said deputy scrutineers I received from time to time complaints of illegalities sanctioned and committed by the Deputy Presiding Officer at the polling booths at which they respectively attended in their capacity as scrutineers. At my request the said Deputy Scrutineers have made legal declarations of some of the said illegalities.

5. In addition to the illegalities referred to in the preceding paragraph many more illegalities of a similar nature have occurred legal evidence as to which is now in process of being collected.

6. As an illustration of the high handed illegal treatment to which I and some of the Deputy Scrutineers appointed by me have been subjected by certain of the Deputy Returning Officers, I desire to record the following facts:—

On Tuesday morning the 4th December 1917 I attended the said Polling Booth at Witley Camp wherein the Military Electors of the 208th Canadian Infantry Battalion were recording their votes. I had previously been informed that on Monday the 3rd December 1917 the day preceding my regularly appointed Scrutineer Captain Guillet in the said polling booth had been refused permission to remain during the voting. I produced letters from Lieutenant Colonel Purney the deputy of the clerk of the Crown in Chancery establishing my identity to the Deputy Presiding Officer Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone but he refused to acknowledge my right to be present and ordered me to withdraw from the said polling booth and on my refusing to comply with his directions he declared the poll to be closed.

7. Having ascertained that the said poll was to be reopened in the said polling booth at the hour of 1.30 p.m. on the said 4th December 1917 I returned to the said polling booth accompanied by Captain Guillet of the 150th Canadian Infantry Battalion of the 5th Division of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces one of the Deputy Scrutineers appointed by me as aforesaid and he in my presence and in the

presence of the said Deputy Presiding Officer the said Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone identified me to the said Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone as Mr. W. T. R. Preston the Scrutineer appointed by the said Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Canadian Opposition under the said Military Voters Act 1917. The said Captain Guillet had previously complained to me that he had been prevented from remaining at the said polling Booth by the said Deputy Presiding Officer Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone. Notwithstanding the production by me of the said letter from Lieutenant Colonel Purney and the identification of me by the said Captain Guillet the said Deputy Presiding Officer, Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone denied my right to remain in the said polling booth during the polling therein and ordered me to leave the said polling booth which I refused to do, and thereupon the said Deputy Presiding Officer the said Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone called in to the said polling booth a sergeant of the special guard which was in attendance and ordered the said sergeant to bring in the guard and remove me from the said polling booth. The said Sergeant then requested me to leave the said polling booth which I refused to do and thereupon the said Deputy Presiding Officer the said Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Malone addressing the said Sergeant said "Remove this man and take him to the Guard House". Accordingly the Sergeant seized me forcibly and removed me from the said polling booth and accompanied by the said Sergeant the said guard with fixed bayonets conducted me to the Guard House and placed me in an inner room used as a detention cell where there were incarcerated a number of soldiers, charged with military offences. I was detained in the said Guard House for a period of about two and a half hours when, escorted by a guard under command of an officer I was marched to General Headquarters a distance of about one mile where I was received in the first instance by Major Green and who was astonished to hear of the treatment to which I had been subjected. At my request in confirmation of the facts heretofore declared to by me as to my arrest I received through the said Major Green a memorandum in the following terms:

"To the 13th Canadian Inf. Batt.

4, XII, 1917.

"Mr. W. T. R. Preston who has been officially appointed a Scrutineer in connection with the Dominion Elections (Vide D.O.C.R.O. 2842) has permission to enter polling booths within this Camp area.

(Signed) Major Green,
D. A. A. & Q.M.G.
5th Canadian Division.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations in this behalf.

(Signed) W. T. R. Preston.

Declared before me at Ottawa in the County of Carleton this 21st day of May, 1918.

(Signed) D. C. Ross,
A Commissioner for Oaths.

Mr. Speaker, that affidavit, together with that part of the affidavits of Mr. Guillet and Mr. Carmichael that deals with this particular matter, proves beyond question paragraph 8 as set forth in the charges.

The next charge, No. 10, refers to the questions on the envelopes being partially filled in and signed and sealed by the deputy presiding officer, and each containing a ballot marked for the Government being in circulation for the perpetration of the charges hereinbefore mentioned. I hold in my hand an envelope, under Form B, signed by Lieutenant W. C. Bryan, deputy presiding officer. This envelope is an exact copy of an envelope that was found during the counting and allocating of the soldiers' votes in England. The ballot within was initialled and the envelope, with several of the questions answered, was signed by the deputy returning officer, but the name of the soldier voter was left blank.

I now wish to read an affidavit made by W. D. Spence, in regard to this:

In the matter of the Elections for the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada holden in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, December 1st-17, 1917, under the provisions of the Military Voters Act, A.D. 1917.

I, William David Spence, of the City of Calgary, in the Province of Alberta, Canada, accountant and Special Returning Officer in the matter herewith, make oath and say:

That in my capacity as Special Returning Officer I received from ballot box 152 an envelope sealed with the following endorsements thereon, the answers being to questions (2) "Pte."....(3) "21st Alberta Reserve" (4) "Yes" and second part of question 4 "No". "Dated this 10th day of December 1917, (Sd.) W. C. Bryan, Lieut.-Deputy Presiding Officer."

Upon opening the envelope I found a ballot therein marked in compartment (2) "I vote for the Government" with a cross heavily marked in lead pencil.

I make this Affidavit on my soul conscientiously believing the statements herein to be true by virtue and under the provisions of Act of Parliament passed for this purpose A.D. 1835.

W. D. Spence.

Sworn before me in the city of Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, England, this sixth day of March, A.D. 1918.

(Sd.) W. T. R. Preston,
Commissioner for taking oaths,
&c., &c., &c.

That goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, that there was an effort made, and not only made, but carried into effect, that envelopes were taken and filled in and signed by a returning officer with the name of the elector left blank and the ballot placed inside the envelope marked "for the Government" for the purpose of finding the name of some elector that could be written in at the last moment, and the envelope placed in the ballot box. This is another irregularity,

another fraud, in the conspiracy to defeat the will of the Canadian people in the elections.

Mr. Speaker, the next charge (No. 11) is:

That military electors were canvassed by superior officers in direct contravention of the King's regulations and orders, and were directed how they should mark their ballots.

I have here a statement—not an affidavit or declaration—made by a gentleman who has already given an affidavit, Mr. T. D. Macfarlane, one of the scrutineers for the Opposition in that election. It reads:

As your representative in the United Kingdom as scrutineer, I beg to report conditions as I found them through the northern part of England at hospitals where Canadian votes were taken, also at Canadian hospitals and other centres.

At the first southern General Hospital, Birmingham, in charge of Capt. J. M. Suttie, Deputy Presenting Officer for the Union Government, I found votes were taken in the various wards, envelopes filled and prepared for the voter in the presence of other voters and instructions given to the voter where to mark his cross, indicating the space opposite Union Government. This applies also to the 21st Southern General Hospital, the First Birmingham War Hospital and the 2nd Birmingham War Hospital under the direction of Lieut. C. E. Haywood, presiding officer.

I next visited the Canadian Discharge Depot, Buxton, presiding officers—Lieut-Colonel A. R. Hanson, Capt. A. Maclean, Lieut. F. W. Lock, Capt. A. D. Gordon, Lieut. C. E. Field.

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps my hon. friend would allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. COPP: Go ahead.

Mr. BUTTS: What percentage of the votes of the soldiers in the trenches did you get in Westmorland?

Mr. COPP: Mr. Speaker, I may say to my hon. friend that if he will consult the returning officer's return, which was brought down, and of which I think he has a copy, he will find exactly the number I received from the soldiers in France.

Mr. BUTTS: I have it here.

Mr. COPP (reading):

I interviewed a number of the soldiers at the depot and from all I learned that a general canvass had been made with a view of arranging voting and the placing of districts in which votes would be applied; among the number canvassed was a young man of 19 who gave me his name as Malcolm, of Vancouver, who joined the Artillery at Victoria, B.C. He mistook me for a representative of the Union Government and gave me the following information: That all of them were supporting the Union Government, and that a large number of them had arranged that their votes would be applied in whatever constituency they were required at the last moment and said they were to be applied in Quebec, but the district would not be selected until they knew where these votes were needed in order to defeat an Opposition candidate.

I also interviewed a soldier in the Canadian army who said that when in Canada he lived at Oxbow and Alameda, Saskatchewan, but left there in 1906 and lived in America until he joined the Army and that he was requested to name Wentworth as the district in which his vote would be recorded.

At the Crescent Hotel, Buxton, where I was stopping, the proprietor and a guest were discussing the Canadian Election Act. I was brought into the conversation by a reference from the guest who inquired of me if elections were conducted in Canada on the same lines as they were carried on here. These men stated that the arrangement enabled the soldier from any part of Canada to register his vote where desired by the Presiding Officer, when I replied that the voter was only entitled to a vote for the candidate in the district in which he had lived. In answer to this guest informed me that he had discussed the matter with officers in charge of the voting; this was verified by the proprietor of the hotel in which they said that officers of the Canadian army informed them that by this method they were going to defeat any candidate they chose, and the whole subject appeared to be a huge joke to the officers discussing it. It appeared to be common knowledge of residents who came in contact with officers or other members of the Canadian army.

I also visited the two Canadian hospitals at Buxton and in conversation with voters I learned that the general arrangements of conducting the vote for the Union Government were so pronounced that those desiring to vote otherwise could not do so fearing detection and disapproval of the Staff generally. At most of the Canadian hospitals and other places conducted by the Canadian officials there was an absence of the necessary list of candidates posted; but in nearly every case there was the usual literature for campaign purposes posted on the gates and on the building—one of these posters stating that "Germany was praying for the defeat of the Union Government—Vote for the Union Government and furnish recruits to relieve our men at the front".

I visited two British hospitals in Manchester where Canadian soldiers voted. A similar condition to the Birmingham hospital was carried on there.

I also visited a number of Canadian Lumber Camps in Inverness district, including 107, 110, and 121. The polling had taken place in all these camps before I reached there, but in conversation with various soldiers a general impression in almost every case was the necessity of supporting the Government by which they were employed.

From the Canadian Camps I went to Aberdeen and there visited the Old Mill Hospital which only contained a very small number of Canadians. One Canadian, by the name of Emery, stated that there was no choice of candidates as the Deputy Presiding Officer informed him in which space to make his cross—opposite the Union Government. I also visited the 1st Scottish General Hospital, Aberdeen, and found pretty much the same conditions.

I then visited the 1st Scottish General Hospital in Edinburg. Polling had been completed and the information regarding the conduct of the voting was on the same lines as the other hospitals. This also applies to the 3rd and 4th Scottish General Hospitals of Glasgow.

At Buxton, hereinbefore mentioned, I was credibly informed by soldiers and civilians that on the Sunday prior to the voting at Buxton that the Chaplain connected with the Canadians stated during the service that some people might say that he had no right to advise them how to vote, but for such people he "didn't care a damn", that he was doing his duty in advising every soldier to vote in support of the Union Government.

Throughout the entire district covered by me in the north of England and Scotland as well as districts nearer London, I found a prevailing existence of coercion and a feeling of fear of detection of being discovered in supporting the Opposition and in many cases was told by Liberals that they must not be seen in my company as it would be serious for them if detected as they knew the feeling of the officers whom they were under in regard to those who were not supporting the Union Government.

If a Court of Inquiry is held sworn testimony can be furnished to corroborate all the statements made herein.

Yours sincerely,

T. D. Macfarlane.

That is the statement in regard to charge No. 11. Charge No. 12 was:

That military electors in non-combatant regiments were threatened with transfer to fighting line regiments if they did not mark their ballots for the Government in the presence of and in the manner prescribed by the Deputy Presiding Officer.

I have on that, Mr. Speaker, two affidavits, which I desire to place before the House to prove to what lengths the presiding officers and those in charge of the taking of the soldier's vote in England would go for the purpose of carrying their point. The first affidavit is as follows:

I, the undersigned, No. 2245479 Pte. Darcy D., make the following statement:—

While a private with the 403rd Forestry Battalion, at Sunningdale the Adjutant of the same Battalion called me in his Office and told me: "Darcy, you are going to vote and in this Battalion the vote is an open vote.

Now I want you to vote for the Government or else, you will have to go from here." I answered "I will vote for Laurier for in the past I always voted for Laurier and every member of my family and more than that I am against conscription." The Adjutant told me: "I am giving you an order to vote for the Government and hurry up vote here (pointing the reserve space No. 2 in the ballot): If you refuse to vote here as indicated, you will be transferred to an English infantry battalion, and more than that you can be punished." So I had to vote for the Government against my will.

After having read the said statement and knowing that the above declaration has the same effect as one taken under oath, I have signed.

(Signed) Dona Darcy,

Witness,
E. B. Bastien.

198th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

[Mr. Copp.]

Here is another affidavit in proof of the same statement:

I, the undersigned, No. 2245525, Pte. Audy, make the following statement:

While a private with the 43rd Forestry Battalion at Sunningdale the Adjutant of the same battalion called me in his office and said to me "Audy, are you going to vote for the Germans or for the Government?" To that question, I answered, "Sir, I am going to vote for Laurier." The said Adjutant then said: "If you do vote for Laurier, you will immediately be transferred to an English infantry battalion; you know that you are afraid of an infantry battalion by the fact that you cannot drill." I answered: "Sir, you can send me anywhere you like, but I am going to vote for Laurier just the same . . . you can put me in the clink if you care to do so, but you cannot change my vote and I am going to vote for Laurier." Then the adjutant sent me back to my hut. After a few minutes, Sergeant Lalende came to see me and addressed me in this way: "Audy, do not make a fool of yourself; vote for the Government, and everything will be all right and you will stay with us." I answered "You can do and they can do what they like, but I am going to vote for Laurier." Sergeant Lalende then took me to the adjutant's office and this last gentleman told me: "You know that there is nothing like a secret vote here. The vote is an open one and you are going to vote here (pointing out the reserve space marked No. 2 on the ballot). The adjutant giving me an order, I was forced to vote and I did vote for the Government. After that, the said adjutant told me, "Now, Audy, get ready, for you are already transferred to the 156th Battalion, where I am now." The same intimidation was given to many soldiers for getting their votes for the Government and some of them were transferred to some infantry battalion.

After explanation made to me of the said declaration and knowing that the said declaration has the same effect as one taken under oath, I have signed.

(Signed) Joseph Audy,

Witness,
E. B. Bastien.

156th Canadian Infantry Battalion.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have shouted themselves hoarse in eloquent speeches on behalf of the young men who have gone to the front to fight the battles of the Empire and to save Canada from the Hun; yet, according to this evidence which I have submitted, their agents have taken these soldiers by the throat and forced them to vote according to the will or caprice of an officer overseas, notwithstanding the fact that the soldiers in question wanted to vote for Laurier.

This charge is that military electors who at first refused to vote as they were requested, but afterwards did so under compulsion, were, nevertheless, removed to infantry regiments proceeding to the fighting line. That charge is substantiated in the two affidavits which I have just read. In these cases officers forced certain soldiers to vote

in favour of the Government, intimating that if they did not do so they would be transferred to fighting battalions. Then, when these soldiers under coercion did vote for the Government, the officers did not keep faith with them, but transferred them to fighting battalions. How is it that the Deputy Presiding Officer can thus transfer these men to fighting battalions and send them into the front line trenches, unless he is in league with the Canadian Headquarters Staff in London.

The next charge is No. 14: that military electors were not afforded facilities for the proper observance of the secrecy of the ballot, as provided by section 9, subsection (e) of the Military Voters' Act, I wish to refer again to that part of the Military Voters' Act, because it was in the mind of members of this House when that Act was passed that the same secrecy should be observed in the taking of the soldiers' votes as should be observed in taking the votes of civilians in this country. The clause relating to secrecy is as follows:

> The ballot paper shall be marked in the presence of the Deputy Presiding Officer and deputy scrutineers present, or military electors acting in their stead, but in such manner as not to disclose to them or to any other person any marking thereon.

The law, therefore, distinctly provides that the ballot shall be marked by the elector himself in such a way that no one can see what mark is being made. In the declaration which I have read I think I have proved, Sir, that the spirit and letter of the law in that respect have not been carried out; that secrecy was absolutely thrown to the winds; that the soldiers were not permitted to give a secret vote as provided by the Act.

The next charge is No. 15: that scrutineers appointed in behalf of the Government were sworn in as scrutineers for the Opposition by deputy presiding officers in polling booths where extensive frauds were practised owing to the Opposition not having bona fide representatives therein. I have a statement to submit to the House with regard to that. The Act provides that the Opposition and the Government have the right to appoint deputy scrutineers and these scrutineers have the right to attend the different military polls held where the votes of the soldiers are being taken. Let us see how fairly this provision was carried out. I submit that this is but another link in the chain of conspiracy which was carried on to win the last election. I wish to read the following documents:

Dominion of Canada.

Military Voters' Act, 1917.

Appointment of Deputy Scrutineer.

By virtue of the powers vested in me by the Military Voters' Act, 1917, I hereby appoint No. 9421, Act.-Sgt. Burrows, A.R., as my deputy.

(Signed) A. T. Thompson, Lt.-Col.
Scrutineer.

Dominion of Canada.

Military Voters' Act, 1917.

Appointment of Deputy Scrutineer.

By virtue of the powers vested in me by the Military Voters' Act, 1917, I hereby appoint No. 2304031, Act.-Sgt. Dow, J. N., as my deputy.

(Signed) A. T. Thompson, Lt.-Col.
Scrutineer.

I want hon. gentlemen to remember the names of these men appointed as deputy scrutineers: one was Sergeant Dow, and the other was Sergeant Burrows. The following oath was taken by Deputy Scrutineer Dow:

Oath to be Taken by Deputy Scrutineer or Military Elector Representing Party.

I, the undersigned, J. N. Dow, a Deputy Scrutineer or Military Elector (as the case may be) under the Military Voters' Act, 1917, representing the Opposition Party, do swear that I will keep secret the votes cast by any of the voters at the polling stations at which I acted as such representative.

So help me God,

Sworn before me at Knockando this first day of December, 1917.

(Signed) George D. Blackadon,
Capt. O.C., 106 Coy.
Deputy Presiding Officer.

The same oath was taken by Sergeant A. B. Burrows:

I, the undersigned, A. R. Burrows, sergeant, deputy scrutineer or military elector (as the case may be) under the Military Voters' Act, 1917, representing the Government party, do swear that I will keep secret the votes cast by any of the voters at the polling stations at which I acted as such representative. So help me God.

Sworn before me at Knockando this First day of December, 1917.

(Sgd.) George D. Blackadon,
Capt. O.C. 106 Coy.
Deputy Presiding Officer.

The point to which I desire to draw the attention of the House is that Lieut.-Col. Thompson, who was a recognized scrutineer and representative of the Government in taking the overseas votes, appoints two men to act as scrutineers, one of whom is sworn in as representing the Government, and the other is sworn in as representing the Opposition, fraudulently to get over the Act which provides that the Government can have a scrutineer and that the Opposition can have a scrutineer. It is abundantly evident that that was a link in the conspiracy to ensure that the Opposition party had no legal authorized scrutineer or representative in the different poll-

ing booths where the soldiers' votes were being taken.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did I catch the initials of Lieut.-Col. Thompson as "A.T."?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the hon. member know who he is?

Mr COPP: I do.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Col. Andy Thompson?

Mr. COPP: I know him well.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A member of this House for years; a gentleman of high standing.

Mr. COPP: I am not discussing the high standing of the gentleman. I am not here to discuss or to debate, or to say an ill word of any individual; I am placing before the House the facts as I have them; and if Lieut.-Col. Thompson—I care not how high his record is, nor how long he sat in this House—took part in a conspiracy to defeat the will of the people of this country, he is not worthy of being sent to represent the Government in looking after the taking of the votes of the soldiers overseas. I have no doubt of the truth of the evidence which I have under my hand, and it is true, that Lieut.-Col. Thompson, under the Military Voters' Act, under which authority he was acting at that time, had no authority and no right to appoint scrutineers to represent the Liberal party. It was beneath the dignity of any honourable citizen, to thus appoint a representative to act on behalf of the Opposition party led by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), particularly when Lieut.-Col. Thompson was overseas representing the Government party to which my right hon. friend was opposed.

The appointment of another deputy scrutineer reads:

By virtue of the powers vested in me by the Military Voters' Act, 1917, I hereby appoint Harry Stevens, corporal, as my deputy.
(sgd) A. T. Thompson, Lt.-Col. Scrutineer.

Let me see what the oath says:

Oath to be taken by deputy scrutineer or military elector representing party.

I, the undersigned, Harry Stevens, Corporal, a deputy scrutineer or military elector (as the case may be) under the Military Voters' Act, 1917, representing the Opposition party, do swear that I will keep secret the votes cast by any of the voters at the polling stations at which I acted as such representative.

Sworn before me at Buxton, Derbyshire, this 29th day of November, 1917.

(Sgd.) Philip Burnett,
Deputy Presiding Officer.

This is a soldier who was appointed by Lt.-Col. Thompson, who represented the Government . That was another case where Lt.-Col Thompson appointed a scrutineer who was afterwards sworn in as scutineer for the Opposition. I am not here to say what was Lt.-Col. Thompson's intention when in these appointments he appoints two scrutineers, one sworn in as representing the Opposition party and the other sworn in as representing the Government party. I am here to place that fact before the House, and I appeal to every hon. member here who wants to be straightforward and honest in winning an election: Would he feel that he was doing the right thing if he went into his opponent's constituency and appointed a scrutineer to act for his opponent and look after his interests during an election campaign or during the polling of the votes in that particular constituency on election day? That is not his prerogative; that is not his right, and I cannot come to any other conclusion than that any gentleman who takes such a course is abusing his right and privilege for the purpose of endeavouring to make it appear to the presiding officer that the Opposition party, as well as the Government party, was being represented when, as a matter of fact, only one party was being represented, and that was by men who were appointed and sworn in by and at the instigation and request of Lt.-Col. A. T. Thompson, who was representing the Government and not the Opposition.

I come next to charge No. 16:

That election campaign literature which was dishonest and untruthful was circulated among the military electors with the authority and by the direction of Lord Beaverbrook, and that the said Lord Beaverbrook was an active participant in the hereinbefore mentioned fraudulent practices.

We have already heard in this House during this session a statement by the leader of the Opposition, speaking on the Address, when he referred to the taking of the soldiers' votes and the literature connected therewith and exhibited to this House a photograph that had been taken of a polling booth on which were election posters directing the electors how they should cast their votes. As that phase of the case will be taken up by some other hon. members who will follow me, I shall not take up the time of the House in referring to it, as that would only mean repetition. I am not going to discuss that phase of the question any more than to say that the information I have and the literature I have seen convince me beyond a

doubt that that statement is absolutely correct.

In reference to the next charge, No. 17:

That Lord Brooke, formerly Commander of the Canadian Forces, was also a participant in the said fraudulent practices.

I have not personal knowledge as to Lord Brooke's domicile before he went overseas during this war; I only have the information from friends. I understand that Lord Brooke was a resident of and domiciled in Calgary, Alberta; but I find from a record that Lord Brooke, a gentleman whom I do not know but who, from his name, I would judge is a man of some substance and standing—he received his title anyway before this matter came up in discussion yesterday—did not vote in the constituency in which I am informed he lived, but he voted in Provencher, in the province of Manitoba, a constituency in which he had no legal qualification to vote. I only give the House the information I have. I do not personally know what his domicile was; but if he was domiciled in Calgary before he went overseas, he had no right under the Military Voters' Act to select a constituency in the province of Manitoba wherein to cast his vote, and if he did so, that must have been for one purpose, namely, because he thought his vote in that particular constituency in the province of Manitoba would be of more benefit to the Government party than his vote in the city of Calgary.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the rank of Lord Brooke?

Mr. COPP: Brigadier-General Lord Brooke.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is right. He never lived in Calgary.

Mr. CURRIE: Lord Brooke is domiciled in Great Britain and he enlisted there. He is the son of the Earl of Warwick, and he has a perfect right under the law to vote in any riding, wherever he designates. I do not think my hon. friend should drag that gentleman's name into the discussion.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience, he will have all the opportunity possible of replying to me. I am trying to put this on Hansard as carefully as I can, but I shall be pleased to give all the information I can to any hon. member.

Mr. CURRIE: There is a rule of the House that no hon. gentleman can rise in his place and impugn the soldiers.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend has no right to interrupt me in my argument.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Westmorland has the floor and may not be interrupted to put a question to him, except with his permission. I do not know of any rule such as that to which the hon. member (Mr. Currie) has referred.

Mr. COPP: I have no desire to avoid answering any question, but I trust my hon. friend will not think me discourteous if I go on with my argument.

Sir SAM HUGHES: On what authority does my hon. friend say that Lord Brooke was located at Calgary?

Mr. COPP: I do not say anything of the kind. I said I had been told by a number of persons that Lord Brooke's domicile was in the city of Calgary, and I therefore contend that he had no right under the Military Voters' Act to cast his vote in the constituency of Provencher, in the province of Manitoba.

The next charge is as follows:

That letters mailed through the Canadian Army Branch of the British Post Office, addressed to military electors, in which was enclosed campaign literature on behalf of the Opposition, were opened, and the said literature was removed therefrom before the said letters were delivered to the military electors, to whom they were addressed, and the delivery of the said letters was also systematically delayed by the said post office authorities.

The evidence I have on that point is that envolopes containing letters and literature were mailed in the city of London to the soldiers who were in the different camps there and also in France. These letters were returned after the election, some of them marked "Unknown" and others marked in different ways. But strange to say, the envelopes had been opened and the literature extracted and then the envelope sealed up again. If the post office system in London is anything similar to the Canadian system, an odd letter might go astray, but surely it is not chance when such a large number of letters, all mailed to people of the same class, should be returned. But that is the information I have, and if it is true, it is but another link in the chain of conspiracy prevailing at the time the soldiers votes were being taken. I wrote a number of letters myself in the month of November last to military electors from my constituency, and while I did not get replies from all, I got replies from a large number of soldiers, and almost without exception they said that they had not received the letters until two or three, and in some cases ten, days after the election.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What date in November were the letters sent?

Mr. COPP: On the 7th.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I had a similar experience.

Mr. COPP: That does not in any way detract from the statement I have made. As I have pointed out, these letters containing literature were returned, and not only that, but in every case the envelopes had been opened and the literature extracted, so I do not see how it could be all chance work. It seems as if there was some prearranged plot by which the literature was to be extracted, and if that is so, I say it is a shame and a disgrace that the post office, which is the channel through which the people of this country communicate with their relatives overseas, should be made a part of a conspiracy to defeat the will of the Canadian people in an election.

Now I want to refer to charge No. 19:

That ballot boxes and bags contained a number of ballot envelopes tightly folded together in parcels or wads too large to have been inserted in the said bags or boxes through the proper aperture, and, in addition bearing dates showing that the votes had been polled not on the same day, but at intervals of time.

We know that the ballot box or bag was described in the Act, and that in the top of the ballot box there was an aperture through which the votes had to be placed. I have not had the privilege of seeing one of the bags that were used overseas, but I presume some similar aperture was provided, and I have affidavits here from a number of individuals which go to show that large numbers of envelopes containing ballots and when found in the bags were folded together, the parcel being of such a size that it was impossible for them to have been placed in the bag through the aperture. Let me read the affidavit of Lemuel E. Prowse:

In the matter of the elections for the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada held in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, December 1st, 1917, under the provisions of the Military Voters' Act, A.D. 1917.

I, Lemuel E. Prowse, of the city of Charlottetown, in the province of Prince Edward Island, in the Dominion of Canada, Merchant and special returning officer under appointment by the Governor General in Council, make oath and say:

1. That on the 26th day of January I assisted with my poll clerk, P. J. Bernard, in opening ballot bag No. 182 commonly termed a ballot box, for the purpose of counting the said ballots in connection with the said election and believed, from the appearance of the contents of the said bag or box, that the parcels of envelopes and ballots had not been legally inserted in the said bag or box, and with the said P. J. Bernard signed a certificate in the following words: "We, the undersigned, agree that the unused ballots in this bag appeared in such large rolls that in our opinion they could not have been inserted into the bag by the small aperture."

The term by "the small aperture" means the aperture provided in the top of the bag under the provisions of the Act of Parliament governing this matter.

I make this affidavit on my soul conscientiously believing the statements herein to be true by virtue and under the provisions of Act of Parliament passed for this purpose A.D. 1835

L. E. Prowse.

Sworn before me in the city of Westminster in the county of Middlesex, England this day of March A.D. 1918.

W.T.R.P.

Commisioner for taking oath for use in the province of Ontario, Canada.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, is an affidavit made by William David Spence:

I, William David Spence, of the city of Calgary, in the province of Alberta, Canada, accountant and special returning officer in the matter herewith, make oath and say:

That in the matter of a ballot box or bag No. B 174 of which polling subdivision Major W. Graham Cunningham, 1st Canadian Cavalry Depot, East Sandling, and which said bag I assisted in opening on the 28th day of January, 1918, which had been formerly protested as having appeared to have been opened and which was subsequently ordered to be opened and the contents allocated to the proper constituencies by Lieut.-Col. Purney, I found that the contents of the said bag contained parcels of tightly folded ballot envelopes which could not possibly go through the aperture in the top of the bag provided under the provisions of the Military Voters' Act. One of these said parcels taken from the bag and tightly folded together was as follows:

Reginald H. Dessey, 52447, dated December 6th, 1917; Chas. Croft, 71794, dated December 6th, 1917; Arthur G. Weeks, 186798, dated December 11th, 1917; Arthur Fenn, 1431, dated December 5th, 1917.

There were four ballot envelopes tightly folded together and impossible to be inserted in the bag through the aperture provided for that purpose. Two of them were dated December 6, one December 11, and another December 5, three different dates and these ballots were all folded together. What story does that tell to the members of this House, what story does it tell to the people of this country, what story must it tell to the soldiers overseas whom we did our best to protect and whose votes were simply taken and put into the bag or box illegally? Will the Canadian people believe that the soldiers' vote was taken in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Military Service Act?

Another parcel folded in like manner contained the following envelopes:

Herbert Hunt, 460750, dated December 7th, 1917; Archie M. Penny, 420772, dated December 7th, 1917; Fred F. Fletcher, 115062, dated December 6th, 1917; Fred Jones, 172022, dated December 7th, 1917.

There is another bundle bearing two different dates, one the 6th and the other the 7th December.

Another parcel tightly folded together contained the following ballot envelopes:

John V. Bateman, 1001054; Alex. S. Deacons, 871023; David Home, 1249; James Cox, 875175; Wm. McMorran, 115480; Edward H. Birch, 210877; Jos. F. LeFontaine, 34360.

There were seven ballot envelopes tightly folded together in one parcel and impossible to be inserted in the bag in the proper and legal manner. Further:

That on the date aforesaid I further assisted in opening bag or box 51 of which Major Armand Smith, Witley Camp, was deputy presiding officer. That the said bag contained parcels of ballot envelopes folded together tightly and too large to be inserted in the aperture provided by law in the top of the said bag, that one of the said parcels contained the following ballot envelopes:

E. S. Clarke, 721721, dated December 14th; G. B. Cowper, 874413, dated December 7th; G. A. Nelson, 460585, dated December 12th; C. F. Thompson, 186257, dated December 12th; C. Moore, 71411, dated December 12th; G. T. Bell, 187753, dated December 14th; T. C. Perry, 874602, dated December 8th.

There were seven different envelopes tightly folded together and containing votes recorded on four different dates. It is for this House to decide what that story tells. Further on:

—and the said bag also contained the following tightly folded ballot envelopes:

G. N. Barnes, 871720, dated December 12th; G. T. Edgcumbe, 418279, dated December 8th; G. H. A. Lawford, 110307, dated December 12th; W. Daniels, 85161, dated December 12th; R. J. Welch, 748085, dated December 7th; D. Mort, 24866, dated December 12th; E. Beaulaen, 417231, dated December 12th; J. Durnais, 1021252, dated December 14th; P. T. T. Brant, 346801, dated December 14th.

Eight more envelopes tightly folded together bearing different dates and again too large to be inserted in the proper aperture according to the Military Voters' Act.

—and on the same date aforesaid I assisted in opening ballot box or bag No. B 68 of which polling subdivision Major W. L. Hutton, 8 Risbon Barracks, Shorncliffe, was the deputy presiding officer, and this said bag also contained parcels or packages of ballot envelopes folded tightly together but too large to be inserted in the aperture provided by law, among the said packages were the following:

T. F. Moulton, 1258169, dated December 8th; J. W. Wright, 3151, dated December 2nd; G. Wheeler, 135895, dated December 2nd,
and also the following folded in one parcel:

W. R. Harvey, 859344, dated December 1st; Capt. A. B. Roberts, dated December 1st; Capt. E. Bartlett, dated December 1st; M. O. Lupsom, 1102429, dated December 2nd.
and the said bag also contained the following ballot envelopes in one parcel tightly folded together:

C. Robertson, 526721, dated December 2nd; G. A. Penton, 469325, dated December 2nd; H. W. Whartman, 835139, dated December 2nd; A. G. Hoonan, 400128, dated December 2nd; E. R. Hicks, 528742, dated December 1st;
and also the following in the same condition:

J. R. Jeffery, 439121, dated December 3rd; J. E. Taylor, 521180, dated December 2nd;
and that I was also present in the opening of ballot box or bag No. 182 of which polling subdivision Major S. M. Fisher, No. 16 Canadian General Hospital, Orpington, was deputy presiding officer, and that unused ballots were taken out of the said bag perfectly flat and also ballot envelope rolled together in such large parcels that they could not possibly have been inserted in the aperture provided by law. One of these said parcels consisted of the following:

S. R. Cockerill, 316043, dated December 4th; William A. Taylor, 760690, dated December 4th; Baretna Adorft, 766746, dated December 5th; Thomas F. Shea, 722026, dated December 6th;
and the said bag also contained another parcel which I casually observed tightly folded containing the following ballot envelopes:

H. L. Boston, 791184, dated December 1st; Gaius W. Horwood, 624881, dated December 1st; Walter White, 841957, dated December 4th; Sachimars Thoracka, 697031, dated December 4th.

All the dates given in the above statements were written and taken down in the order in which they appeared when the parcels were opened.

I make this affidavit conscientiously believing the statements herein to be true by virtue and under the provisions of Act of Parliament passed for this purpose A.D. 1835.

(Sgd.) W. D. SPENCE.

SWORN before me in the City of Westminster in the County of Middlesex, England, this 6th day of March A.D. 1918.

(Sgd.) W. T. R. PRESTON,

Commissioner for taking oaths for use in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

Another one is an affidavit by Arthur Hersey of the city of Montreal. He says:

I, ARTHUR H. HERSEY, of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, in the Dominion of Canada, appointed by Governor General Order in Council, special returning officer in the matter herein, make oath and say:

That in my capacity as special returning officer I assisted in opening ballot box or bag No. B 294, of which polling subdivision Captain G. A. McNaughton, 122nd Company, Canadian Forestry Corps, was the deputy presiding officer. On the 29th day of January, 1918, when the said bag was opened I found that it contained parcels or packages of ballot envelopes folded tightly together but too large to have been inserted in the legal aperture in the top of the said bag, in one package tightly folded together were the following envelopes:

Charles Kersey, 2198414; Lucine Buschard, 1012696; Josiah Kenway, 2198420; Lieut. Charles F. Carnegie, John P. Fritz, 1013705; W. C. Paige, 2198432; Alfred Hardy, 297368; James Turley, 2198432; W. J. O'Connell, 2157373; Vincent J. Ramsay, 108145.

There were ten ballot envelopes all folded together and too large to go into the aperture as provided by the Act.

I make this affidavit conscientiously believing the statements herein to be true by virtue and under the provisions of Act of Parliament passed for this purpose A.D. 1835.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR H. HERSEY.

SWORN before me in the City of Westminster, in the County of Middlesex, England, this 6th day of March, A.D. 1918.

(Sgd.) W. T. R. PRESTON.

Commissioner for taking oaths for use in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Would the hon. gentleman give me the name of the official before whom this affidavit was made?

Mr. COPP: W. T. R. Preston, commissioner for taking oaths for use in the province of Ontario.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is the hon. gentleman aware that to take an affidavit such as he has read is a crime under a provision of the Criminal Code of Canada?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is a declaration; it is not an affidavit.

Mr. DAVIDSON: He referred to it as an affidavit.

Mr. COPP: I am not here to answer any cross-examination questions put by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davidson).

Mr. MURPHY: Grant an inquiry and we will have Mr. Preston before it too.

Mr. COPP: I am putting the facts concerning these charges before the House. If my hon. friend thinks it is a crime to do so, or if he thinks there is ground for bringing a criminal action against me, he is well aware of his rights in that regard.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I do not accuse him of any crime. What I say is that he, as a lawyer, should know that any official that prepared and took affidavits such as he has read is committing a crime under the provisions of the Criminal Code.

Mr. COPP: If the hon. gentleman will look through the Criminal Code he will find that no crime is committed in making a declaration.

Here is another affidavit by Mr. Guillet:

In the matter of the Elections for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada holden in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, December 1st-17, 1917, under the provisions of the Military Voters' Act, A. D., 1917.

I, Louis Eugene Guillet, Captain in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces and Deputy Returning Officer herein, make oath and say:

That on the 25th day of January, 1918, in my official capacity I assisted in the opening of bag or ballot box No. B. 300, in the presence of Major Sweet, an appointee as poll clerk of the Unionist Government, of which Poll Captain J. E. Cameron, 112th Co., Canadian Forestry Corps, was the Deputy Presiding Officer. Several packages of ballot envelopes folded tightly together were taken out when the bag was opened, and I made efforts to insert some of the said packages or parcels of envelopes in the legal aperture for the insertion of the said ballot envelopes and it was impossible to insert them. It was agreed between Major Sweet and myself that the said parcels had not been inserted in the said bag through the before-mentioned aperture, and the bag was accordingly laid aside under the plea that it appeared to have been opened.

On the 26th of the said month of January I assisted in the examination of ballot box or bag No. 246, the neck of which was open sufficiently wide to allow Dr. Elliott, the Returning Officer for the Union Government, to put his arm in and extract the contents therefrom, and I accordingly agreed with the protest of the Opposition scrutineer that the bag in this respect gave evidence of having been opened, and Dr. Elliott also agreed on the facts as to the state of the bag, and it was accordingly reserved for future consideration.

I make this affidavit on my soul conscientiously believing the statements herein to be true by virtue and under the provisions of Act of Parliament passed for this purpose A. D. 1835.

Sworn before me in the city of Westminster, in the County of Middlesex, England, this 6th day of March, A.D., 1918.

(Sgd.) L. E. Guillet.

(Sgd.) W. T. R. Preston.

Commissioner for taking Oaths for use in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

That evidence goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, that the ballot bag was open to such an extent that Mr. Elliott, the Union Government representative, was able to put in his arm and extract ballots therefrom. If that is true, hon. gentlemen will see how easy it would be, and it is a natural conclusion to come to, that the bag was in such a condition that after it had been closed it was a comparatively easy matter for any one to fold up envelopes and insert them.

I now wish to read another affidavit going to prove these statements, and it is that of A. A. Dickson:

In the matter of the Elections for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada holden in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, December 1st-17, 1917, under the provisions of the Military Voters' Act, A.D., 1917.

I, Archibald Anderson Dickson, of Harrow, in the County of Middlesex, Special Poll Clerk in this Matter, solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

That I was present at Westminster at the opening of bag or ballot box No. B. 99 on the 16th of January, A.D., 1918, of which Polling Subdivision Lt.-Col. M. E. B. Cutcliffe, 125th Canadian Infantry Battalion, Witley, was acting as deputy presiding officer. That package of ballot envelopes were taken from this bag

or box in too large numbers to be inserted through the aperture provided by law, and that one of these packages closely folded together contained the following ballot envelopes duly endorsed as hereunder:

P. Pesine, 7, voting East Toronto; C. J. Furler, 197,569, voting Simcoe Centre; A. E. Allen 643206, voting North Essex; W. Wood, 772481 voting Brantford; J. Spencer, 772966, voting Brantford; B. Scott, 237683, voting E. Toronto; J. H. Walsworth, 270622, voting Brantford; H. Donaldson, 772896, voting Brantford; E. H. Force, 772683, voting Brantford; J. Borthwick 770009. voting Brantford.

Here is a list of ten voters, whose envelopes being together, it would have been impossible for them to be legally inserted in the ballot bag, and several of those then were voting in the same constituency.

That I was present at the opening of ballot boxes in this matter on the 17th of January A.D 1918, when ballot box 163 was opened of which Capt. H. J. Dennis, 25th Reserve Battalion Bramshott, was deputy presiding Officer, and parcels of ballot envelopes were taken from the said box or bag folded together in numbers which could not be inserted through the aperture provided by law, and that one of these said parcels contained ten ballot envelopes rolled together, the endorsation thereon being dated respectively December 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th, 1917. and another parcel of ballot envelopes consisted as follows, each duly endorsed as herein stated.

Alfred C. D. McGregor, 654304, dated December 7th; Martin B. Roy, 654209, dated December 4th; Samuel Mayourok, 417068, dated December 17th; Robert Smith, 177597, dated December 5th. And that all the dates given in the before-mentioned parcels of ballot envelopes are stated herein in the rotation in which they appeared in the said parcels.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declaration Act, A.D. 1835.

(Signed) A. A. Dickson,
S.P.C.

Declared at Westminster in the County of Middlesex this 8th day of March, A.D., 1918, before me.

(Signed) W. T. R. Preston,
A Commissioner for Oaths for use in the Courts of the Province of Ontario.

That is the evidence, Mr. Speaker, that I have to give to the House in regard to that matter.

Now then, as to paragraph 20:

That the contents of these ballot boxes and bags which thus appeared to have been fraudulently tampered with were, contrary to the provisions of the Election Act, counted and allocated in the United Kingdom to the number of 15,000 votes under instructions from the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

In support of this charge I have a memorandum signed by W. E. Elliott, deputy presiding officer, and W. B. Spence. Mr. Elliott, I understand, was the representative of the Union Government, while Mr. Spence represented the Opposition. This memorandum contains an agreement at which they arrived as to the condition of the bags and boxes, which was left to Lieutenant-Colonel Purney for his decision That is to say both agreed as to certain facts and the matter was referred to Lieutenant-Colonel Purney for his decision as to what should be done.

Memorandum for Lieut.-Colonel Purney.

A difference of opinion exists between certain officials appointed to count the Military Vote, respecting certain bags of envelopes containing ballots.

The following facts are agreed upon, respecting bags:—

Bags No. 218, 417, 352, 106, 201, 420, opened Wednesday, January 9th, or Thursday, the 10th. Rolls of ballots containing two's, three's, four's or more, were found closely rolled together, too large to have been inserted through the opening on the top of the bag.

These bags were locked before opened by the officers, but whether or not there was any space within the chained opening through which papers might have been inserted, we are not prepared to state. There was not anything in the external appearance of any of the bags to lead us to believe that they had been opened.

Bag No. 153 was opened on Friday, January 11th. Bag was locked before opened by the election officers. Rolls were taken from it which were too large to have gone through the aperture on the top. These rolls consisted of ballots closely rolled together, of different dates, one roll of ballots was dated December 7th and 10th, and another roll of six ballots had at least four different dates. We are not positive as to how tightly the opening of the bag was secured by the lock and chain.

Bag No. 155 opened on Monday morning, January 14th. Lock and chain examined before opened and found not tightly closed, and opening could be made size of two fingers. Rolls of ballots taken therefrom in three's, four's, and sixes. These rolls could not have been inserted through the aperture on the top of the bag.

Bag No. 102, opened Monday morning, January 14th, Colonel Purney being present. Lock and chain were examined carefully before opened and found tight and closely locked, and a few ballots were taken therefrom. Rolls were found closely folded together, three, four, and more together in rolls, which could not have gone through the aperture on the top of the bag.

It is contended on the one hand that the opening which might be made in the neck of the bags through the chain being loosely locked, would allow the folded envelopes to be placed within the bag through such an opening, and on this account the suggestion that the boxes have been opened for an improper purpose, is not justified.

On the other hand, it is contended that as the envelopes which were folded together could not be inserted in the bags through the small flap covered aperture, the conclusion is justified that the said boxes come under the clause of the Act which declares that the contents of certain boxes shall not be examined, and

that therefore the ballots therein shall not be counted.

Signed on behalf of Special Returning Officers.

W. Elliott,
S.R.O.
W. D. Spence,
S.R.O.

January 16th, 1918.

Mr. Elliott represented the Government, and Mr. Spence represented the Opposition. The Special Returning Officers and clerks at London were obliged to proceed with the allocation, counting, etc., of these votes on the order of W. P. Purney, in spite of the fact that there was an agreement by the representative of the Government and the representative of the Opposition that these parcels of envelopes that were folded together and bearing different dates were in such numbers that it would be impossible for them to be inserted in the bag in the proper legal way through the aperture in the top of the bag or box. Lieut.-Col. Purney makes a decision as follows:

I decide that you are obliged to proceed with the allocation, counting, etc., of the contents of all the Ballot Bags mentioned in the foregoing statement of facts.

W. P. Purney,
Asst. Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,
for Canada.

Dated at London, January 16, 1918.

Afterwards, the 15,000 votes thus cast were counted and allocated, which had been taken from the bags which the representatives of the two political parties were agreed had not been placed in the bags in the proper legal manner through the proper aperture. They must have been inserted in some illegal and improper way, because that was the agreement signed by both representatives, yet the special returning officers were forced to count and allocate these votes to the amount of upwards of 15,000 upon the order of Lieut.-Col. Purney, who gave his instructions in that regard. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a statement which shows how the votes were allocated. Out of those 15,175 illegal votes 70 went to Prince Edward Island; 1,634 went to Nova Scotia; 688 to New Brunswick; 1,092 to Quebec; 7,043 to Ontario; 1,316 to Manitoba; 910 to Saskatchewan; 1,044 to Alberta; 1,364 to British Columbia. And fourteen, Mr. Speaker, which I claim to be illegal votes, were counted yesterday to bring my hon. friend from the constituency of the Yukon into this House.

I also desire to read a list of protested bags of a few in the province of Manitoba, with the names of the returning officers:

[Mr. Copp.]

Bag No.	Names of Deputy Presiding Officers.
175	Burke, W. M., Capt.
201	Clarke, D. A., Lt.-Col.
420	Cairns, J., Capt.
352	Christie, R. R., Lieut.
174	Cunningham, W. G., Major.
115	Cameron-Smith, A. H., Major.
359	Cherry, H. M., Major.
102	Day, Lt.-Col.
182	Fisher, S. M., Major.
209	Fletcher, J. A., Lieut.
218	Gorst, H. P., Major.
276	Hall, R., Lieut.
106	Hutton, W. L.
77	Hart, W. M., Major.
423	Hudson, G. L., Major.
308	Lock, F. W., Lieut.
230	Main, W. W., Capt.
342	Maxted, V., Lieut.
155	McPherson, C. S., Lt.-Col.
294	McNaughton, G. A., Capt.
106	Rogers, E. S., Major.
51	Smith, A., Major.
29	Shaw, Jno. A., Lt.-Col.
34	Smith Armand, Major.
417	Watt, Lt.-Col.
153	White, W., Capt.

In addition to the foregoing Protested Bags, a special affidavit, in duplicate, was made by A. A. Dickson with reference to bags No. 99 and 163, identified on Mr. W. T. R. Preston's Memorandum Book by the initials A.A.D. These bags contained bundles of ballot envelopes tightly folded together numbering as many as ten, several of them being of different dates. The bundles were so large that the hand holes only would allow them to be put into the bags.

This goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, the statement I have made in regard to the illegal and improper allocation of these votes. Several thousand ballot envelopes fraudulently endorsed went into the bags. I have in my hand a list that I shall not attempt to read, but to which I wish to refer briefly. Here are a number of constituencies, and I start with the constituency of Kent, New Brunswick. Thirty-three votes were allocated and transferred to the county of Kent, N.B., and from the actual residence, which I have under the signature of the men themselves, not one in the whole list of the 33 voters ever had a domicile in the province of New Brunswick. Coming from that province as I do, I am almost prepared to pledge my word that not one of the men ever put a foot in the county of Kent, yet 33 of these gentlemen selected the county of Kent in which to apply their ballots. Why? Were they free agents? They go to the province of New Brunswick to select a constituency when they do not know the candidates or the county. Probably if the truth were known they did not know that there was a county of Kent in the province of New Brunswick until they were told by some man in authority where they should cast their vote, and what con-

stituency they should elect to transfer that vote.

Going a little further, I find that 145 electors transferred their votes and selected Prince Edward county, Ontario, as the place where they should vote. And not one of them gives his residence in the county of Prince Edward. Why were these votes allocated there? Is it possible that 145 honest military electors who wanted to cast their vote for or against a certain candidate would select the county of Prince Edward, Ontario? I do not go quite so far as to say in regard to these men, what I did in regard to the county of Kent, N.B., that they had never heard of the county of Prince Edward. But they never had a domicile there, according to their own statement. Yet that vote was transferred to the county of Prince Edward. I will read a few names of the men who voted in the county of Prince Edward: Henry R. Honeybone, Regina; W. Mercer, Toronto; Edgar T. Girling, Calgary; F. H. Wills, Star City, Sask.; Paul Greenwood, Edmonton; Joseph E. Page, Blind River, Ont.; Eugene Dubois, Montreal; W. V. Hepburn, Winnipeg; George Vagos, Halifax; Percy Lowe, Nova Scotia; H. M. Labowski, Manitoba; C. E. Woodbridge, Salmon River, B.C.; William B. Cass, United States subject. Then follow men from Toronto, Nova Scotia, Montreal, another American subject, Toronto, Indian Head, Ottawa, Calgary, Peterborough, Saskatoon, St. Johns, P.Q., Fort Frances, Ont., London, Ont., Edmonton, Greece, Windsor, Laprairie, Port Arthur, Winnipeg Restigouche, N.B., and so on.

That is a list, Mr. Speaker, taken at random, of these men whose domicile is not in the county of Prince Edward. Yet 145 of them, for some unaccountable reason or other, transferred their votes to the county of Prince Edward. Would it not naturally arouse suspicion in the mind of an innocent man that there was some particular reason why these votes should go to Prince Edward county, and that the reason was that the constituency might be considered to be in doubt, and might well need a few extra votes to make sure of the election?

Mr. TWEEDIE: Would the honourable member mind handing me the names of the Calgary men?

Mr. COPP: I read them at random. I will give my hon. friend a number of them.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman could not give them all; it would take too long. There are thirteen thousand of them.

Mr. COPP: The only ones from Calgary that I observe by glancing hurriedly over the list are Edgar T. Girling and William Deane.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is the hon. member aware that on the civilian vote in Prince Edward County the Government candidate had a majority of over one thousand?

Mr. COPP: Whether I was aware of that or not, the presiding officer in England was not aware, when the vote was taken, what the majority would be. It was very nice to have all these votes on hand in order that they might be slipped in in case of emergency.

Take the county of North Huron. They gave this constituency eighteen votes. Among the places of residence of the soldiers voting there I find the following: Lambton East, Waterloo South, Seaforth, Clinton, Wingham, United States, Port Elgin, Goderich, Trenton, Stellarton, Toronto. I may point out that I could give thousands of other cases of this kind; I have had opportunity of collecting information respecting only a few of these allocations.

Sixty-five of these votes were transferred to the constituency of South Huron. Some of the domiciles of the soldiers are given as follows: Nova Scotia, Moosejaw, Saskatoon, Battleford, Montreal, Goderich, North Huron, Auburn, Wingham, Trenton, Winnipeg, Vankleek Hill.

Ninety-six votes were transferred to the constituency of Kent, Ontario, and in not one case was the residence given as in that constituency. The following are some of the soldiers' domicils given: Toronto, Northern Ontario, Toronto, Saskatchewan, actor between Vancouver and Halifax—I suppose this gentleman thought he had better vote in Kent, Ontario—Toronto, Sorel, Montreal, Edmonton, Regina, London, Norfolk, United States, Oxbow, Saskatchewan, Pt. Leir, Quebec, New York, Albert, Victoria County, East York, Brockville. All these voters were domiciled outside the county of Kent.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Government endorsed no candidate in the county of Kent?

Mr. COPP: The Prime Minister endorsed no candidate in Westmorland either, but similar attempts were made to have votes transferred into that county. The Prime Minister, either because he did not appreciate the qualities of the candidate chosen by the Conservative party in the county of Westmorland, or because of some other reason with which we are not acquainted, did not endorse the candidature of his friend in that county. In any case, the

presiding officer who directed the soldiers in this case to transfer their votes to the constituency of Westmorland, did not know that the Prime Minister had not endorsed a candidate in that electoral district.

I know of twenty-four votes that were transferred to Westmorland county. Evidently the powers that be were kind to me, although they might have put in five times twenty-four without materially affecting the result. And where did those twenty-four come from? The county of Westmorland is hardly known in many portions of the world; yet an American citizen voted there. I find on the list another American citizen, and still another. A gentleman from Prince Edward Island came over and voted in my constituency. Others were from the following places: Guysboro, Saskatchewan, Montreal, United States, Chatham, Australian citizen, and so on. Is it not peculiar that twenty-four gentlemen who probably never heard of the county of Westmorland, or of your humble servant, or of his opponent, whom the Prime Minister did not see fit to endorse, should record their votes in this constituency?

I suppose the county of Northumberland is more famous than the county of Westmorland, because I know of sixty-three electors who transferred their votes to Northumberland. The following are some of the domiciles: United States, Butte, Montana; South End, Ontario; 73 Annette street, Toronto; 1166 South street, Regina; 779 Dufferin Road, Toronto; Valcartier; Ville St. Pierre, Quebec; Hamilton; Brandon; Camp Hughes, Manitoba; Valcartier; Saskatoon; Estevan, Manitoba; Moosejaw, Belleville; Waterville, Quebec; Lloydminster, Saskatchewan; Amherstburg, Ontario; Russian, Sussex; Edmonton; Battleford; Magog, Quebec; Winnipeg; Broad avenue, Toronto; Saskatoon; Dauphin, Manitoba; North Bay, Ontario; Calgary; Russian, Valcartier; Winnipeg; N.B.; Portage la Prairie; Qu'Appelle; Scotch Town; High Banks; Macleod, Alberta; Saskatoon; Yorktown, Saskatchewan. These gentlemen, realizing the ability of the candidate of the Government in that locality, I suppose, decided that they would like to record their vote in the county of Northumberland, N.B.

Now we come to the constituency of North Cape Breton and Victoria, represented by my friend in front of me (Mr. McKenzie). I know of seventy-one military electors who allotted their votes in that constituency, but not one of them stated that their domicile was in that part of the country. I quote a few of the residences as given: Lake Loon, St. John, United States, Brampton, Ontario; United States; Halifax; Bridgetown; Lockeport; Saskatchewan; Saskatoon; London, Ontario; Vancouver; Moosejaw; Arcola, Saskatchewan; Moosejaw; Wainwright; United States; Valcartier; Cornwall, Ontario; Glace Bay; Colchester county; Halifax; Dauphin, Manitoba; Pictou, N.S.; Halifax; Colchester; United States.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Who gave my hon. friend this list?

Mr. COPP: If I had time I could read hundreds of lists which I have under my hand. The names have been given by the electors over their own signatures giving details as to their residences, etc. I only refrain from doing that, because I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House; but if my hon. friend asks for the information, I can tell him that I have here information that would keep me speaking until 12 o'clock to-night, and I can give the statements and affidavits to prove every statement I have made.

Mr. BUTTS: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: Let him ask it?

Mr. BUTTS: I wonder if my hon. friend knows how long he has been inflicting this punishment upon the House?

Mr. COPP: I can say to my hon. friend I do not know, and I do not care. I stand upon my rights in this House, and I purpose taking what time I deem necessary to put my case before this House. My hon. friends, by asking questions, are only extending the time. I have the information here, and all I ask of the Government is to grant an inquiry, and I shall provide the evidence satisfactory to my hon. friend in regard to every case and every statement I make.

We now come to the county of Leeds in the province of Ontario. Leeds is better known by the soldiers overseas than some of the other counties, because I have found 138 of the military electors overseas cast their votes in the constituency of Leeds. Not one of them gives his residence or his domicile as being in that county. The following are some of the domiciles: Sydney Mines, N.S.; Guelph, Fergus, Ontario; Edmonton, Alberta; Victoria, B.C.; Valcartier, Toronto, Montreal, Sussex, N.B.; Vancouver, Kelowna, B.C.; Kamloops, B.C.; Maniwaki, Quebec; Bull River, B.C.; Prince Rupert, B.C.; Montreal, (a Russian); Halifax,

N.S.; St. John, N.B.; Glace Bay, N.S.; Sussex, N.B.; Winnipeg (a Russian); Moncton, N.B.; a stray one from my constituency, Edmonton, Alberta; Amherst, N.S.; Charlottetown, P.E.I. I am picking out only a few of the hundreds of names which I have here of men whose votes were transferred to constituencies in which they had no domicile, in which they never resided, but who selected those constituencies for only one purpose. One can come to only one conclusion, that that was for the purpose, as I have said several times already, to offset a possible adverse vote in those different constituencies to which those votes were transferred.

In South Bruce 48 voted on the same ground, without one giving his residence as in South Bruce. Some of their domiciles are as follows: Toronto, Montreal, Tisdale, Manitoba; Toronto, Weston, and so on.

In North Bruce we find 46 votes transferred in the same manner. Some of the domiciles of the men voting in North Bruce are as follows: Battleford, Sask.; Vernon, B.C.; Montreal, a United States citizen from Saskatoon, Wright, Quebec.

Mr. BURRELL: Is the hon. member reading a list of military voters who gave their place of residence, and in No. 9 indicated where they wanted to vote?

Mr. COPP: I am reading from a list of the names of military voters whose residences I have obtained from the official nominal roll of the Militia Department. In this manner I found out where their proper residences were. I have the statement of where their votes were cast, and I am telling the House that if they voted in North Bruce, their proper residences and domiciles were in other constituencies altogether, and they should have voted in them.

Mr. BUTTS: Might I ask the hon. member another question?

Mr. COPP: I do not want to be discourteous to my hon. friend, but I think he is only detaining me.

Mr. BUTTS: The only thing, Mr. Speaker, is—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member (Mr. Butts) can ask a question only with the permission of the hon. member who has the floor. I understand the hon. member who has the floor has refused that permission.

Mr. BUTTS: Well, I would ask the hon. member if he would give me the permission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BUTTS: He will not allow me to ask a question?

Mr. COPP: I do not like to have it put in that way, that I will not allow the hon. member to ask a question. I do not want to be discourteous to the hon. member, or to any other hon. member, but I do not think this will get us further along. My hon. friend can put his question after I have finished my argument. He simply wants to interrupt me, and that is all.

Mr. BUTTS: I am not seeking to interrupt; I am asking for information.

Mr. COPP: Will my hon. friend kindly wait and ask me his question when I have finished my remarks?

Mr. McMASTER: He will have forgotten it by that time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. This discussion between hon. members concerning their rights to ask a question of each other is absolutely out of order, and I would ask the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) to continue his speech.

Mr. BUTTS: I bow to your ruling.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Keep on bowing.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend (Mr. Butts) will keep his question in cold storage for a while he will have an opportunity of asking it. I want to refer to one or two other matters. In regard to the votes transferred in East Edmonton, the number that I have been able to look up is so small it is not worth while taking up the time of the House to go into that matter. There were 69 votes transferred to Cape Breton South, and some of the domiciles are as follows: Medicine Hat, Alberta; London, Ontario; Lethbridge, Alberta; Tignish, Cape Breton; Aldershott, N.S.; Vancouver, B.C.; Mawata, Sask.; Lethbridge, Alberta; Saskatoon; Winnipeg; Calgary; Vancouver; Toronto; Colchester; Ingersoll, Ontario, and so on.

In the same way I know of 129 votes transferred to the constituency of Ottawa in the province of Ontario. The voters came from all parts of the world, so far as I can see. Some of their domiciles are: Montreal; Toronto; Renfrew, with kin in Newfoundland; Victoria, B.C.; Valcartier; St. John, N.B.; Billings Bridge, Ontario; Calgary, Alberta; Montreal, Quebec; a United States citizen from Windsor; Vernon, B.C.; Calgary; Glace Bay, N.S.; Annapolis, N.S.; Saskatoon; Halifax.

There were fifteen votes transferred to the constituency of South Renfrew in the province of Ontario. Some of the domiciles are: Montreal; Valcartier; Smiths Falls; Ottawa; Toronto; Renfrew, and so on.

I have found 32 votes transferred to the constituency of Digby and Annapolis in the province of Nova Scotia. Some of the domiciles are: St. John, N.B.; a United States citizen from St. John, N.B.; Kingston, N.B.; another United States citizen from St. John, N.B. Hence you find a Union candidate in one constituency taking a vote from another Union candidate in another constituency.

58 votes were transferred to the county of Wright in the province of Quebec. Some of the domiciles are: Toronto; Montreal; Winnipeg; Delson Junction, Quebec; Montreal; Little Current, Sask.; Prince Albert, Sask.; Montreal; Sussex, N.B.; Calgary, Alberta; Little Harbour; Shelburne county, N.S.; Valcartier; United States Navy, Cote St. Paul; Burlington, Kings county, N.S.; Yarmouth, N.S.; 603 Gerard street, East, Toronto; Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, Indian Head, Sask.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Will the hon. gentleman give me the names of those who voted in Digby and Annapolis?

Mr. COPP: I do not wish to read the list again, but I will show it to my hon. friend. Thirty-six votes were transferred to Westmount and St. Henri, the electors not being domiciled or resident in that constituency. The same is true of St. Ann's in the province of Quebec, where forty-one votes were transferred. I have only given a partial list of the electors whose votes were illegally transferred to constituencies in which they were not domiciled.

I now want to refer to charge No. 22:

That military electors were systematically persuaded to give answers for endorsation on their ballot envelopes setting forth residence in constituencies in which they did not reside and upon which declaration of domicile their qualification to vote was based.

The statements I have just read prove that charge. Lieut.-Colonel Glenn and some ten or fifteen others were persuaded to give answers for endorsation on their ballots envelopes setting forth residence and constituencies in which they did not reside and upon which declaration of domicile their qualification to vote was based. The domicile qualification under the Military Voters' Act was two-fold; it provided that if the elector had been resident in a certain locality for four months of the twelve months prior to voting he was properly domiciled. Not one of these ten or fifteen men who voted with Lieut.-Colonel Glenn, according to a statement signed by Col. Glenn, were domiciled in the county of Prince Edward, in the province of Ontario, and yet they were allowed to vote contrary to the whole spirit as well as the letter of the Military Voters' Act.

I said a moment ago that some hundred votes had been transferred to the county of Northumberland in the province of New Brunswick. Since I made that statement I have had placed in my hand a list, which I am convinced is absolutely reliable, showing that 350 votes were illegally transferred to the county of Northumberland. These voters had no qualification whatever to vote in that county, and yet their votes were transferred, and for what purpose? Was it because they appreciated the ability of the hon. gentleman who so ably represents that constituency in this House? No, it was not for that reason. It must have been because those who had charge of the campaign down there realized that the Union Government policy was not very much favoured in that constituency, and so these 350 votes were transferred from the noble, patriotic and high-minded motive of supporting the hon. member who now represents that constituency in this House.

The next charge is No. 23:

That fraudulent votes were recorded for the electoral district of Cumberland, N.S., by Captain H. M. Burke, deputy presiding officer at Ashford, County of Kent, England, in which voters declared their residence to be Springhill, Tignish, Joggins Mines, Shulie and Nappan, Pugwash, Oxford and Amherst, whose domicile was, in fact, in some one of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec.

That charge can be substantiated by a list I have here, but as a list of these votes will be given to the House in another way I shall not take up the time of the House by reading the list I have.

The next charge is No. 24:

That similar conditions to these referred to in the preceding paragraph prevailed in the polling booth presided over by Lieut.-Col. C. M. R. Graham, of the 156th Battalion, Witley, in which military electors whose domicile was in other parts of Ontario and Manitoba together with a number of subjects of the United States were induced to falsely declare their residence to be in Brockville, in the electoral district of Leeds.

I have here a list of people who were induced falsely to declare their residence to be in Brockville, in the constituency of Leeds, and who voted there. I will give the names of the residences of these people: Merrickville, Ont.; Messina Springs, U.S.A.;

Renfrew, Ont.; Bury, Que.; Renfrew, Ont.; Lyndhurst; Renfrew, Ont.; Mille Roche, Ont.; Kemptville, Ont.; Spring Valley, Ont.; Renfrew, Ont.; Whitney, Renfrew county, Ont.; Renfrew, Ont.; Montreal, Que.; Frontenac, Ont.; Toronto, Ont.; Renfrew, Ont.; Winnipeg, Man.; South Lake; Acton (Halton county), Ont.; Merrickville, Ont.; Renfrew, Ont.; Toronto, Ont.; Weyburn, Sask., and then there were four four others who voted who were United States citizens. I have ascertained that not one of these electors had resided, or was domiciled, in the county of Leeds, yet they all voted there.

The next charge is No. 25:

That at the said polling booth in the presence of the said Lieut.-Col. C. M. R. Graham, deputy presiding officer, it was arranged that the votes of the military electors whose surnames commenced with the letters ranging from 'A' to 'H' should be polled in the electoral district of Grenville, and the said votes were so polled after the said electors had been induced to falsely declare their domicile to be in the town of Prescott in the electoral district of Grenville.

The affidavit I wish to read in that connection is as follows:

In the matter of the elections for the Dominion of Canada holden in Great Britain Dec. 1-17, 1917.

I, William Thomas Rochester Preston late of Norbury in the county of Surrey, England, make oath and say,

That I was present at the opening of ballot box No. 101 at the city of Westminster, London, January 21, 1918, which said ballot box contained the votes recorded by Lieut. Col. C. M. R. Graham, of the 156th battalion, Witley.

That at a subsequent date when the envelopes from the said box containing the ballots were being allocated to constituencies in the province of Ontario and at which allocation E. R. Dewart, Esquire of Toronto, and quarter-master Sergeant McKinnon, special returning officers, were also present, I checked over the votes recorded by the said Lieut. Col. Graham as being entitled to vote in the town of Prescott, and the said lists of votes contained surnames only beginning with letters between the letters A and H of the alphabet.

And from other evidences of fraud in connection with the said polling booth and which have since been corroborated, I verily believe the said list of voters is improper, unreliable and fraudulent.

I make this declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the legislation enacted in this behalf.

(Sgd) W. T. R. Preston.

Declared before me at Ottawa this 21st day of May A.D. 1918.

(Sgd) D. C. Ross
A Notary public,
in and for Ontario.

Evidence is accumulating that subjects of the United States who had joined the Canadian Expeditionary Forces were organized to vote at the elections in direct contravention of the Military Voters' Act. A large number of citizens of the United States voted in the electoral districts of Peel, Digby and Annapolis, St. Ann's, Que., Prince Edward County, Ontario, North Essex, Bruce North, Edmonton, Cape Breton South and Richmond, St. Lawrence and St. George, Ottawa, Brome, Renfrew, Laurier and Outremont, Wright, Cape Breton North and Victoria, Pictou, Westmorland, Cumberland, Leeds, Yarmouth, Hants, St. Antoine and Port Arthur and Kenora. A somewhat hasty examination of the records shows the following votes to have been polled by American citizens:

Name.	Number.	Voted in
J. F. Cane	844675	Peel, Ont.
W. P. Turner	845393	"
W. McCormack	536386	Digby and Annapolis, N.S.
J. McGnogna	536272	" "
H. S. Diller	808348	Ste. Anne's, Que.
F. Jacques	660,667	" "
E. Smith	919660	" "
E. A. Tuppe	440864	" "
J. P. Fritz	1013705	Prince Edward, Ont.
M. R. Gilbert	264598	" "
L. Lacosti	1036306	" "
A. R. Jones	1037714	" "
M. Hale	1048435	" "
W. Chandler	1048608	" "
W. G. Boyd	1048201	" "
J. F. Stanoch	1013628	" "
D. McManus	1045936	" "
William B. Cass	2288441	" "
W. Jahnke	207463	" "
J. Lapaine	1045737	North Essex, Ont.
R. Gunner	772828	" "
N. J. Pallen	270645	" "
E. H. Kingdon	772493	" "
D. Dennison	1081181	Bruce North, Ont.
N. D. Isaac	1051572	" "
C. May	1036284	" "
D. J. Perry,	Major.	" "
W. C. Hough	925413	" "
H. D. Kennedy	18802	Edmonton East, Alta.
D. Kennedy	13514	" "
M. Jarvis	931088	Cape Breton S. & Richmond.
L. Juniper	931662	" "
Q. West	931564	" "
E. Guerry	931565	" "
S. Sergeant	931780	" "
C. J. Brooks	931460	Cape Breton S.
L. Kirksey	931663	" "
E. Madison	931628	" "
R. Jamieson	931563	" "
C. Simpson	931325	" "
Thomas Ward	458497	St. Lawrence & St. George.
H. P. Gariepy	841139	St. Lawrence.
C. Wright	748449	"
H. McCaffrey	919579	"
F. E. Robeare	1102167	Ottawa, Ont.
J. H. May	737225	" "
R. A. Ince	1027021	" "
J. J. Ratra	514646	" "
G. O. Gregg	40412	" "
J. Musson	688276	" "

Name.	Number.	Voted in
P. Reilly	258952	Ottawa, Ont.
T. R. Coslick	448060	" "
L. M. Allender	925864	" "
K. A. Mann	703442	" "
J. J. Slater	514648	" "
C. Gould	132120	" "
L. Stern	763902	" "
R. E. Lee	190378	" "
H. F. Annis	513078	" "
F. Cameron	427755	" "
J. P. Sullivan	448611	Brome, Que.
H. N. Mackenzie	1057423	" "
F. Hughes	110254	" "
E. Ploof	841869	" "
H. Houle	1042942	Renfrew, Ont.
J. Brown	718220	Laurier & Outremont.
H. Phillips	920076	" "
G. E. Guay	336875	" "
J. Waldooger	418761	Wright, Que.
M. A. Livingstone	24851	" "
W. H. Tufts	734251	" "
Percy Stewart	931751	Cape Breton N. & Victoria.
Chas. Sutton	889803	" "
R. A. Lucas	511939	" "
L. L Shattick	1261136	" "
W. L. Duhl	910930	" "
T. Macon	931737	" "
J. Welford	931716	" "
A. Platt	931591	" "
H. L. Day	931618	" "
J. H. Munro	931715	" "
George Burtts	154242	Pictou, N.S.
Thos. H. Bryant	515588	" "
Moses Wren	102827	" "
J. T. Wood	739826	" "
Jos. Violette	743261	" "
W. B. Avery	207826	" "
J. R. Kearns	532154	" "
M. J. Lake	213637	" "
B. E. Fuller	264050	" "
R. E. Williams	1031331	Westmorland, N.B.
Wm. R. Woody	1030653	" "
F. W. Hunter	1030786	" "
D. B. Woodworth	1031189	" "
A. L. Wood	2109942	" "
C. P. Cowley	2621867	" "
F. A. Daniels	2621827	" "
L. R. Gillilon	2109873	" "
D. R. Jackson	2621806	" "
C. P. Reigel	2109903	" "
J. M. Kidd	1030743	" "
Applicants for American Citizenship		
Jas. Haldane	1031367	" "
Jno. S. Dawson	1031229	" "
W. S. Shorter	1031427	" "
Isaac Studholme	1031138	" "
J. J. Rogan	1030883	" "
A. Larkin	1031210	" "
Wm. Kidd	1030818	" "
J. H. Giipin	2130468	" "
A. Bradbury	1030477	" "
H. Corey	552902	Edmonton West.
H. Robertson	261143	" "
J. Clinton	101139	" "
G. Knappe	904306	" "
E. Errickson	114565	" "
J. J. Donough	709495	" "
J. C. Johnston	895098	" "
A. E. Webster	904988	" "
H. Stevens	183631	" "
G. S. Apton	177823	Cumberland, N.S.
John Comeau	414916	" "
G. G. J. Hensley	11052	" "
A. G. Parent	491324	" "

Name.	Number.	Voted in
E. W. Keith	183047	Cumberland, N.S.
E. Osterbauer	63700	" "
Pte. Hunter	639279	Leeds, Ont.
Pte. Empey	640053	" "
Pte. Bronck	640235	" "
A. W. Durkee		Yarmouth, N.S.
T. C. Gale	299053	Cape Breton N. & Victoria.
J. J. Wall	534442	" "
Henry H. Williams	300926	Envelope endorsed as "Not British Subject". Allowed to vote in Westmount by Major E. S. Rogers, Dep. Presiding Officer.

Sgt. Bowser—attached to office of Ass't. Clerk of Crown in Chancery, an American Citizen, voted at London Polling Booth.

Name.	Number.	Voted in
Lieut. Perry		Yarmouth, N.S.
V. C. Hayes	2329828	" "
E. L. Taylor	788164	Hants, N.S.
J. H. Semmell	1078523	Voted in St. Antoine, Que., although they declared they were not British subjects.
J. McCarty	920160	
J. C. Laban	749278	
Lieut. Wyld		
F. Fortinos	660661	
H. G. Baird	347554	
H. Percy	349196	
P. R. Colins	1013668	Voted in Port Arthur and Kenora, although they declared they were not British subjects.
W. Harding	1013612	
M. Blaesse	1013665	
H. Brockman	1013575	
F. C. Anderson	1013601	
O. J. Barene	1013666	
F. Moine	1013681	
P. Flynn	1013638	
J. A. Swanson	1013648	
Hans Neilson	1013697	
J. Holawitch	1013662	
R. Martin	213728	Admitted U.S.A. Citizenship, and allowed to vote in North York.
Clarence L. Goodyear	249765	Toronto. Voted North York.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I had just completed reading a list of military electors who had given their answers to the questions on the envelope, and had declared that they were United States citizens, but who nevertheless voted in a number of constituencies throughout the Dominion. That was to prove charge No. 26 that a large number of citizens of the United States had voted in the following Canadian constituencies: Peel, Ontario; Digby and Annapolis, N.S.; St. Ann's, Quebec; Prince Edward, Ontario; North Essex, and Bruce North, Ontario; Edmonton East, Alberta; Cape Breton South and Richmond, N.S.;

St. Lawrence and St. George, Montreal; Ottawa; Brome, Quebec; Renfrew, Ontario; Laurier and Outremont, and Wright, Quebec; Cape Breton North and Victoria, and Pictou, Nova Scotia; Westmorland, New Brunswick; Edmonton W., Alberta; Cumberland, and Yarmouth, Nova Scotia; and Leeds, Ontario.

I want to read another list on the same matter of citizens of the United States, non-resident voters, who answered No. 5 on the ballot envelope in the negative. There were twenty on the list in question, all of whom voted in the Yukon electoral district. Their names are:

NON-RESIDENT VOTERS IN THE YUKON WHOSE VOTES WERE COUNTED.

Name.	Number.	Where enlisted or answer to question 5.	D.R.O.
Pte. Frederick B. Blooms.	528407	No.	Thomas Grembell.
Pte. Peter Gondie	180846	No.	Geo. Fisher, Capt.
Pte. Harry 1. Smith	528420	No.	Thomas Grembell.
Pte. Donald Campbell	528342	No.	Thomas Grembell.
Pte. William Joseph Moran	2498419	Chicago.	Geoge Barton.
Pte. Joseph Dunall	2606858	No.	Thomas Grembell.
Pte. Charles McKenzie	821113	Don't know.	A. E. Shaw, Capt.
Pte. Albert I. Imlock	523317	No.	Thomas Grembell.
Pte. W. Cambell	9460	No.	R. Orme.
Pte. Robert Grees	528195	No.	Thomas Grembell.
Cpl. Albert V. E. Osborne	523344	No.	Thomas Grembell,
Sgt. James Edward Mahar	487329	Cannot say	Geo. E. Shaw.
Pte. James William Yill	540467	Not applicable	Geo. E. Shaw.
Pte. W. McCrea	2499335	No.	R. H. Sloan.
Pte. H. Mikison	514742	No.	R. Orme.
Pte. Sylvester Gullimore	F. & R. Con.	No.	H. H. Timmons.
L/Cpl. J. Whitecross	2304495	No.	Robert Orme.
Pte. William Bennet	827215	Cannot say	Geo. E. Shaw.
Pte. Clement Merriman	3030531	Chicago	George Barton.
Pte. Oscar Petterson	523435	No.	Thos. Grembell.

The above well illustrates the injustice done to the Yukon; all the above voters were allowed their votes, though none of them answered either the 6th, 7th or 8th clause on the envelope. The answers in the 3rd column were made to question No. 5. The voter placed his vote under 9. This also is a good sample of all the constituencies where there were hard fights put up. Thousands of envelopes were marked this way, and I contended they should all be thrown out, but was ruled against.

(Sd.) W. R. Hearn,
Scrutineer for Canada.

These men all answered Question No. 9 and selected the constituency of the Yukon in which to cast their ballots.

Now, it seems to me that when such a number of non-residents answered Question No. 9 and selected the Yukon as the constituency in which their ballots should be counted, there is at least a very strong suspicion that some person in high authority influenced, advised and directed how those ballots should be cast.

The next paragraph in the charge No. 27, to which I refer is that military voters had two ballots in the same envelope. That military electors were permitted to vote more than once is established by the following statement:

J. R. Cattanach, 928607, voted twice in Leeds. (Capt. H. J. Denis, Deputy Presiding Officer.)

J. J. Connolly, 249437, residence Dingwall Ave., Toronto, voted twice. (Lt.-Col. Malone, Deputy Returning Officer.)

Rees Jones, 501219, Halifax, voted twice. (Capt. J. H. Johnstone, Dep. Presiding Officer.)

Clarence A Coleman, 684026, 18th C. M. G. Co. voted twice. (Major Brownlee, Deputy Presiding Officer.)

J. Edwards, 2497986, voted in Arthabaskaville, Dec. 5th and Dec. 10. (Capt. McLean, Deputy Presiding Officer.)

Wilfrid Boyle, 672606, voted December 2nd and December 4th. (Lt.-Col DeRosiere, Dep. Presiding Officer.)

Lieut. P. S. Whitehead, R.F.A., voted twice on December 7th. (Major Shore, Deputy Presiding Officer.)

E. Green, 469050 voted in Fernie, B.C., and in Cumberland, N.S.

M. Bonlick, 716016, voted twice in Nova Scotia.

J. G. Fraser, 514325, voted twice in Nova Scotia.

C. J. Tracy, 90150, voted twice in Nova Scotia.

J. J. Wall, 534442, voted twice in Nova Scotia.

W. L. Doane, 50916, voted twice in Nova Scotia.

W. W. Bell, 2005073, voted twice in Nova Scotia.

E. C. Sandy, 2574317, voted twice in Ontario.

E. S. Barney, 66951, voted twice in Ontario.

R. W. Leach, 803022, voted twice in Ontario.

Daniel O'Leary, 1015603, voted twice in Yukon.

C. B. Conway, 2303915, voted twice in Yukon on December 12th, (Capt. J. H. Johnstone, Deputy Presiding Officer).

Sergt. A. J. Horne, 1037702, 127th C.F.C. 14th Avenue, Vancouver, voted twice in British Columbia.

Mary Stewart Walsh, Nursing Sister, voted twice December 3rd. (Major Chown, Deputy Presiding Officer).

Clarence L. Goodyear, 249765, U.S.A. citizen, voted in North-York, and this regimental number was voted in Bruce North in the name of D. R. W. Burrows.

Lt. Col. Claude Harding Hill, D.S.O., voted Halifax twice, December 10th. (Lt. E. Jones, D. P. O.).

Cadet Peter J. Macdonald, 52023, voted twice in Sydney, N.S., December 10th. (Lt. E. Jones D.P.O.).

Those are only a few of the instances that I have been able to gather in my investigation of the facts in connection with the ballots cast by military voters at this election. While I am able to submit only a few individual cases to the House, there can be, without doubt, abundant evidence accumulated to show that thousands of such cases occurred during the election.

In connection with charge No. 28, that the Deputy Presiding Officer gave military electors two ballots in direct violation of the Elections Act, that is established by the following list of envelopes which contained double ballots:

Name.	Number.	Deputy Presiding Officer.
Gusoon, G. S.,	Lieut.	Major J. McCuaig.
Lavialoire, A.,	2160916	" " "
Dube, L. J.,	1003143	" " "
Raby, R. S.,	Lieut.	Lieut. J. Maxted.
Gillie, G. D.,	Lieut.	" " "
Anderson, R. S.,	2nd Lt.	" " "
Devlin, J. R.,	Flight Lt.	" " "
Steers, W. B.,	Lieut.	" " "
Evans, T. C.,	Lt.-Col.	" " "
Lindsay, Mabel,	N. Sister	" " "
Hatley, E. N.,	2nd Lt.	" " "
Cutton, Dorothy,	N. Sister	" " "
Lewis, A. C. T.,	Lieut.	" " "
Ostes, H. S.,	Lt.-Col.	" " "
Cornish, J. H.,	Lieut.	" " "
O'Sullivan, J. J.,	Staff Capt.	" " "
Donaldson, W. D.	R.N.A.S.	" " "
Treadwell, E. H,,	Lieut.	" " "
Sutherland, J. A.,	R.A.N.S.	" " "
Parker, E. S.,	Capt.	" " "
Ross, A. C.,	Capt.	" " "
Wood, F. C.,	Lieut.	" " "
Brown, E. G.,	C.A.S.C.	" " "
Watson, W. W.,	Lieut.	Capt. Alex Fenton.
McLeod, G. W.,	2157348	" " "
Aubrey, C. J.,	297276	" " "
Clarke, C. J.,	145630	" " "
Edwards, P. E.,	297001	" " "
Cherry, H.,	1036133	" " "
McAndrew, J. J.,	1012567	" " "
Desjardins, S.,	1012441	" " "
Cooper, P.,	1012481	" " "
Agar, W. L.,	2157402	" " "
Brunskill, R.,	1048561	" " "
Burton, H.,	2157497	" " "
Bell, J.,	513272	" " "
Zupray, P.,	219387	" " "
Gagnon, J. C.,	246142	" " "

[Mr. Copp.]

Name.	Number.	Deputy Presiding Officer.
Brown, A.,	1105021	Lt.-C. H. Desrosiers.
Chenier, M.,	417008	" " "
Lussier, L.,	660537	" " "
Mennier, L.,	672387	" " "
Bouchard, A.,	847282	" " "
Paquette, A.,	513476	" " "
Cote, W.,	660806	" " "
Godfrey, C.,	61098	" " "
Protain, O.,	416113	" " "
Boivin, V.,	448859	" " "
Lapersie, J. H.,	417058	" " "
Villeneuve, D.,	144165	" " "
Blondin, Rene,	1105023	" " "
Burns, E. A.,	1027210	Major J. McCuaig.
Burke, P. H.,	1049048	" " "
Stewart, W. P.,	454580	" " "
Taylor, W. A.,	1048430	" " "
Loushaway, F.,	2160982	" " "
Haydon, C.,	13509	Major G. D. Smith.
Hopwood, F.,	26556	Major J. H. Brownlee.
Walter, Hurd,	Major	Lieut. J. Maxted.

Each of these envelopes containing votes cast by the names I have mentioned, contained two ballots. The Act distinctly says that only one ballot shall be given to a voter when he goes into the poll to cast his vote. While I have only one page containing some forty or fifty of these names, undoubtedly it will be found on investigation that there are a very large number of others who had two ballots given to them when they went to cast their votes in the election. It might very well be said: "Well, the extra ballot was not meant to be given." That may be very true. But we know there was a systematic effort made according to the list I have, because there are only three or four different presiding officers in the list I have given the House, and when eight or ten or twelve different voters were going into those polls and getting two ballots from the same deputy returning officer and putting them into an envelope, it could not be considered to be a mistake that two ballots were put in instead of one. I can readily understand, in our own elections here, where you go behind a screen and get the ballot paper and put it in the envelope, how two ballots might be picked up off the shelf or table, being closely stuck together. But it is beyond me to understand why in that particular place, and at the taking of these votes in that polling booth, that large number of envelopes would have two ballots enclosed in them. And it could have been only for one purpose, that is with the expectation that it might be possible when these envelopes were opened that there might not be representatives present for both parties, and in that case the ballots might have been counted; and a

very criminal breach of the election law would have been committed.

The next charge is:

That military electors voted on behalf of and personated other military electors.

The next charge is No. 29:

Pte. Rickett voted in Leeds for E. T. Taylor, 170, Toronto.

Pte. Lake voted in Leeds for J. F. Christie, 943, Toronto.

Pte. Mejsken voted in Leeds for W. H. Easton, 639218, Merrickville.

Pte. Flynn voted in Leeds for J. Whitfield, 640222, Winnipeg.

N. Robinson voted in Leeds for Mark Norman, 49475, Toronto.

J. Wyper voted in Leeds for Harry C. Bull, 84108. Galt, Ont..

J. Dawson voted in Leeds for Chas. G. Ashdown, 106063, Winnipeg.

G. A. Rutherford voted in Leeds for Robt. C. Hughes, 410311, Ottawa.

D. J. McLelland voted in Leeds for J. G. McKay, 4150079, Glace Bay, N.S.

G. H. Hill voted in St. Anne's for Alex Macdougall, Winnipeg.

J. Parkin voted in St. Anne's for Harold Robinson, Toronto.

A. Lambert voted in Prince Edward for W. Campeau, 243238, Laprairie, Que.

L. Domoseai voted in Prince Edward for Percy Insley, 27624, Valcartier, Que.

T. Bourbonier voted in N. Essex for S. D. Eatherstone, Mt. Tomie, B.C.

L. P. Cann voted in Edmonton E. for D. Kennedy, 13514, U.S. Citizen.

J. W. Scrinshaw voted in Edmonton E. for L. J. Baddoe, 1557, Toronto.

P. Rudd voted in St. Lawrence & St. Geo. for P. Dunn, 141901, Nigaara.

H. Atkinson voted in St. Lawrence & St. Geo. for L. Morgan, 41724, Valcartier.

J. E. Jeary voted in Ottawa for Robt. Cleland, 487327, Killean.

E. Monney voted in Ottawa for F. Lalonde, 410524, Cornwall.

R. J. Huffman voted in Ottawa for Clarence Huffman, 644061, Orillia.

A. King voted in Ottawa for L. S. Cormack, 86049, Winnipeg.

E. G. Gilmour voted in Ottawa for Thos Bootland, 41, Ottawa.

W. Mitchell voted in Westmount & St, Henri for A. Laliberte, 26220, Montreal, Que.

Anson McEwan voted in Queens, P.E.I., for Jas. S. McBeth, 712161, Charlottetown;

That list proves to me that there was personation in the conduct and carrying on of the election; and the military voters whose names I have given here voted on a number that did not belong to them. For that reason, it was an illegal vote, because on the ballot envelopes the elector was asked: Your number; your rank; your name. A list was there before them; and though these voters that I have mentioned are few in number, to be sure, yet that only goes to show that an attempt was made, and effectively carried out, whereby military voters personated other voters, and thus an illegal vote was cast and recorded for the Government in these cases.

The next charge is No. 30:

That after military electors had voted ballot envelopes were fraudulently re-endorsed so that the votes of the said electors were transferred to electoral districts other than the constituencies indicated by the said electors in their reply to questions 6 and 7 in Form B.

I have a list here showing the procedure by which votes were switched to constituencies other than the ones indicated by the military electors when taking the oath before deputy presiding officers. According to the Military Service Act, these questions were to be answered under oath. We find a large number of envelopes in certain constituencies with the electoral constituency, in answer to question 9 filled in by the voter and said envelope signed by the deputy presiding officer. Afterwards, the name of the constituency selected by the elector, or in which he was qualified to vote in accordance with the answers on the envelope, was erased and the name of another constituency entered thereon. After the soldier had selected his constituency, as is possible in question No. 9, if questions 6, 7 and 8 are left unanswered, and the constituency was placed there apparently in good faith by the soldier, and after he had retired from the booth the name of the constituency was erased and another one written in its place. I cannot conceive, Mr. Speaker, of any other reason why a number of envelopes should be found in that condition unless that was systematic fraud practised on that occasion. There was not even an initial to show that the change had been made in the presence of the soldier.

Here is a list of a few names:

Milan Pankovitch, 132807, enlisted at Montreal, voted at 5th General Hospital, Liverpool. Lieut.-Col. S. C. Hart, deputy presiding officer. Envelope was endorsed that voter resided in Montreal South. This endorsation was struck out and Cashwell, Sherbrooke, Quebec, was inserted.

Howard S. Allen, Sergeant, 1030430, endorsed his envelope as residing at Fredericton, N.B., and the vote was transferred to Cumberland, N.S.

Horace McNutt, 715004, gave his residence as Cape Breton North and Victoria, which was struck out and Cumberland, N.S., inserted.

Louis Klitzner, Duluth avenue, Montreal, marked to Quebec South.

W. T. Brennan, 283488, Shelburne, Queens, N.S., endorsation changed to Halifax.

Alex. McDougall, 931427, Tremont Hotel, Nelson, B.C., changed to Antigonish, N.S.

J. W. Herron 875458, Bowsman River, Manitoba, struck out and Ottawa inserted.

Captain H. S. Thain, Sundown, Alaska, struck out and Lambton West inserted.

W. P. Draffen, 628130, Vernon, B.C., struck out and Lambton West inserted.

Major James K. Lawson, Spadina avenue, Toronto, struck out and Lambton West inserted.

Fred W. A. Fordham, Hamilton, changed to Lambton West.

George Riordan, 437331, 9 Doris street, Toronto, changed to Calgary.

J. J. Lyons, 1045701, Windsor, Ontario, changed to Cape Breton North and Victoria, N.S.

W. J. Richardson, 410387, Cornwall, Ontario, changed to Cape Breton North and Victoria, N.S.

H. C. Lockwood, 73336, residence given as Port William, Kings County, N.S., changed to Hants, N.S.

A. Walcott, 334029, residence LaSalette, changed to London.

P. F. Gray, 799679, Herman street, Montreal, changed to Toronto, W.

W. Polak, 294962, Halifax, changed to N. Wellington.

F. Benck, 294945, Winnipeg, changed to N. Wellington.

R. R. Emden, 2203696, Vancouver, changed to Prince Edward County.

G. C. Kelly, 880590, Frankford, Ont., changed to Chatham, Ont.

Ray Strand, 288856, residence Winnipeg, changed to N. Bruce.

C. J. Burns, 20807, residence Vancouver, changed to Toronto, W.

Anson McEwan, 712161, endorsed his envelope as residing in Queens, P.E.I., and vote was changed to Kent, N.B.

Elmer McKay, 712172, Queens, P.E.I., changed to Kent N.B.

Alfred G. Daniels, 712061, Queens, P.E.I., changed to Kent, N.B.

Cecil M. Thomas, 713174, Queens, P.E.I., changed to Kent, N.B.

Captain G. W. Stornaway, Queens, P.E.I., changed to Winnipeg, Man.

Captain W. F. Kennedy, endorsed ballot envelope giving residence at Springfield, N.S., changed to Halifax, N.S.

Fred L. Evans, 718063, residential endorsation Gravel View, Manitoba, changed to Mount Forest, Ontario.

Ambrose Ambeau, 757808, Hamilton, residence struck out and South Bruce inserted.

N. Povogozruk, 1087277, Montreal, residence struck out and Prince Edward County inserted.

Charles Peter, 1045616, Windsor, residence struck out and N. Renfrew inserted.

Adam Leeman, 712025, endorsed his ballot as residing Saskatchewan, and voted in Kent, N.B. (Major Cecil Roberts, deputy presiding officer).

In these cases the constituency named on the ballot envelope, which the soldier had given as his domicile and in which his vote should have been counted, was struck out and another constituency inserted, as I have read. I can come to only one conclusion, that that was done after the soldier had answered the questions, and that it was done without the soldier's knowledge or consent.

With reference to statement No. 31: that persons were fraudulently allowed to vote by deputy presiding officers with knowledge that such persons were not qualified under the Election Act, the following ballot envelopes were marked as entitled to vote in Ottawa by Lieutenant F. W. Lock, Casualty Depot, Buxton, deputy presiding officer, although the residence of the voters was endorsed on the envelopes by the electors as appears in the following list:

G. Jones, No. 23153, actual residence, Nashwaak, N.B.
L. Summer, 457575, 302 Burgess St., Montreal.
J. A. Cooper, 195630, Warsaw, Ontario.
J. H. Goodridge, Alberta.
J. Mowat, 874718, Manitoba.
T. S. Short, 109600, Toronto, Ontario.
H. Hamlett, 1078269, Montreal, Quebec.
J. Hall, 163015, Toronto, Ontario.
A. Lafrance 417308, Montreal.
C. Vezina, 919432, Verdun street, Montreal.
F. D. Ullman, 455017, Prescott, Ontario.
W. Cooping, 657098, Toronto, Ontario.
F. C. Wareham, 408548, Thornton, Ontario.
A. Smith, Saskatchewan.
H. F. Speakman, 211210, Manitoba.
H. W. Jollimore, 283518, Liverpoll, N.S.
H. Smith, 252792, Saskatchewan.
A. L. Gray, 148589, Manitoba.
S. R. Wood, 809039, Alberta.

This is a short list, but I think it is sufficient to show the House that very grave irregularities and frauds were practised in this respect.

The following is a list of military electors who gave their residence as Fort Albany, James Bay, Ontario, but whose envelopes were endorsed as voting in Ottawa:

Robert Linkletter, Patrick Katabrawbit, George Kiaki, Joseph Okeman, James Knach, George Farries, John Keeach, Jacob Swanson, D. Okitego, Thomas Sutherland, James Farris, Albert Metch, John Jakagon, W. Katakawbit, Peter Swanson, Thomas Goodwin, Thomas Noah, Joel Wesley, Charles Tomacartick, N. Chakasum, Isaac Goodwin, Joseph Poney, Peter J. George, Peter Jackagon, S. Sutherland, James Katakawbit, John Iserkoff, David Iserkoff.

Following this point further, I have already referred to Lord Brooke, whose residence was Calgary, but whose vote was transferred to Provencher, Manitoba. Lord Beaverbrook, formerly Sir Max Aitkin, M.P. in the British House of Commons, who was nominally in charge of the Canadian War Record publication in London, voted in Northumberland county, New Brunswick. Other illegal votes accepted by deputy presiding officers were as follows:

Amy G. Cassels, civilian, C.A.M.C., Montreal (Lieutenant-Colonel W. L. Watt, deputy presiding officer).

Mary Stewart, civilian, C.A.M.C., Brantford, Ontario; (Colonel Macpherson, deputy presiding officer).

Caroline Larose, Brome, Quebec; (Lieutenant J. M. Douglass, deputy presiding officer).

Ethel Mould, wife of Mould, 20550, voted in Leeds, Ontario, whereas her husband's residence was given by himself on his own envelope as Lindsay Block, Winnipeg (Lieut. J. M. Douglass, Deputy presiding offiver). It was contended that his wife had no vote.

Gwendolyn Read, wife of Captain G. R. Read, voted in Nanaimo, B. C. (Lt. J. M. Douglass, deputy presiding officer).

Mrs. Scatterwood, married woman, not in Canada for several years, was allowed to vote.

Frances G. Renwick, Women's Army Auxiliary Corps—not Canadian—voted (Captain Gimblett, Deputy Presiding Officer.)

Marjorie Mallam, resident of Acton, N.W. London, visiting King George's Hospital, Waterloo, when the poll was opened, was persuaded by a chaplain to vote because she "was kind to Canadian soldiers," and did vote.

Miss E. G. Ferris, an attendant at the Navy and Army Canteen, voted (Major Shore, Deputy Presiding Officer.-

Nora Lucas, wife of Lt. G. P. Lucas, South Wales Borderers, voted in West Toronto (Lt. J. M. Douglass, Deputy Presiding Officer.-

Dorothy O. McLaren, attendant, Canadian Red Cross offices, voted in Ottawa (Lt. J. Oxhed, Deputy Presiding Officer.-

Ethel L. Robertson, attendant, Canadian Red Cross offices, voted in Ottawa (Lt. Maxted Deputy Presiding Officer.)

Catherine McGrath, Dorothy Outerbridge, Mrs. Walter Barwick and Clare Georgina McKendrick voted in Ottawa in the same way.

Laura C. McKendrick, British Red Cross; Mrs. W. S. H. Simard, Military Massage Corps; Catherine Taylor, civilian, born at Clinton, Ontario, voted in King's county, N.S.

Lenora Draper (née Paterson), British V.A.D., certificate A149566; Mrs. Vera McNally, wife of Major McNally, Deputy Presiding Officer, British V.A.D., 148th Detachment, voted in Prince Edward, Ontario.

Jean M. Boney, British Red Cross, voted in Richmond and Wolfe, Que.

Jean Isobel Coloquon, British Red Cross, voted in Richmond and Wolfe, Que.

Martha Vadenias, United States subject, voted in Laurier and Outremont, Que.

Marguerette Allen, Montreal, voted.

Mrs. Mary Theodora Kayle, wife of Lt. H. O. Kayle, voted.

Gwenneth Gertrude Mason, British Women's Army Auxiliary Company, voted.

R. Martin, 213728, admitted United States citizen, allowed to vote by Lt. A. Provost, Oxford.

I have a few other names here, but I shall not take up any more time in reading them.

I now will read a statement of Canadian officers who voted in constituencies other than those in which they were entitled to vote:

Name.	Residence.	Voted in
Lt. H. D. Anderson	Vancouver	Yukon.
Capt. W. B. Allen	London, Ont.	Russell.
Capt. J. H. Atkiknson	Kingston, Ont.	Ottawa.
Capt. J. P. Brennan	Montreal	Westmorland.
Lt. C. H. Booth	Ottawa	Kent, Ont.
Capt. L. P. Burwash	Toronto	Prince Edward county.
Hon. Capt. (Rev.) Buck	Alberta	Yukon.
Capt. F. H. Burr	Winnipeg	Northumberland, N.B.
Lt. W. W. Copeland	Toronto	North Simcoe, Ont.
Lt. H. F. Clarke	Durham county	West Lambton.
Capt. H. T. Cook	Halifax	Westmoreland, N.B.
Lt. & Adjt. Coolin	Halifax	North Bruce.
Lt. F. Dickson	Brantford, Ont.	Northumberland, N.B.
Lt. D. Q. Ellis	York county	West Lambton.
Major J. L. Evans	Brandon	Peel.
Lt. L. H. Earle	Vancouver	Ottawa.
Lt. M. McQ. Foster	Winnipeg	Lambton West.
Capt. Logie Foster	Fort Frances	South Bruce.
Lt. G. A. Hubbard	St. John, N.B.	Northumberland, N.B.
Lt. W. H. Harton	Richmond, Que.	Northumberland, N.B.
Lt. A. A. Horton	St. Thomas, Ont.	South Essex.
Lt. W. Hampton	Toronto	South Essex.
Lt. Heaton	Montreal	Pictou, N.S.
Capt. A. J. A. Illingworth	Saskatchewan	Ottawa.
Lt. E. R. Johnstone	Saskatchewan	Ottawa.
Capt. W. F. Kennedy envelope endorsed	Springfield, N.S., changed to	Halifax, N.S.
Lt. J. S. Lamrock	Hamilton	S. Essex.
Lt. Col. F. W. Miller	14th Hussars, Halifax	East Hamilton.
Brig. Gen. Macdougall	former residence Ottawa	Prince Edward county.
Lt. J. R. Morris	Lanark	Ottawa.
Lt. W. McIntyre	Kingston	Russell.
Capt. H. A. McLeod	Pictou, N. S.	Westmorland, N.B.
Lt. C. McLeod	Halifax	Pictou, N.S.
Lt. F. C. Newman	Norfolk co.	Prince Edward co.
Lt. G. R. Newton	York co.	Lambton West.
Lt. H. R. Poussette	Toronto	Lambton West.
*Hon. Capt. H. A. Pain		Ottawa.
Lt. Walter Reid	Port Arthur	West Middlesex.
Lt. E. A. Robinson	Coaticooke. Que.	Cape Breton N. and Victoria.
Major C. M. Roberts	Vancouver	Yukon.
Lt. C. E. L. Skedden	Hamilton	West Lambton.

Name.	Residence.	Voted in
Lt. W. F. Scott	Huron county	East Toronto.
Major W. H. Scarth	Winnipeg	Yukon.
Major W. F. Seaton	Alberta	Northumberland.
Lt. W. F. Smith	Lunenburg, N.S.	Westmorland, N. B.
Capt. A. N. Sanderson	Toronto	Westmorland, N. B.
Lt. J. F. Smith	London	Westmorland.
Lt. H. B. Smith	York co. Ont.	King5s co., N.B.
Capt. W. H. Tayor	Calgary	Ottawa.
Lt. J. R. Taylor	Sherbrooke	Lambton West.
Hon. Capt. M. P. Titus	King's co., N.B.	Yukon.
Lt. A. B. Todd	Windsor, N.S.	Northumberland, N.B.
Lt. J. J. Thompson	Vancouver	Westmorland, N.B.
Lt. J. E. Webber	Haldimand co.	Kent, Ont.
Lt. H. Westmorland	Ottawa	Kent, N.B.
Capt. O. E. Wallace	Alberta	Prince Edward county.

* This list does not give Capt. Pain's residence. He may have been entitled to vote in Ottawa.

There is not one officer on this list whose vote has been cast in the constituency in which he resided before going overseas, they voted in other constituencies, without qualification and absolutely against the letter and spirit of the Military Voters' Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed before the House and the country the facts which I desired it my duty to make known. I can assure you, that I do not bring this matter before the House for any personal feeling I have in the matter, or any personal feeling I have against any hon. member in this House, nor do I so because the overseas vote or the soldiers' vote in Canada made any difference in my election or anything of that kind. This information, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, came to me from soldiers themselves in answer to letters that I had sent to them and that were not delivered until after the votes had been cast. They stated to me that the letters were not delivered until after the vote was taken. They gave me a number of illustrations of irregularities and frauds that had been committed in the polling booths where the military electors went to cast their ballots under the Military Voters' Act that was passed at the last session of Parliament. Being prompted by those letters, I commenced to make some inquiries. I made those inquiries in the best possible way I could. I made investigations; I compared, where that was possible, the nominal rolls of the officers and men. I satisfied myself that gross irregularities took place in the taking of the soldiers' votes, and frauds and election crimes were committed in regard to the taking of that vote. The opportunity afforded me of investigating matters was indeed meagre and, in a great measure,

I had to secure a good deal of information from hostile witnesses, but nevertheless I secured that information and I believe it to be true. When I pieced together the different portions of evidence that I had gathered, I was satisfied that gross irregularities and frauds had been perpetrated in the taking of the soldiers' votes. I said at the outset that, when the Military Voters' Act was going through this House, it was stated that just such frauds and irregularities as these would be the result. Those apprehensions were well grounded, and I think I have given absolutely convincing evidence that the irregularities that were feared have taken place. I have taken up a great deal of the time of the House in presenting this argument.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COPP: I realized that this task would be unpopular with hon. gentlemen opposite, but when one has a matter of this kind to bring before Parliament and the country one must make an argument such as he would make before a court of law, and it should be in sequence as far as possible. I have endeavoured to do that. I did not undertake this duty to gain the plaudits of hon. gentlemen around me, nor did I shirk it because it would be unpopular amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. I knew that the duty devolved upon me or some other member on this side of the House to bring the facts before the public. I have undertaken that responsibility, and I leave it to the country to judge whether or not I have done my duty. Before taking my seat I beg to move:

That an investigation be held conducted by a judge of a court of superior jurisdiction, assisted by two counsel, one to be selected by the Prime Minister and the other by the leader of the Opposition, to examine into the taking

and counting of the military votes cast in the last general election, with power to order the production of all cables, telegrams, correspondence, toll books, nominal rolls of regiments and papers and documents of all kinds, and with power also to summon and examine witnesses, except soldiers whose attendance at the inquiry would interfere, in the opinion of the judge, with their military duties.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment is not in proper form. I presume the hon. member intends to move in amendment to the motion for Commitee of Supply "that the Speaker do not now leave the Chair."

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, it would have been a pity if the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) who states he has not shirked his duty—and I am quite sure this House will be confirmed in that view, if he conceived it to be his duty to make a speech of this kind, seeing that he has taken four hours to deliver it—it would have been a pity indeed if he had forgotten the principal part of his speech, in which he desired to move for a committee of inquiry on a matter in respect of which, I submit, he has given no reason at all why a committee of inquiry should be appointed. However, I do not want to dwell on that.

In the first place I would ask my hon. friend, who has brought this matter up at such great length, what on earth was the good of bringing it up, and stating what he has stated at this particular time? He has talked a great deal about fraud and crime. I am not sure that it is not a crime perpetrated against this House on the night before prorogation to take up four hours of the time of this House in trying to prove a case which he has not begun to prove. If there had been a situation where the mandate of the people, coupled with the mandate of those who are Canadian citizens across the seas, had been of so undecided a character that there was doubt in the minds of this nation whether or not this Government should be supported in its policies, I could quite understand that with the feeling of soreness, perhaps, that all people and all parties have when they are defeated in an election they might bestir themselves and say, "Well, this is a very narrow margin; possibly something has been going on against the law; let us pursue the matter and see if we cannot turn the scales." But that was not the case here. The case here is that without a single soldier vote overseas or in Canada, this Union Government and its policies has been so absolutely and so substantially endorsed that there has been no question as to a mandate from the people of Canada, and it is rather amusing to hear my hon. friend express his horror at the desperate things that have been going on, and the pain it has given him. Personally I did not see any great evidence of pain when the hon. member was bringing up this matter in the way he has. Throughout all his speech there is not only an admission that he attacks the political side of this thing—political in the sense that all politicians understand, namely, the methods and practices of those not holding office, but who are desirous, nevertheless, of returning their party to power—but there is also an implication or plain charge that the administration of this Election Act by the officials appointed for that purpose has been of a deplorable character. Before saying another word, I resent in the strongest possible way the imputations that have been cast by the hon. member on the character of the officers who have carried forward this election in Canada, in England, and in France, and I think the best answer I can give my hon. friend after his four hours' speech would be this: that he has not said, practically, a single word or made a single charge in regard to the administration of the Act and the running of the election in France or in Canada, but has confined practically all of his criticisms and charges to the conduct of the election in England. I would point out to this House what many members know, that there have been the same administration, the same rulings and decisions, and practically the very same methods, in France, in England, and in Canada. In France we have had no complaints; in Canada we have had virtually no complaints. Indeed, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself commended the way in which the general returning officer, Mr. O'Connor, had conducted election affairs in Canada. Mr. Langlois, the gentleman appointed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition to take chief charge in France, commended Colonel Purney, the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery overseas, for the way he had conducted affairs so far as France was concerned. My hon. friend attempts to show that things were conducted in a different way in England from that in which they were conducted in Canada or France. That charge is absolutely without foundation. Mr. O'Connor had charge of the administration of the Act and the conduct of the elections in Canada, and was constantly in touch, every day, by cable

with the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery overseas, Colonel Purney.

Colonel Purney himself was part of the time in England and part of the time in France, and he was directing operations in France as well as in the United Kingdom. What have these gentlemen got to say about this man? I do not need to say that I do not propose to discuss Mr. O'Connor's personality in this House—that is something that we are not discussing now, but I do not think there is an hon. gentleman present who will deny Mr. O'Connor's undoubted ability or that any one would charge him with having done or assented to anything to which you might apply the term crooked in connection with this election. I shall speak of that later on. I may say that Mr. O'Connor himself has stated that, as general returning officer, in England, France or Canada, not a single case of impropriety in this election has come to his knowledge. That statement is borne out by Col. Purney, the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in England. By implication, Col. Purney is placed under suspicion. He happens to be the President of the Great War Veterans' Association, and is it a blemish upon his character, or an undesirable thing, that he should be selected to serve his country when he is incapacitated for further work at the front. Is it an undesirable thing that this returned soldier and President of the Great War Veterans' Association should be put in charge of this important work, and why should it be regarded as a blemish if he is qualified in other respects; especially as there is no evidence furnished by the correspondence or presented from any source to show that Col. Purney has not lived up to the spirit and letter of the law and performed his duty in an absolutely efficient and satisfactory way?

I have said that the same rulings and decisions that have governed the elections in Ottawa, and in Canada generally, have governed the whole of the cases in England and in France. I intend to take up some of these matters in detail later on. My hon. friend, of course, will not surely expect me to follow him through all the thirty-two articles of faith, or the thirty-two charges which he has made before this House. I would rather imagine that he would not expect me to do that. I tried to follow as closely as I could the bulk of his speech or his arguments. I had a little difficulty, I must confess, because during the course of his four-hour argument, two hours or two hours and a half were taken up in the reading of lists of names which was not necessary, because the argument based upon them was absolutely fallacious and he could have saved the House a good deal of time and the King's Printer much expense if he had refrained from reading those lists.

I will touch on some features of his remarks as far as I was able to follow them. They practically came down to a series of charges which are vague in character, but which, in the main, might be classified as charges of irregularities, fraud and conspiracy. I do not think it will be unfair to say to my hon. friend that if he has done nothing else he has earned a distinction which I am sure no one will be disposed to deny him. We abolished titles last night, or we are supposed to have done so, but I think I can assure my hon. friend that he has fairly earned the distinction of delivering a speech which, by reason of its turgidity and length, has rarely been equalled in the House, and by which he very successfully emptied the benches on his own side as well as on ours. He accompanied that speech with a large number of affidavits. I suppose there is something in the old saying that the truth can be found even in an affidavit sometimes. You must partly estimate the value of an affidavit by the source from which it comes, and by the motive of the person who subscribed it, or by whom it is submitted. Some of these affidavits have been coupled with the name of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, whose history in connection with election work is well known. I shall not deal with that phase of the matter now, but I intend to refer to it a little later on. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that while no charge is made in regard to these matters in France or in Canada, where Mr. Langlois and Mr. Ahearn were acting, it is significant that we have charges coming from England, where Mr. Preston was the representative of the Opposition party.

Let me take up some of the points to which my hon. friend referred. In the first place he picks out the names of persons who voted in places where they did not reside, or tried to vote. He mentioned Prince Edward County, Ontario, he named Col. Glenn, and many others and he stated that they had been allowed to vote in places where they did not reside. I would call the attention of the House to the questions contained in Form B of the Military Voters' Act and with which hon. members are very familiar. Question 6 is:

Specify the names of the place or places in Canada (giving streets and numbers where

possible) whereat you last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding your appointment, enlistment, enrolment or calling out on active service.

Then he said that these gentlemen not having answered these questions satisfactorily, their votes were allocated to certain constituencies under Question 9. There has been a very great misconception in the public mind as to the question of whether a man could allocate his vote to a particular constituency. I think I am simply stating the truth when I say that a tremendous number of people did believe, or were led to believe, both civilians and soldiers, that because a man was a military voter he had the right to allocate his vote to any constituency he liked. I can add to that with some confidence that my hon. friends on the other side of the House were the ones who industriously circulated that idea. In my own province that statement was deliberately circulated by the Opposition stating that that was what was meant by the Act, that that was what was being done, and would be done. It is no small wonder, that they having circulated that statement and it having appeared in their press, that many men did honestly believe that a man, because he was a military voter, had the right to place his vote in any constituency he pleased.

I want to show the fallacy of the general argument based on this misconception that my hon. friend presented. If the voter's residence was given under Questions 6, 7 and 8, if he desired to vote some place else under Question 9, the vote was always allocated where his residence was given and it was not allocated to a constituency in which he might express a wish to vote in. None of these votes that my hon. friend disturbs himself so much about went astray or could possibly go astray in so far as the real residence of the voter was concerned. I would like to also say that if Questions 6, 7 and 8, as to whether a man lived in a certain place and if he had lived there for four months preceding enlistment remained unanswered, and if he did not specify his place of residence and he was put under Question 9 to choose a constituency, that vote was invalid. I would like to speak about this for a moment because, I must confess, I think there may have been honest confusion on the part of the military voters in regard to these questions, Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8.

5. Were you in Canada when you were appointed, enlisted, enrolled or called out in active service .....

6. Specify the names of the place or places in Canada (giving streets and numbers where possible) whereat you last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding your appointment, enlistment, enrolment or calling out on active service .....

7. State if you can the electoral district wherein such place or places in which you so resided are situate .....

Electoral district .....

Province .....

8. If you cannot specify as required by question No. 6, or state as required by question No. 7, then state in what electoral district or place within Canada (giving street and number where possible) you have resided at any other time than is referred to in question No. 6.

Now take the case of a man coming to this country from the United States—we will say, a British subject,—and enlisting in the city of Quebec, Montreal, or anywhere else, having those questions put to him and then going into camp, we will say at Valcartier. When that question is put to him asking him to "specify as required," knowing that he was not in any sense of the word a resident in Canada, he might naturally omit answers to questions 6, 7 and 8, and might consider himself entitled to answer with respect to No. 9, as to where he desired to vote. And I know perfectly well that some scrutineers themselves held that view. But my hon. friend (Mr. Copp) argued, or appeared to argue, that a whole lot of such votes were allocated, although the answers to these questions were omitted. I want to point out to him—though no doubt he knows it,—that when questions 6, 7 and 8 were not answered, the Government and the general returning officer took the view that if a man enlisted in Canada and went into camp here, although he was not living in the Dominion before, he became, for the purposes of this Act, a resident of Canada, and it was desirable to put him down in the electoral district where he happened to enlist, because it was not desirable to have a tremendous number of these votes allocated wherever a man might choose. At all events that is the ruling which was given, and, therefore, in regard to the cases as to which my hon. friend manifests such distress—

Mr. MURPHY: By whom was the ruling given to which my hon. friend has referred?

Mr. BURRELL: That ruling was given by the general returning officer and by Colonel Purney, and was followed out.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. BURRELL: No, I am absolutely right.

Mr. MURPHY: The general returning officer had nothing to do with giving the ruling. The Order in Council passed by my hon. friend and his colleagues calls upon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to give the ruling, not the general returning officer.

Mr. BURRELL: A decision was given by the proper authority, and the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery overseas gave that ruling.

Mr. MURPHY: The general returning officer had nothing to do with it. The clerk of the Crown in Chancery here gave the ruling and the assistant clerk of the Crown in Chancery overseas followed it.

Mr. BURRELL: The ruling was given and absolutely followed, that is what I am contending for.

Mr. MURPHY: All right.

Mr. BURRELL: Therefore, the argument of my hon. friend, who seems to contend that all these votes where questions 6, 7 and 8 were not answered should not have been given, is absolutely beside the mark, because none of those ballots were allocated at all. In fact, in England, out of 104,000 votes which were cast, 17,000 ballots were rejected, and rejected largely because of that very reason. Indeed, I think there were a great many men who, perhaps, suffered an injustice by being done out of their votes. Furthermore, the candidates concerned, who did not receive the votes of those men, who honestly believed they were entitled to vote, were adversely affected. At all events, rightly or wrongly, that rigid interpretation of the law to which I have just referred was given, so that the number of men I have mentioned were not permitted to vote, and in France there was about the same proportion. In Canada alone no less than 19,000 votes were rejected, and very largely for the reason I have indicated.

I would also like to point out another fallacy indulged in by my hon. friend and to indicate to him that the fulminations and the heat which he displayed, and the fiery indignation into which he worked himself on this point, were entirely wasted energy. He argued—and if he is sincere I can only say it shows great ignorance on his part of the actual facts of the case—that it was the deputy presiding officers who allocated all these votes in, as he says, this improper way. That is what I understand the hon. gentleman to argue—that the deputy presiding officer allocated these votes although he should not have allocated them—thus implying grossly improper proceedings on the part of election officials in this matter. Now, as every member of the House knows—or many members do—the deputy presiding officers had absolutely nothing whatever to do with allocating the votes; they were simply there for the purpose of receiving the votes; and the allocation was done by the Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in England; by Mr. O'Connor in Canada, and by the gentleman appointed for the purpose in France. The allocation was carried out according to the merits and facts of the case, and according to the law, and in the presence of two men, one of whom was appointed by the Union Government and the other by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I cannot see where all the indignation manifested by my hon. friend enters at all on this subject; I think his whole case falls to the ground.

Now let me deal with another charge that the hon. gentleman made. He spoke several times about improprieties in connection with the ballot envelopes. He argued that there were improper things going on because of military voters in England filling out their envelopes before they came to the polling places to vote, and that the whole thing was extremely irregular. He alleged that a lot of this occurred at Witley in particular, and also in connection with the 156th Battalion under Lieutenant Colonel Grant. Well, that is true enough. It is not true that the ballots were filled out before the electors came to the polling place, but it is true that some were filled out before the men actually came into the polling room. As a matter of convenience some of them were filled out at Witley in an adjoining room, but, let me observe, under the Presiding Officer and sworn to and attested by him. After all, I do not know that there is anything illegal about that. It is true, it may not have been a literal or full compliance with the Act, and that it was afterwards discouraged by Colonel Purney, who stopped it; but after all, what does it amount to? The Act requires that the voters shall come to the Deputy Presiding Officer and answer certain questions that appears on the envelope as to whether they were resident in Canada, and so on. The voter was supposed to swear to those answers, and then the certificate was attested by the Presiding Officer. I would ask, however, what is the difference between a Deputy Presiding Officer giving

the voter an envelope and getting him to fill it in himself and then returning and handing it in and the Presiding Officer himself seeing that the envelope is filled out. What is the difference between putting the oath to the voter as to whether his answers are correct or not, and putting the oath to him before he filled out the envelope. The man gave his oath that those were his true answers, and I cannot see anything in that contention but a matter of hair-splitting. Although, it is true, it was not a strict compliance with the law it was only done for a short time, and done under proper supervision. Surely my hon. friend would not argue in any conceivable way that that was improper, or in any real sense an illegal proceeding? To say that that constituted evidence of a dark, dangerous, sinister conspiracy on the part of people unknown, I think would be a very far-fetched idea.

While on the envelope question my hon. friend waxed eloquent because envelopes had been put in which had not been properly filled out, or filled out before the voter went to the poll. I think that is what my hon. friend argued, although I do not want to do him an injustice. He held up a white envelope at that time.

Mr. COPP: No, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BURRELL: Very good. If my hon. friend held up an official envelope I have nothing to say. If he had held up a white envelope it would be perfectly natural because a large number of white envelopes were used by both parties for instructional purposes, many of which, through ignorance or dishonesty, were put into the various polling bags, but were rejected and destroyed at the final count. I certainly thought that was one of these envelopes.

Mr. MURPHY: Will my hon. friend say where these envelopes were used for instructional purposes?

Mr. BURRELL: I think they were used in England and Canada and by both sides I am informed. My hon. friend in the course of his remarks animadverted on the case of United States citizens voting. Here he again seems to scent some evidence of a dark and deep-laid conspiracy to get them to do improper things. In the first place, no United States citizens, as he knows, can vote under the law, although here again it was industriously spread throughout my province that this Act was so intricate that it allowed United States citizens to vote in an election. I am sure everybody who knows anything about it should know that no United States citizen could vote. It is true that if he filled out in the answer to No. 5—first of all he has to say whether he is a British subject, and if he said he was, and answered No. 5: "Were you in Canada when you enlisted?" in the negative, then I maintain he was within the law in answering No. 9. I am not pronouncing on the question as to what would be done if a United States citizen deliberately perjured himself by saying "yes" in answer to question No. 4, "Are you a British subject?" That is a different point altogether. The onus of that must rest on the individual. But as far as the election officers go, and as far as the administration of this Act goes, there is absolutely not a shadow of impropriety in regard to such a charge about United States citizens voting.

Now, I wish to come to another criticism which my hon. friend made, and that was in relation to Colonel A. T. Thompson, who is very well known and very much liked by a great many men on both sides of the House, and who formerly sat as a member of this House, and was a very strong and pronounced supporter of my right hon friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for years. I might say in this connection that the gentlemen who were appointed as chief scrutineers by my right hon. friend and by the Prime Minister, and who are by implication assailed through the speech of my hon. friend, were these:

In France, Major Gibson, representing the Government as chief scrutineer in the whole of the United Kingdom, Colonel A. T. Thompson; in Canada, Mr. John F. Orde, K.C., who is well known here. The leader of the Opposition appointed in France Mr. Godfroi Langlois, who is well known; in England, Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who is also well known; and in Canada, Mr. W. R. Hearn. I do not think that any man in this House would care to say what my hon. friend in his speech this afternoon said, that however high a standing Colonel Thompson may have had, he allowed this most deplorable conduct in the selection, for that is the effect of his charges. He said that Colonel Thompson appointed two scrutineers, one for the Opposition and one for the Government, and thereby misled everybody, and worked in a Government man masquerading as an Opposition man and did a great injury to the party of my hon. friends opposite. My hon. friend surely knows that Colonel Thompson, as chief scrutineer, does not appoint an Opposition scrutineer and assign him to a particular place, because the whole inference of my

hon. friend's remarks was that at a certain polling place Colonel Thompson had put in two men, one a Government man and one an Opposition man to work in a particular poll.

Mr. COPP: If I may be permitted: I said that Colonel Thompson appointed two scrutineers, and that the presiding officer swore one in as a scrutineer for the Opposition and the other as a scrutineer for the Government.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend cannot get away from the fact that he impugned Colonel Thompson in that respect. Because, when he was interrupted by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) he got rather heated about it, and certainly left the impression in my mind, and in the minds of hon. gentlemen on this side, that Colonel Thompson had done something very dark. Colonel Thompson was the chief scrutineer for the whole of the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands, and, as anybody who has anything to do with elections knows, he had to issue hundreds of certificates for the appointment of scrutineers, and he would issue them by the hundred. He would not always know where these certificates went. He might issue them with a name, and again it might possibly be left in blank. He does not appoint these scrutineers to go to a particular place. Here is an Opposition and a Government man. That man goes himself and takes his oath before another officer as to whether he is an Opposition scrutineer or whether he is a Government scrutineer. And upon that man and upon that officer who takes that oath is the onus of saying whether that man is an Opposition or a Government man. It is quite conceivable, to one whose mind is not so full of dark suspicions as my hon. friend's, that in the issuance of hundreds of certificates to scrutineers, mistakes should occur. If I wanted to get highly suspicious, I might as well argue that one of these certificates was filled in by my hon. friends opposite for the purpose of saying that this was a cooked-up case. I do not want to assume such things. It is very much beside the mark that my hon. friend should draw the deduction from such a slender hypothesis as this that Colonel Thompson, as a Government officer, has been behaving in a highly improper way.

My hon. friend followed that by the remark that Mr. Preston, the chief scrutineer appointed by my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition, had been maltreated in England, had not been dealt with properly, and that he had even been arrested at one time. Well, I am afraid that Mr. Preston was arrested; I cannot deny that. As a matter of fact, what happened was this: Mr. Preston was the only civilian who was operating as an election officer of any kind practically, in Great Britain. They were all military men, and every one of them in uniform. And Mr. Preston appears at some military camp and states that he is Mr. Preston and is a scrutineer, and does not produce anything to show that he is. As I understand it, he had the papers on him, but would not produce them. And the military authorities, in times like these, when civilian gentlemen, whom nobody knows, assume that they are something, and take no steps to show that they are, the military also, like my hon. friend, entertain suspicions, and perhaps even better founded than his. Apparently they entertained some suspicions of Mr. Preston and put him in jail, and I understand he was in jail for five or six hours. Nothing very serious happened, except, I have been informed, that Mr. Preston was a little disturbed in his mind. I understand one of his fellow-prisoners was a jolly little Irishman, and, during the course of that brief incarceration, there were steps heard outside, and Mr. Preston asked in some apprehension what this thing was, and was told: "Don't worry yourself, it will soon be over; it is the firing squad."

My hon. friend next brought up a lot of charges which I must confess I had very great difficulty in following. His voice, while it rose at times to great passion and fervor, sometimes sank so low when he was reading that bewildering list of names, that I could scarcely hear him. As nearly as I could follow him, he was charging that there were a lot of votes transferred to different places such as Prince Edward county or elsewhere where they did not belong, and to Northumberland, and he read out, in fact, several pages of these things. He seemed to think that something terrible had been done; that this was further conclusive evidence of the deep-laid conspiracy which he was so fond of rolling under his tongue. But let me point out that in each case the vote was allocated to the place indicated on the envelope as the residence, not to the place where the man might want to vote or was trying to vote and should not. A widespread impression prevailed among the soldiers that they could elect what constituency they should vote in. Take the case of Prince Edward County, for instance. It is conceivable that a great many men in the battalion of their

officer, Major Hepburn, who was a candidate for Prince Edward County, even if they did not belong to that county would have the impression that they could vote in the county of Prince Edward and would do all they could to persuade all the other fellows to vote there too if they could. But that does not imply that they did so.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, they did.

Mr. BURRELL: Their votes were not allocated there if they gave their residence as somewhere else.

Mr. MURPHY: They voted there.

Mr. BURRELL: Was the vote allocated to that constituency if the residence was given as somewhere else? Not at all, it was rejected.

Mr. MURPHY: Not all. Practically the whole battalion voted there.

Mr. BURRELL: If in filling out the envelope a man chose to vote in Prince Edward County, although he gave his address as somewhere else, certainly the vote would not be allocated to that constituency, because in all cases the rule was followed that where the man had lived, the place which he gave as his address, there his vote was allocated. I make that statement with the absolute assurance that I speak the truth. My hon. friend implies that he did not get from the envelopes these names of electors whose votes, he alleges, had been allocated to other constituencies than the place of residence named. Well, if the address was on the envelope, the vote went to the constituency thus indicated. If it was not on the envelope—and I do not know where else my hon. friend could have got it—the vote did not count; if questions 6, 7 and 8 were not filled in, it was rejected. In England and in Canada 36,000 votes were rejected; that is quite a large number.

The hon. member said that about 350 votes had been allotted to Northumberland County. It is possible that 350 votes were rightly allocated to that constituency; he did not give us any evidence on that point.

The hon. gentleman said also that an examination of box 101 revealed the fact that from A to K a number of votes went to the county of Leeds, and then from L to Z a number of votes went to the county of Grenville. He spoke of this as further evidence of the existence of that deep conspiracy. If a thousand votes from A to K went to Leeds and another thousand from L to Z went to Grenville, there might be reasonable ground for alleging conspiracy, but it might happen that half a dozen or eight or ten votes from A to K should go to Leeds and half a dozen or eight or ten to Grenville. If my hon. friend bases his charge of conspiracy on such slender material as this and the other points which he has dealt with during his speech of four hours, all I can say is that his charge is not very well founded.

The hon. gentleman intimated also during the course of his remarks—this shows that he cannot be very accurate, though here again I am subject to correction—that two votes with residences given as Clinton and Seaforth were allotted to South Huron. I always had the impression that Clinton and Seaforth were in South Huron.

My hon. friend made another charge. He implied that the post office officials under the direction of this Government, or of the Canadian military authorities in England, had permitted parcels to be opened, literature to be extracted therefrom and other literature to be substituted in the place of that taken out. Any literature carried in the mails of the United Kingdom—I assume that is what he referred to—is not under the direction of this Government or of the Canadian military authorities, but is purely under the English Post Office system. The hon. gentleman will stretch the credulity or the imagination of the House if he seeks to make hon. members believe that the British postal authorities would lend themselves to the free opening of parcels in order that certain campaign literature might be substituted for that which was being carried in the mails. Of course, if it had actually happened and there were any alleviation for the circumstance, one might almost be forgiven for saying that a better kind of literature would be put in than what my hon. friend's friends were sending. My hon. friend's friends can give us all pointers in the matter of campaign literature, both as to its character and the manner of its distribution.

I will touch upon that a little further before I get through. They employ clever and devious means of getting literature around. The House might be surprised to learn that Mr. Preston's son-in-law circularized a large number of the non-commissioned officers and men throughout Great Britain, in the camps and elsewhere, asking their name, rank, place of birth; inquiring whether they had lived in Canada, how long, and so on. And what do you think he told them? He said that these circulars were being sent for the purpose of making

"historical notes." Well, to quote the words used by the member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Butts) last night, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

I wish to touch upon another matter on which my hon. friend laid a good deal of stress and on which his friends and the chief scrutineer in England, Mr. Preston, also laid stress—the alleged irregularities in connection with the ballot bags. He asserted that all kinds of ballots had been folded together and put in the ballot bags; that they had been put in one time, not in a proper way, and that they were of different dates. As this matter has been the subject of some discussion, I wish to deal with it somewhat fully. Charges also were made in respect of the envelopes from different camps. It was intimated that the officers at these camps, as well as the higher election officials, must have been cognizant of this. As evidence of the spirit in which Colonel Purney, Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery overseas, conducted his operations, I wish to read a letter which he sent to the special officers whom he was to assist by instruction and advice concerning the election laws, and so on, in the various polilng places. It is as follows:

Dear Sir,—

If it were possible I would visit all points where voting at the ensuing Dominion election will be carried on. My chief objects in making such visits would be to satisfy myself without actually interfering with the work of the officials at the polls, that they have:

1. A thorough knowledge of the Military Voters' Act and of the work they are carrying on.

2. That every effort is being made by them to give every military elector in their district a chance to vote.

3. That the instructions which have been sent out by me have been absolutely followed.

As it is physically impossible for me to make this visit personally I have asked for the services of officers to assist me in this work. You have been detailed to me as one of them and I would like you to understand that in carrying out your work you must be strictly non-partisan, not doing anything that could possibly be construed as being campaign work. The least departure from this necessary provision would mean your instant return to duty.

I would also like you to make it known throughout your district that you will be available to all officials conducting the election within your area, for advice and instruction.

It is my desire that the full vote be polled and if there is any carelessness or a disposition on the part of any official not to do this, you must report it immediately to this office.

I do not wish you to take from these blunt instructions, which I must necessarily give you, any inference that I have anything but the fullest confidence in your ability to do the work which I have appointed you to do. That is farthest from my mind. If I had not the utmost confidence in your willingness and ability to assist me in the heavy work which is imposed upon me, I would not have called upon you. It is, however, incumbent upon me, situated as I am, to lay down hard and fast instructions, such as I myself have to follow in the prosecution of my work, for those who are sharing my responsibilities.

I hope to make a hurried trip to the various districts where the votes are being polled.

That, I think, will commend itself to the House as a proper spirit in which the chief and responsible officer should address all the men who are carrying on those elections.

Irregularities were charged in reference to the ballot bags and envelopes, and the charges were especially directed to certain matters that went on at Witley Camp. The officer in charge at Witley Camp is Major-General Hughes, who is known to many members in this House, and when the matter was called to his attention, he wrote this letter:

With reference to your letter of December 6th, 1917, enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to you from Mr. W. T. R. Preston.

The 158th Canadian Infantry Battalion which he refers to is not in this area and there is evidently a mistake either in the designation of the battalion or in considering that it is in this area.

I have, however, referred Mr. Preston's letter to the Deputy Presiding Officers of the 125th Canadian Infantry Battalion and the 208th Canadian Infantry Battalion, and have received from them in both cases, definite assurances that there was absolutely no irregularity in the polling of the votes taken by them.

Colonel Malone of the 208th Canadian Infantry Battalion mentions the fact which he has already reported to me in my military capacity that a civilian, who claimed to be the Mr. Preston in question, interfered with the taking of the vote at his polling booth, and that he is now of the opinion that the letter addressed to you resulted from his action at that time.

Colonel Malone further states that he is prepared to state and prove that the polling in his Battalion was conducted in accordance with the Military Voters Act, that he took no part in any manipulating of votes, and that no such thing existed in the Battalion to his knowledge.

Colonel Cutcliffe states that he knows of and took no part in any conduct to manipulate votes in this area. He states that the poll in his Battalion was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Election Act and makes a categorical denial of the suggestion that there was any violation of the Election Law in his poll.

Might I say in regard to all those officers and in regard to the matter as to opening of the bags, that every officer was indignant, and had a right to be indignant, at the broad insinuation, unbacked by any substantial proof, that he had been conniving at improper work and conduct in taking the soldiers' vote at the front. Many affidavits

have been taken. I shall not read as many as my hon. friend (Mr. Copp). I shall read this one in connection with the ballot bags:

I, Henry Percy Gorst, Deputy Presiding Officer for the 3rd C.C.D., Seaford, Sussex, having a personal knowledge of all matters hereinafter referred to, make oath and say as follows:

(1) I did not possess the key of bag No. B 218—

This is one of the bags which was thrust on one side because, it was stated, it had been manipulated.

—and it was not opened at any time during the time it was in my custody as Deputy Presiding Officer. When the poll was closed, said bag was under lock and key, or under charge of the quarter guard.

(2) All the ballots which were inserted in said bag were inserted by me through the slit made for that purpose.

(3) I am of opinion that envelopes rolled for the purpose of being placed in the ballot bag, would become unrolled and would be flattened out by the weight of other ballots.

(4) As far as my poll is concerned, everything was strictly carried out in accordance with the Military Voters Act, and in accordance with instructions issued by the Overseas Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada.

Sworn to at London in the County of London, this 10th day of January, 1918, before me.

Walter Jarvis, H. P. Goret,
A Commissioner for Oaths. Major.

That is a sample of many others, and I should like to say that, from my examination of the documents in question and from listening to my hon. friend's remarks, I have absolutely failed to see that there was any sufficient evidence in connection with this matter to impugn the honour and good faith of a large number of His Majesty's officers in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces who were trying to do their duty. I shall, however, speak a little more about this matter of the bags because a good deal of stress has been laid upon it by my hon. friend. There were cases submitted. There was nothing to indicate in many cases that the bags had been opened. It was urged that the best proof that they had been tampered with or opened was the fact that a number of those envelopes that were put in had become unrolled, flattened out and folded together, and looked, therefore, as though they had been put in at one time and subsequently to the proper day of voting. It is quite obvious that, as soon as envelopes containing ballots were dropped into a bag, they would become unrolled, and that many would gradually fit or fold together, as bags were hung up and, after the voting, put aside for weeks probably with other bags of considerable weight on the top of them. Naturally in such a case a number of the envelopes would become pressed or folded together. In any case if a deputy presiding officer had allowed a few envelopes to collect, folded them together and inserted them in the bag at the same time, and even did so (not through the very small aperture provided for that purpose, but pushed them through the chained and locked mouth of the bag, which might not have been perfectly tight), there would have been nothing decidedly illegal about that, as all such instructions in the Act as to how the envelope should be inserted, etc., were directory only. It would have been permissible to put the envelope in an open bag, or through the opening if a chained and locked bag. The instructions were not compulsory. But, however, there is no reason for believing that every envelope was not inserted through the aperture made for that purpose. I want to put this on record. When a few bags had been laid aside on the grounds above stated, Colonel Purney caused the deputy presiding officers affected to be brought to London in order that the facts might be ascertained.

But this became a habit, and in England Mr. Preston, or other gentlemen acting under him, began to urge that every bag looked as if it had been tampered with, and they not only objected to those bags being counted, but went the length of insisting that every bag should have the reason for its having been thrust aside marked on it; further that the bag should be opened and that there should be marked on every envelope the reason for that bag having been set aside as being no good and even that the envelopes should be opened and the ballots so marked. If that practice had been pursued there would have been no such thing as an election and Parliament would not have sat here until the summer. The thing was so absurd and obviously for the purpose of delay that I do not wonder at the Overseas Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in London becoming impatient. He took advice on this matter, because he could see where it was leading to, and he sent this telegram dated January 22, to Mr. O'Connor, General Returning Officer, in this country:

PRIORITY.

W. F. O'Connor, c/o Secretary of State, Ottawa.

Special Returning Officers and Clerks in London disagreed as to the allocating of several bags. Reasons given under section 12 sub-section 8 because after said bags had been opened and examined rolls of ballots were found therein in three's, four's and sixes' which apparently had not been inserted through slits provided in section 2 (A). The exterior appearance of said bags was not questioned. The matter was submitted to me in accordance with your Order in

Council and I decided that the contents of bags should be allocated. Preston and the Opposition Special Returning Officers and Clerks questioned the validity of my decision and of said Order in Council. They however, have reluctantly agreed to accept it but purpose endorsing the bags and every envelope contained therein with their objections and reasons, etc. They also intend to put the same endorsement on ballots to identify them. This will prolong the allocating indefinitely. I have endeavoured to handle the situation diplomatically and have succeeded in many points but the same vital disagreement between the parties still exists and unless something drastic is done immediately there will be a deadlock which will seriously handicap the expedition of the work in hand and prolong it indefinitely. Preston and several of the Opposition Special Returning Officers are doing everything they can to delay proceedings. Others are trying to hold on to a good job as long as possible and are raising every imaginable technically many of which are frivolous. Could not an Order in Council be passed more fully explaining section 12 subsection 8 and the Order in Council to the effect that the clause "appears to have been opened" refers to some illegal opening which is apparent on the face of the bag and not because of any condition of contents, and that where a decision is made by me in regard to a bag the endorsement of disapproval of such decision by any Special Returning Officer or Clerk must be made on the bag alone, and the only endorsement of disapproval which can be made on an envelope is where a decision has been given with regard to the endorsement, illegal opening of envelope, or the certificate, etc., on same and on the ballot where a decision has been given re the marking, defacing, rejecting, etc., of said ballot. In your cable of 31st ultimo you mentioned a plan which you had in mind regarding the limiting of proceedings. Do you think such a scheme quite legal and if so will you more fully outline it.—Purney.

To that the general returning officer in Canada replied by cable on January 24th, as follows:

Colonel Purney,
47 Victoria Street,
London.

Clerk Crown Chancery, Deputy Minister Justice and self all concur that provision re polling in locked bags merely directory. Your ruling correct. Further, several envelopes may be inserted in bag at one time. Also quite easy for several envelopes to interlock after depositing in bag. Neither Act nor Order in Council require supplementing to authorize you to forbid course proposed by Opposition counting officers. Bag being opened, contents must be counted if envelopes do not appear to have been opened and if certificate in order. Endorsement of objections must be of objections particularly referable to bag or envelope or ballot for reason based on some term of Act which explicitly deals with bag, envelope or ballot as case may be, and you must not permit such frivolous endorsements as threatened. Provisions as to apparent openings clearly refer only to opening in perpetration of fraud. Inform all concerned that business must be expeditiously wound up and cable me names of all who continue obstructive tactics, whereupon I will advise immediate removal and repeal under the War Measures Act of present provisions and substitution of sufficient number of persons recommended by you to finish operation. Having no trouble whatever here and not necessary to put up with any nonsense overseas. Name for me date when you consider reasonable men of sufficient number can finish operation. Cannot continue to pay officers indefinitely who will not reasonably perform their duties, as every officer here is doing. Are you successfully locating voters' proper ridings, and if not can I further help? Pay of counting officers overseas when appointed should start from time reporting unless special circumstances justify payment from time of setting out to perform duties. All new counting officers recommended your cables appointed. Leader Opposition nominated N. G. Charlton, vice Powell, so if position still vacant swear Charlton in.

O'Connor.

That telegram sets forth the facts very well. I would point out to my hon. friend and the House that the policy which was adopted by the chief scrutineer and many of his subordinate officers was to insist on very slight evidence that bags had been tampered with and envelopes inserted in an improper manner, and yet precisely the same operation which took place in England took place here and took place also in France, and we never had a word of complaint, practically speaking, in France or Canada. The same objections, it is true, were raised in Canada, but after examination and after consultation bags were set aside, though not to anything like the same number, and afterwards a general agreement was come to and the votes were counted. It is perfectly plain that the whole object over there was to set aside an indefinite number of bags, and an effort was made to delay in a most extraordinary and unjustifiable way the progress of the whole election. My hon. friend adduced as a reason that there was a conspiracy the fact that three or four envelopes of different dates were rolled together, and he argued that that was proof they had been put in improperly. I would say it proved just the contrary, because it would have been stupid for a man who wanted to do such a thing as that to put together envelopes of different dates. Such a man would have been clever enough to make them all of the same date, so as to avoid being detected. I do not think I need delay the House any longer on that point.

My hon. friend has said that a great number of the soldiers voted twice. It is quite possible that some of the soldiers voted twice. I think it has been quite possible in any election for a number of men to vote twice; you cannot always stop these things. But in regard to the military voters, if any of them did vote twice, wherever that was detected both votes were

rejected, and I think my hon. friend ought to know that. In regard to personating, I am not here to argue whether there was personating or not. I think it would be very difficult to trace out innumerable points of alleged irregularities in an election of such extraordinary difficulties as the one held last December. I am not saying whether personating was or was not done, but I am here to say that there was no double voting or personating to the extent that would justify my hon. friend in assuming that there was a dark and deep-laid conspiracy on the part of somebody unknown to do all these things.

I would point out, in closing, that the one obvious thing that sticks out in this whole matter is, that all these objections, all these charges and all these insinuations of deep and dark conspiracies, come from one place, from England. They do not come from France, and they have not been alleged in regard to Canada; and yet, I repeat, the administration by the election officials was carried on in precisely the same way, under precisely the same rulings and decisions in all three places, England, Canada and France. I would also like to emphasize again this fact in regard to the futility, to my mind, of wasting the time of the House on a subject of this kind in the manner my hon. friend has wasted it; the soldiers were so overwhelmingly in favour of conscription that the matters my hon. friend refers to are a mere bagatelle, an infinitesimal grain of sand, so far as they affect the general results of the mandate of the people as expressed in the last election.

My hon. friend knows that from 90 to 95 per cent of the votes of soldiers that were counted, to say nothing of those that were rejected, were in favour of this Union Government and of conscription. As to what the feeling of the soldiers was, I particularly remember that during my election I went down to a certain station in British Columbia to meet 330 soldiers who had just come back from France. We were in the middle of the election and we were naturally anxious to know what the real feelings of the soldiers was in this grave national crisis. One man who got off the train was a stalwart Highlander of about 45 years of age, who had been at the front since 1914. I asked him if he knew what the general views were of the Union Government and of conscription. "Well," he said, "I do not know anything about Union Government, but as regard the other matter, while I am not able to speak with regard to the feeling in England, I can say that every man who has been in France is in favour of conscription and against prohibition." I have nothing to say about his views with respect to prohibition, but I got from him an impression of the strength of feeling that existed. What is it after all that has inspired the general attitude—what is it that has inspired my hon. friend in regard to England? It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that it is the personality of the chief election agent of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Preston. He raised, all through the conduct of affairs the most strenuous objection to the administration of the Act, to the officials and to everybody engaged in carrying out the Act, and he has hinted at and charged irregularities all along the line. He has made allegations of wholesale fraud which have not been substantiated, and he has made very strong charges about the unjustifiable partisanship that existed. I do not know that the gentleman in question is a very bad judge of partisanship. I do not think that anybody who knows the history of that gentleman will deny that he is a fairly strong partisan. It is no wonder that this type of man should be looking around all over England for some mysterious machine for running the election because he no doubt believes that is the way elections are run. He probably knows something about it, and he has a good deal of suspicion of other people with regard to election frauds.

I have alluded to one or two things that the hon. gentleman said in connection with that matter, but I would like to point out that Mr. Preston does show suspicion and my hon. friend does show suspicion of the work that was done in England by those who were responsible for the administration of this Act. My hon. friend while reading innumerable affidavits read one of a gentleman named Mr. D'Arcy. It appears that Mr. D'Arcy was told that he would be sent right off to the front if he did not vote for Union Government, but he said he was going to vote for Laurier, that his father and his grandfather and his whole family had voted for my right hon. friend and that nothing could swerve him from his determination to vote for Laurier. He would vote for Laurier and was against conscription. In the face of that statement and having in mind the source from which it emanated I desire to tell the House that I hold in my hand a newspaper bearing date December 11, 1917. It is a newspaper called the Penrith Observer, a well known Welsh newspaper, and in a corner of that paper there appears, in large type, an ad-

vertisement addressed, "To the Canadian Overseas Forces". This is signed by "W. T. R. Preston, on behalf of the Liberal candidates." How does the House think this advertisement is worded, and what is the heading? In big black letters, "Vote for Sir Wilfrid and Conscription and a Leader You can Trust."

See his statement at Ottawa, (London Press, Nov. 29th) in which he declares he will not ask Parliament to repeal the Compulsory Service Act. Training will therefore go on which will furnish a full quota of reinforcements.

Here is a man who is supplying my hon. friend with his ammunition, most of it based on the flimsiest evidence and talking about partisanship and everything of that kind, publishing over his own signature in a British paper an appeal to the soldiers to "vote for Laurier and conscription" under the theory and belief that he will delude the soldiers into believing that if they supported my right hon. friend they would be voting in favour of conscription. This advertisement was published in face of the fact that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition told the people of the West that he was not in favour of conscription. Lots of my right hon. friend's friends in the West had a very loyal and affectionate regard for him and they gave him, as we Unionists gave him, a real welcome on account of his personality when he came to the West. There was no lack of courtesy there. There were a great many men who had suspended judgment upon my right hon. friend and who, although they approved of conscription, and rather approved of Unoin Government, hesitated to withhold their votes from my right hon. friend because they believed that he had been maligned in the party press, and that he had not said what he was reported to have said in regard to conscription. My right hon. friend came there and told them where he stood. They went away with bowed heads and said: "There is nothing for us to do but to leave him and to vote for Union Government, because he has put his position plainly before us." What was it that he put before us? He said that he was against conscription. It is true he said that he would not repeal the Act, but he would suspend the operation of the Act, return to the voluntary system, take a referendum of the people and go out to the people himself and appeal against the whole theory of conscription. In the face of that here is this man putting an advertisement in a British paper and asking the soldiers who are fighting our battle in Europe, who believe that conscription was the only way to get the necessary reinforcements to oppose the Hun, to "vote for Laurier and conscription." If that is the authority to which my hon. friend appeals, I must say that he is discredited by that authority's own announcements.

I have to apologize to the House for speaking so long, but I want to close with this testimony. I think my hon. friend was rather unfortunate in his somewhat vague denunciation of everybody connected with the administration of the Act, and in suggesting that the officials were more or less cognizant of those things which he charged, that they tolerated and connived at them. It may be a surprise to the House to know that the gentleman who advertised this appeal in that way is the person who supplied my hon. friend with his ammunition and supplied him, I presume, with those lengthy lists of names, which really need not have been put on Hansard, because they did not substantiate anything in connection with this matter. This same gentleman wrote a letter and I am going to read it. This is a letter to Colonel Purney in reply to the suggestion, and it is dated November 23, 1917:

National Liberal Club,
Victoria Street,
London, S.W.I.
November 23rd, 1917.

My dear Colonel Purney,—

In reply to the suggestion that the advertisement in to-day's issue of Canada might possibly be interpreted or taken as a reflection upon your position as assistant clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and your staff, permit me to say that the reference to officers is entirely in regard to those who had received instructions from the Government at Ottawa to canvass and organize the overseas forces on behalf of the Government, and to do their utmost to secure the election of the Government candidates in certain constituencies, a list of which instructions had been given should be placed in their hands.

Speaking on behalf of the Liberal candidates I desire to say that instead of there being a suspicion that you would not act impartially, there is, without exception, a unanimous opinion that your integrity is unimpeachable, and that you will discharge your duties with the most strict impartiality, and that no partiality on the part of any of your appointees will be tolerated by you.

With much respect, believe me,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) W. T. R. PRESTON.

That is Mr. Preston's opinion of Lieut.-Colonel Purney. I would like also to read a letter from General Currie addressed to Lieut.-Colonel Purney, as follows:

Canadian Corps Headquarters,
22nd January, 1918.

Dear Colonel:

I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, and beg to thank you for what you have said with reference to the manner in which the polling of the vote of the Canadian soldiers was carried on in the Corps. It was a matter of great pleasure to me that Major Gibson, your representative here, had such a thorough grasp of the situation, and that he was most heartily in sympathy with my desire to have every soldier given an opportunity to vote, to have the Act fairly explained to that soldier, and to have the election clean. These things we were able to accomplish, and when those votes are counted I know our pleasure will be greater still.

Ever yours faithfully,
(Sgd. A. W. CURRIE,
Lt. General Commanding
Canadian Corps.

Now I desire to read a letter from General Turner to Lieut.-Colonel Purney:

Canadian Headquarters,
London, 7th January, 1918.

Dear Colonel Purney,—

It has been a great pleasure working with you during the trying period of the election.

You have been considerate, and asked for only what was necessary to carry out efficiently your important duties for Canada.

I will have conveyed to the officers concerned your appreciation of their assistance.

Trusting the count will be taken without undue worry,

Believe me,

Faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) R. E. W. TURNER.

I have only to say in closing, that to those who are chiefly concerned in this matter, any difficulties, any irregularities, or any breach of the technicalities of the law, which have occurred,—and which must necessarily occur to some extent in any election, and which it would be impossible to avoid in an election so extraordinary as that which has just taken place,—have not been sufficient to justify the general and broad charge of conspiracy that my hon. friend has made, and on the whole I think this House will agree with me, that as far as the administration of the Act goes, and as far as regards the fulfilment of the purpose which the Government and this House had in mind,—namely, to give the military electors of Canada, and all those who are fighting our battles, a fair right to express their opinion in regard to the destinies of this country,—I think that purpose was fulfilled with few blemishes and with an honest and sincere desire on the part of the officials to carry out their duties, and I think with a reasonable and fair measure of success.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I was not at all surprised to-night when I saw the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) rise, to answer in the name of the Government the charges made by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) on the military vote. No one else in the Cabinet could have replied, as the hon. minister is probably the only Simon-pure on this subject, and probably the only member of the Government who did not commit himself last year when the Military Voters Bill was discussed in the House. Looking through Hansard, I find that the Secretary of State did not speak on this question on that occasion. The other members of the Government, if I am right, did commit themselves, but, Sir, how differently. Some of those hon. gentlemen, like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) indignantly repudiated the idea that frauds could be committed in relation to the Act, or that it could be used in the interest of the Union Government. But others, like the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) and the present Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean) denounced the Act in question most vigorously. I have not time to read the whole of their utterances, but it may be of some interest to the House to quote just one extract from the speech of the Acting Minister of Finance, which I find at page 4716 of the Revised Hansard of last year:

Subsection 2 of section 3 requires that a voter, on presenting himself, must state the electoral district wherein he last resided, during a restricted period at least. Then there is another provision to the effect that if he cannot state or specify a residence he shall be deemed an elector from such electoral district as he may indicate. Supposing he had never been in Canada prior to his enlistment. Imagine the case of his proceeding overseas the day after he enlisted. Theoretically at least he would not know the name of a single electoral district in Canada. Take a case put to me after six o'clock this evening by a member of this House whose next opponent is an officer commanding a Canadian regiment in France. Say that, of 1,000 men, 999 came from the colony of Newfoundland and the British West Indies, and that they did not know any of the electoral districts of Canada; it would be quite evident that they could not state the electoral district in which they resided continuously for a certain period in Canada, because they had never resided here. They could not indicate any electoral district to which they desired their vote allocated. What would be the consequence? They would be entirely under the domination of their commanding officer. I do not say that would happen, I have no fear whatever of any improper influence being exerted in the taking of these votes overseas. But I submit that, when you point out the possibilities for the exercise of improper in-

fluences, you thereby point out fundamental weaknesses in the Bill, and we, as representatives of the people, seriously considering an important piece of legislation, are bound to take that into consideration.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to reply to the speech of my hon. friend the Secretary of State, because at the beginning of his remarks he stated that even if all the charges made by the hon. member for Westmorland were true, it did not matter, because the Union Government was elected without the military vote. To such a conception of political morality, Mr. Speaker, it is useless to answer. I may say, though, that my hon. friend was right when he stated candidly that in his opinion there was a universal impression that the military voter could apply his vote in any constituency he desired. It is an admission, indeed, that when the Government secured the passage of this Act last year, and when the present Minister of Public Works and the Acting Minister of Finance denounced it, expressing their fear that the Government could use that vote for improper purposes, my hon. friends who are now on the treasury benches, but who were then on this side of the House, were right in the fear to which they gave expression.

The Secretary of State has seen fit to make a charge against a son-in-law of Mr. Preston. I am not aware of the facts which he has related, but it seems to me that the making of such an accusation is a pretty good reason why we should have an inquiry. The Secretary of State will then have ample opportunity to air his charges properly and legally, and we, on this side, will not prevent him from punishing the guilty whether the man is a Liberal or a Unionist. My hon. friend also said that there were no accusations from Canada or France, but only from England. Let me tell him that it is not my intention--

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The Secretary of State has left the chamber.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: His friends will tell him what I say. Let me state that it is not my intention to review the votes cast generally by the soldiers overseas or in North America, because I have not made a study of that vote. But the present discussion gives me the opportunity of bringing before the House a special case of conspiracy carried out, not overseas, not in France, or in England, but in the military barracks at St. Johns, Quebec, during the last general election, which only emphasizes the necessity of having an inquiry in relation to the whole military vote. I have tried, Mr. Speaker, unsuccessfully since the beginning of the session, to bring this matter up, and in this connection let me assure the Secretary of State that my ammunition does not come from the source which he dislikes so much. On the 16th of last month I placed on the Order Paper a motion calling for:

A copy of envelopes Nos. 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 39, 53, 56, 59 and 99, polling booth No. 9, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last and placed in Military bag No. 446 of the North American Continent Military Votes. Also, a copy of the envelopes Numbers 65 and 70, polling booth No. 4, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last, and placed in Military bag Number 451 of the North American Continent Military Votes.

To this motion, when I proposed to move it, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) said, "Stand." On the 22nd of April my motion was still on the Order Paper, and when I was about to proceed with it the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) expressed some doubt as to the possibility of producing the documents asked for, and begged to be allowed to examine more closely into the effect of the motion before it was passed. On 1st May the motion was called again and the Minister of Justice stated that the reasons he had given on April 22nd appeared sufficient to refuse the production of such papers. However the motion was again allowed to stand. My next move was to drop the motion, believing that, perhaps, the phraseology was not regular. I had asked for the production of documents, which had been placed in ballot bags. I was informed later on that the documents had been taken from those ballot bags and placed in ballot boxes. Therefore, I put in another motion asking for the same envelopes, papers and documents that had been originally put into ballot bags, but later on had been transferred to ballot boxes. To the latter motion the Prime Minister again said "Stand." Finding that the Government was unwilling to grant my request, I said: Since the Government does not seem disposed to grant this motion, as I believe they should, I shall withdraw it, but I give notice that I will bring the matter before the House at the first opportunity. This is the subject which I wish to bring up to-night. It is with a great deal of reluctance, Mr. Speaker, that I bring it forward, and I must say that before taking this step I gave the question very careful consideration. My election not having been

disturbed by the unnamed and unheard conspiracy that I will relate, I have nothing to gain personally by disclosing it. Had it not been for the pressure that was exercised upon me to stifle the matter, I, perhaps, would not have realized as clearly as I do now that it is an imperative obligation on my part towards my country, and a necessity in the interest of the honour of our gallant army, to disclose, fearless of the threats made to me, the regrettable incidents which took place at the barracks of St. Johns, Quebec.

Before presenting the facts, Mr. Speaker, I want to state emphatically that I do not want to cast any discredit on the army, and especially on the privates. Nay, It is my unswerving desire to protect the soldiers from the immoral and perverse influence of damnable officers which prompts me to bring this matter up. I wish to demonstrate that, in a particular instance, at any rate, the hon. Prime Minister was labouring under a grave delusion when he stated on the opening day of the session that never since Confederation was an election in Canada conducted more fairly and decently than the recent one. The Prime Minister on the same occasion reproached the hon. leader of the Opposition for having suggested the existence of a plot or conspiracy in connection with the soldiers' votes in Canada. I am afraid that another of the delusions of the right hon. gentleman will be shattered, because I will lay before this House the proof of that conspiracy.

My opponent in the last election was the former Deputy Speaker of this House, and he knew from the outset that he could not be elected by the civil or military voters of the county of Chambly-Verchères. He stated so publicly; he did not hide it. He boasted of it. He told his constituents, and his partners and friends told his constituents, that even if he required two thousand soldiers' votes he would get them. Surely he had sacrificed enough for the Government, his solemn word, his province, his honour. They were to see that he was to be returned by any means, even if it was against the desire of the majority of the electors of the county. The Military Voters Act of 1917, with its intentional loopholes and ambiguities, was there to carry out his intentions. In the little town of St. Johns, Quebec, in the county of St. John-Iberville, some twelve hundred men were stationed in the barracks, training for overseas service as the "Engineers' Training Depot." Their commanding officer was Lieut.-Colonel W. W. Melville, who was born in Peel, near Woodstock, had lived for a while in Florenceville, near Woodstock, was residing at Woodstock at the time of his enlistment. The major of the corps was Major T. C. Keefer, of Ottawa, and to them and to other officers of the Engineers went my opponent for his well-prepared and well-mapped out scheme to secure election to this House, even against the will of the electors. The idea was to get the 1,200 men to vote for the Unionist candidate in the electoral district of Chambly and Vercheres. I do not know what happened between the officers of the Engineers' Training Depot and the Unionist candidate and the Unionist organization, or what conversation took place between them; inquiry into the matter would probably reveal many unsavory incidents. I know that the officers of the Engineers' Training Depot were convinced and decided that my opponent should get the 1,200 votes; so they went to work. A banquet was given to the men in the barracks, and I can assure you that the flag of war-time retrenchment was not flying on that occasion. Political speeches besides many good things other than those cherished by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell)—such as grape juice, ginger ale, and coca cola—were indulged in. Placards containing a picture of my opponent and an urgent appeal in his favour were liberally posted around the barracks. The power of persuasion to say the least, of the officers towards their subordinates was played to the limit, in absolute violation of the King's regulations and Orders. But besides the banquet and the speeches by the candidates and the verbal power of persuasion employed on that occasion, there was published in the barracks, under the authority of the commanding officer, Lieut.-Colonel Melville, a certain newspaper, copies of which I now hold in my hand, called "Knots and Lashings" for the men of the Engineer's Training Depot, in which partisan, political, slanderous articles appeared for the purpose of having the men vote for the Unionist candidate in Chambly and Vercheres. I have in my possession two issues of this paper, one published on December 15, two days before the election, and another on December 17, the day of the election. Allow me first to read a few interesting extracts to prove my assertion. I quote from the issue of December 15, the subtitle of the newspaper:

A Weekly Newspaper, sanctioned by the Officer Commanding, and published by and for the Men of the E.T.D., St. Johns Quebec, Canada. Volume 1. No. 7.

This paper, therefore, was published purposely for the elections, the first issue appearing five or six weeks before December 17th. After the extra edition published on December 17th, the paper appeared no more in St. Johns.

Mr. MURPHY: The war was won.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I repeat that this paper was published and distributed throughout the barracks against the King's regulations and orders, which provide that no political meeting shall be held or political publication distributed in barracks where soldiers are quartered. This issue of December 15th, page 12, has also the following:

One vital issue. For the first time in the history of Canada public opinion is sharply divided on a single, vital issue. Shall we or shall we not send reinforcements to those heroic Canadians, who, during the past three long years, have played such a gallant part in making it possible for you and for me to live in safety and in comfort?

On the one hand are those indomitable Canadian battalions which, at Ypres and St. Julien, at Messines, Vimy and on numberless bloody fields have brought immortal fame to the name of Canada.

On The Left Hand—

And on the other side what do we find? Cowardly mobs who, at Sherbrooke, at Montreal, at Quebec and at a score of other places, have attempted and still attempt to impose German brutality and mob violence on the people of Canada; Germans and avowedly pro-Germans who at Kitchener and elsewhere, have attempted to disgrace the name of Canada in the eyes of the world; slackers who would stand idly by and see their women folk suffer the unspeakable fate of the women of France and Belgium rather than play a man's part beside the heroes who are to-day fighting their battles.

In the past, in civil life, you have been accustomed to choose your friends and associates; your selection has reflected your true character. Now you are confronted by a choice of supremest importance.

And what will be your choice?

Will you by your vote identify yourself with pro-Germans, Germans and slackers, or will you honour yourself by taking a man's place behind the heroes in the trenches?

It must be one thing or the other. THERE IS NO MIDDLE COURSE.

I may add that on page 16 there appears a picture of Sir Robert Borden. I quote from page 1 of the extra edition published on December 17, the day of the election:

A weekly newspaper sanctioned by the Officer Commanding and published by and for the men of the E.T.D., St. Johns, Quebec, Volume I., No. 7. Extra.

On the first page appears a picture representing a Canadian soldier casting his vote. There is one ballot box called "Union" where soldiers are lined up, and there is another ballot box called "Opposition,"

where there is a soldier maiming women and children. Is it not a disgrace that such publications should be distributed, especially in barracks where soldiers are training for overseas service? From the second page of this issue, referring to the soldier, this article says:

Does he realize that in voting for the Opposition he is voting for a "party" which has nothing but rash promises to offer?

Does he realize that in voting for the Opposition he is voting for procrastination, while our Canadian boys at the front are in need of reinforcements?

Does he realize in voting for the Opposition he is protecting the sleek slacker, the miserable "skunk" who will shelter behind all manner of excuses rather than go out and do a man's work?

Does he realize that he is offering sanctuary to this class of individual who, if Canada was immediately threatened, would no doubt act in the same manner?

That is their cry: "Canada is not in need of defence"—"Canada is not threatened by the Hun."

You poor shortsighted, misguided fools—small wonder you cry in that manner. Your scope of vision is so narrow that it is piteous to believe man could be so puny. Remember Edith Cavell, the Lusitania, the Belgian massacres. Remember Louvain and a thousand more acts of frightfulness. You, as a soldier, as a part of this great Empire, can only have one right point of view. Sink your petty grievance, take a broader look at the situation, use your vote as a bullet against the Hun and your duty will have been well done at the poll.

Mark these words:

If you vote for the Opposition, you are not fit to wear the uniform; you are not fit to live with your comrades; you are a traitor.

Another page is adorned with the picture of the ex-Deputy Speaker of this House. I do not know if the ex-Deputy Speaker has a press representative with as much literary experience as the private secretary of the President of the Privy Council. I do not know if there was a man by the name of Donald Hunt who was writing those articles, but they are just as laudatory as the articles we have read in the Toronto Globe. On this page I read the following and every one can see the photograph:

Here is a Good Man to Vote for Monday.

J. H. Rainville, Esq., LL.B., M.P., is an attorney of some distinction. He is at present Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons, and is slated as a Cabinet member in the prospective "Union" Government.

My hon. friends who sit on the treasury benches must be glad that I defeated J. H. Rainville:

Here is one of three French Canadian public men who have had the courage of their better opinions in refusing to associate with the pro-German element.

Blondin, Sevigny and Rainville are names that will go down with fame and honour in the annals of Canada, when those who are to-day flocking to the Opposition banner, to protect the slacker and help the German, will not be able to lift their heads in decent society.

Might I digress a moment in reminding you, Sir, that three days after the election the Toronto Saturday Night, speaking of Mr. Blondin and Mr. Sévigny, said that now that the Union Government was safe, they were glad that Blondin and Sévigny were not returned, because the furniture would be safer in Ottawa. The article continues:

These men are for a real Canada—a Canada for all; and, what is more to the point just now, they stand for Union against pro-German; for Union against slackers; for Union and the soldiers' weal, at this critical stage of Canada's history. J. H. Rainville was born in Ste. Angele, Quebec, March 8, 1875 educated at the Seminary St. Marie de Monnoir, taking his degree of B.A. He contested the Vercheres seat in 1908 and was defeated, but was elected for Chambly-Vercheres in 1911.

I wish hon. members to note the following sentence:

He is a lieutenant in the 85th Regiment, which appointment he has held for ten years.

I wonder where is the slacker. I wonder how this appeal could be made to soldiers, telling them that Rainville would go against the slackers when he was an officer for ten years and yet saw fit to stay at home instead of going overseas.

Your vote can put this excellent French Canadian in. The Union Government will be strengthened by the addition of this candidate. Do not make any mistake.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is in the extra.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Yes, that is in the extra. There is more of this:

Now is your opportunity to avenge Kitchener and Sherbrooke. In voting for the Union Government at this election you will not only be providing for the soldier, but you will register your disapproval of the mob methods practised by the German and pro-German in Kitchener, and the slacker and pro-German at Sherbrooke. Such mob methods are a disgrace to a country boasting of its democracy and which also allows the privilege of free speech. Imagine, if you can, a country governed by such as these. With the reins of power in their hands we would be ruled by laws of brutality; we would have "Kultur" and mob violence, instead of sane, progressive government. Remember this when casting your vote. Remember your comrade when casting your vote—and remember that over eighty per cent of your comrades in France and Flanders have voted solid for Union Government. Go to the polls and register for Union Government.

Section 430 of the King's Regulations and Orders for the Canadian Militia, 1917, reads:

An officer or soldier is forbidden to institute or take part in, any meetings, demonstrations or processions for party or political purposes in barracks, quarters or camps.

It is useless for me to add anything to convince you, Sir, of the flagrant breach of discipline on the part of the officers and men of the E. T. D. of which I have spoken. But you will certainly be astounded when I tell you, Sir, that not one of the 1,200 men stationed in the St. Johns barracks had ever resided in the electoral district of Chambly-Verchères; that all the officers and nine-tenths of the men had resided in Canada before enlistment, and that quite a number of the men were not even British subjects. Indeed, the first question that will come to your mind will be: What was the purpose of all this work, this undue influence, these banquets, these speeches, this expense, if those men could not, under the Military Voters' Act, cast their votes in the electoral district of Chambly-Verchères? Surely a candidate is not foolish or stupid enough to conduct such propaganda amongst voters who will not be able to cast their votes for him. That is what struck me when, a month before the election, I heard of the banquet, the placards, the speeches and the accompanying paraphernalia that was going on at St. Johns, Que. I beg to direct your attention to the Military Voters' Act, 1917. Section 3 reads:

(1) Every military elector shall be qualified and entitled to vote at a general election.

(2 If he can state the electoral district wherein he last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding his appointment, enlistment, or so particularly specify a place or places within an electoral district whereat during such period of time he so resided that such electoral district can therefrom be ascertained, he shall be deemed an elector of the electoral district so stated or to be ascertained, and his vote shall be applied thereto.

(3) If he cannot state or so specify an electoral district or place wherein he has so resided for the time and within the period mentioned in subsection two but can state an electoral district or so specify a place within Canada wherein he has at any other time resided, he shall be deemed an elector of the electoral district so stated or made ascertainable and his vote shall be applied thereto.

(4) If he cannot, because of non-residence or otherwise, so state or specify, he shall be deemed an elector of, and his vote shall be applied to, such electoral district as he may indicate.

Paragraph (c) of section 9 says:

The voter shall answer under oath, before the Deputy Presiding Officer, the questions set forth in the certificate which is form B in the Schedule. Such certificate shall be endorsed on the envelopes referred to in section five of this Part.

Form B of the schedule has already been read. I wrote to the general returning officer explaining the facts. Mr. W. F.

O'Connor in reply to my letter said there was no possibility of a soldier non-resident in my constituency but who had resided in Canada previous to his enlistment applying his vote in Chambly and Vercheres. But the rumour gained ground that 1,200 soldiers at the St. Johns barracks would apply their votes in Chambly and Vercheres. I took no chances. I had nine scrutineers appointed, one for each poll in the barracks, and instructions were given to the effect that soldiers should be properly sworn, according to law, as to residence. Then not a vote in the barracks could be applied to the electoral district of Chambly and Vercheres and the scheme would fall through. But you will be amazed, Mr. Speaker, to hear as I did on the 18th of December that seventeen officers and about seven hundred men, as shown in my scrutineers' books, applied their votes in Chambly and Vercheres, voting at St. Johns barracks. How could they do it? The law was plain that not one of these soldiers who had not resided in my constituency could cast their vote in Chambly and Vercheres. The only way in which they could apply their votes to that constituency was by not only violating the King's regulations, but by trampling on sections 170 and 172 and 175 of the Criminal Code of Canada dealing with perjury, and I quote these sections not for the lawyers of the House, but for the benefit of the laymen. Section 170 says:

Perjury is an assertion as to a matter of fact, opinion, belief or knowledge, made by a witness in a judicial proceeding as part of his evidence, upon oath or affirmation, whether such evidence is given in open court, or by affidavit or otherwise, and whether such evidence is material or not, such assertion being known to such witness to be false, and being intended by him to mislead the court, jury or person holding the proceeding.

Subornation of perjury is counselling or procuring a person to commit any perjury which is actually committed.

Section 172 says:

Every one is guilty of perjury who,—

(a) having taken or made any oath, affirmation, solemn declaration or affidavit whereby any Act, or law in force in Canada, or in any province of Canada, it is required or permitted that facts, matters or things be verified, or otherwise assured or ascertained by or upon the oath, affirmation, declaration or affidavit of any person, wilfully and corruptly, upon such oath, affirmation, declaration or affidavit, deposes, swears to or makes any false statement as to any such fact, matter or thing.

Section 175 says:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to seven years' imprisonment who, being required or authorized by law to make any statement on oath, affirmation or solemn declaration, thereupon makes a statement which would amount to perjury if made in a judicial proceeding.

I have read a few paragraphs from the paper published in the barracks of St. Johns. Now, to prove that the military regulations were transgressed, I shall make a few quotations which are nothing less than subornation of perjury, and let me remind the House that this paper is published under the authority of the commanding officer. My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) complained that there was no proof or evidence of a commanding officer inducing his men to vote a certain way, but I believe, after reading this article, he will change his mind. It says:

THE ELECTION.

We go to print on the eve of the election with out watchword—

VOTE FOR UNION.

In another column you will find instructions as to voting.

Every soldier of the C.E.F. has a vote in this election, and that vote is a powerful instrument which, used in a proper manner, can be made to operate effectually. You can size up the situation for yourself.

Ask yourself these questions:—Will your vote be needed in the constituency from which you come? Will your vote, marked for the Government, be the means of putting in a candidate in a constituency where your vote is needed?

Weigh these questions in your mind!

DON'T WASTE YOUR VOTE!

Have your mind made up before you enter the Polling booth. Don't hesitate to place your vote for the Government, in a constituency where it will count.

Mr. MURPHY: Where is the Secretary of State now?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: In the next column is: "A specimen ballot showing the only mark you need to make to convert it into a Win-the-War ballot."

I vote for
I vote for the Government..X
I vote for the Opposition..
I vote for the independent Candidate..
I vote for the Labour Candidate..

Following is this:

Specimen envelope showing how questions may be answered

1. What is your name..... Thomas Atkins.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is that printed?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is printed.

2. What is your rank?.... Sapper. What is your number.. 21144.

3. In what force or service are you?.. Engineers C.E.F.

4. Are you a British subject?.. Yes.

Otherwise he could not have voted.

Have you previously voted at this election?.. No.

5. Where you in Canada when you were appointed, enlisted enrolled or called out on active service?.. Yes or no.

6. Specify the name of the place or places in Canada whereat you last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding your appointment, enlistment enrollment, or calling out on active service.. Cannot say.

7. State if you can the electoral district wherein such place or places in which you so resided are situated.. Cannot say.

8. If you cannot specify as required by Question No. 6 or state as required by question No. 7, then state in what electoral district or place within Canada (giving street and number where possible) you have resided at any other time than is referred to in Question No. 6.. Cannot say.

9. If none of your answers to Nos. 6, 7 and 8 specify or state as required thereby, to what electoral district do you desire your vote to be applied

Electoral district..... Chambly-Verchères.
Province..... Quebec.

I certify that the above named military elector did this day make to me under oath the preceding set forth answers to the preceding set forth questions.

Dated this.. 7th day of December 1917.

Sgd. P. W. Coles, Capt. C.E.
Deputy Presiding Officer.

What was the result of these appeals and incitements to crime? Was I not right, Mr. Speaker, in telling you in my opening remarks, that never before in this country was there such debauchery of conscience, such unfair and immoral appeals as the ones I have just read? The soldier represents in the mind of the people all that is noble, right and chivalrous; he sacrifices his life and everything he has in the world for the protection of his fellow countrymen, the protection of his women and the honour of his country. But before he embarks to cross the ocean, men without morals, for the sole purpose of fostering political ends, invite him to step on his honour and become a criminal. I have a detailed report of every vote recorded in the nine polls of that parish, of what the commanding officer did, and the result of the conspiracy. The Government has in its hands all the affidavits and votes. My motion was for the production of these envelopes. You will find on these envelopes all the affidavits I have mentioned. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that every time the question which I put upon the Order Paper was called the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, or some other member of the Government had no other answer than "stands." Seven hundred men perjured themselves; they swore falsely.

Mr. BUTTS: Order.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: They swore falsely.

Mr. BUTTS: Order.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Butts) always butts in. I have here the names of the men, the numbers of their regiments, the numbers of the ballots, the name of the returning officer, and the name of the scrutineer. I am not going to give the names of the privates. If an inquiry is granted I will name them, but otherwise I shall not do so, because I believe they have been misled, and although they committed a very reprehensible act, I have some doubt as to their full responsibility. But, Mr. Speaker, the officers who have led them into such actions do not deserve my mercy, nor the mercy of their fellow-citizens, and I shall name them so that the Government will be in a position—

Mr. LEMIEUX: To promote them.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I do not say to promote them, but the Government will be in a position, and that is the wish I express, to withdraw the soldiers from the pernicious influence of these persons. At the beginning of the session I put a question on the Order Paper asking for the names of the officers of the Engineers' Training Depot at St. John during October, November and December, 1917; who were the officers stationed at St. John on the 17th, where did these officers enlist? As my hon. friend the Secretary of State said a moment ago, the place where they enlisted did not mean that they had resided there. I put a further question, which was this:

Where did these officers reside before their enlistment?
Where did these officers reside at the time of their enlistment?

At the head of the list is the name of Lt.-Col. W. Melville, enlisted at Valcartier, P.Q.:

Where did you reside before you enlisted?.. Woodstock, N.B.

I charge here—and I will make good my charge, and if the Government are willing to produce and lay on the table of the House the envelopes I will present the proof now—that Lt.-Col. Melville voted No. 8 in poll No. 9 in the barracks, St. Johns, ballot bag No. 446. Here is what Lt.-Col. Melville said under oath——

Mr. LEMIEUX: He will be made a baron.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: These are the questions and answers:

What is your name?—Col. Melville.

What is your rank?—Colonel.

In what force or service are you?—E.T.D.

Are you a British subject?—Yes.

Were you in Canada when you were appointed, enlisted, enrolled, or called out on active service?—Yes.

Specify the name of the place or places in Canada (giving streets and numbers where possible) whereat you last continuously resided during at least four months of the twelve months immediately preceding your appointment, enlistment, enrollment or calling out on active service?—Can't say.

State if you can the electoral district wherein such place or places in which you so resided are situate?—Can't say.

If you cannot specify as required by question No. 6, or state as required by question No. 7, then state in what electoral district or place within Canada (giving street and number where possible) you have resided at any other time than is referred to in question No. 6?—Can't say.

If none of your answers to questions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 specify or state as required thereby, to what electoral district do you desire your vote to be applied?—Chambly-Verchères.

Mr. MURPHY: Nothing wrong in Canada!

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Colonel Melville is well known in the province of New Brunswick. I understand that he was the organizer of the Conservative party in the last provincial election, and some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House can probably give us some light on Colonel Melville.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I should say so.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Now I will not take the time of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MURPHY: Don't omit a thing.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The second name on the list is Major T. C. Keefer. To question No. 3, which I put on the Order Paper: Where did this officer enlist? the answer is Ottawa. 4. Where did this officer reside before enlistment?—Ottawa. And Major T. C. Keefer voted No. 19, in poll No. 9, bag 446. And he answered, "I cannot say" to questions Nos. 6, 7 and 8, and applied his vote to Chambly-Verchères.

Captain R. W. Powell: The answer to the third question: Where did he enlist? is "Ottawa, Ont." Where did this officer reside before enlistment? "Ottawa, Ont." And he voted No. 20, in poll No. 9, bag 446. And he answered to questions 6, 7 and 8, "I cannot say," and he applied his vote to Chambly-Verchères.

Captain J. P. Campbell, of Kingston, in answer to the third question: Where did he enlist? is "Kingston." Where did he reside before enlistment? "Napanee, Ont." He voted No. 56, poll 9, bag 446; and he answered the same way, perjured himself the same way, and applied his vote to Chambly-Verchères, to "win the war."

Captain A. C. Wright: to the third question: Where did he enlist? the answer is "Ottawa, Ont." Where did he reside before enlistment? "Ottawa, Ont." He voted No. 80, poll No. 2, bag 453, and he voted the same way as his friends, perjured himself, answered "I cannot say," to questions 6, 7 and 8, and "Chambly-Verchères" to question 9.

Captain L. Pettigrew: He enlisted at Lindsay, Ont., and before his enlistment resided in Toronto. He voted No. 53, poll 9, bag 446, and with his other friends he committed perjury, and applied his vote in Chambly-Verchères.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And he is from Toronto?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is a shame. Lieut R. R. Knight, enlisted at St. Johns, Que.; before his enlistment he resided at Fort William, Ont. He voted No. 65, poll 4, bag 451; and he did the same as the others.

Lieut. D. B. Armstrong enlisted in Ottawa. To my sorrow he resided in Montreal before his enlistment, but bad companionship probably made him perjure himself; and he voted No. 22, poll 9, bag No. 446.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Are any of those votes counted?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I do not know. It makes no difference from the standpoint of morality on this side of the House. It may be that our mentality is not the same on this side of the House as that of my hon. friend.

Lieut. A. T. Adney enlisted at St. Johns, P.Q. He resided before he enlisted at Woodstock, N.B. He voted No. 17, poll 3, bag 446. He swore he had never resided in Canada before he enlisted, and he applied his vote to Chambly-Verchères. The same gentleman is the officer who was demonstrating the other day in the hall of the

House of Commons a very well made model of trenches, much according to nature. And after an inquiry from me, he told me that he had never been over at the front.

Lieut. R. M. Trow, of Toronto, enlisted in St. Johns, P.Q.; he had resided in Toronto before his enlistment, and he voted No. 12, poll 9, bag No. 446. He answered, "I cannot say" to questions Nos. 6, 7 and 8, and "Chambly-Verchères" to question 9, like all his friends.

Lieut. H. G. Young has resided before his enlistment at Farran's Point, Ont., voted No. 59 in poll 9, bag 446, and he did like the others, perjured himself and applied his vote to try to help the ex-deputy Speaker of this House—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Real Union.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —the future minister. Lieut. H. S. Phillips enlisted in St. Johns, P.Q.; he had resided in Toronto before his enlistment, he voted No. 99, poll 9, bag 446, and he did the same as the others.

Lieut. J. V. Culbert, of Timmins, Ont., voted the same way, and he voted No. 39, poll 9, bag 446.

Mr. MURPHY: How did he swear?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He swore he had never resided in Canada before his enlistment, and that he wanted badly to put in his vote for Chambly-Verchères, and he did it.

Lieut. H. Blackadder, North Vancouver, B.C. We have some from every province, no province will be jealous. Lieut. Blackadder voted No. 13, poll 9, bag 446.

Lieut. T. Bourget, of Ottawa, Ont., voted No. 10, poll 9, bag 446, and he answered the same way and applied his vote the same way.

Lieut. J. C. Armer, of Toronto, Ont., swore that he had never lived in Canada before enlistment, but he had resided in Toronto, as this paper shows. He voted No. 11, poll 9, bag 446.

Lieut. H. P. Duthie, of Toronto, voted No. 15, poll 9, bag 446, and he had resided in Toronto before his enlistment, and he swore that he had never resided in Canada, and applied his vote in Chambly and Verchères.

Captain H. H. Pinch, of Ottawa, voted No. 21, in poll 9, bag 446; he had resided in Ottawa before his enlistment according to this official document, and at the same time he swore that he had never resided in Canada, and that he wanted to apply his vote to Chambly and Verchères.

These officers, Mr. Speaker, were not satisfied with the preparatory work they had done. They did not think it was sufficient to publish a paper and put up placards and posters in the barracks. But some of them, especially Lieut.-Colonel Melville and the returning officers on the day of the election, saw fit to supervise the voting, and saw that the work was done according to their views and the views of their masters, my opponent, and the Union organization. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read just three affidavits. I could produce a large number of affidavits, but I have been speaking for quite a long time, and I will read but three.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I will read first the affidavit of Mr. Stanislas Poulin:

I, the undersigned, Stanislas Poulin, advocate and King's Counsel, of the city of St. Johns, in the district of Iberville, in the province of Quebec, do solemnly declare:

1. That on the 17th day of December, 1917, this being the date set for polling at the federal election, I was duly authorized to act and did act as deputy scrutineer in accordance with the Military Voters' Act, at poll No. 8, in St. Johns' Barracks, this being one of the places set to receive the votes of the military voters in Barrack at St. Johns, and especially those belonging to the Engineers Corps.

2. The deputy returning officer at the said poll was Lieutenant H. G. Young.

3. Among 97 military voters who polled their votes at said poll, 63 declared that said vote should apply to the county of Chambly-Verchères.

4. When questions 6, 7 and 8 of Form B of the said Military Voters' Act were put to those 63 military voters their answer was: "I cannot say."

5. Nevertheless most of those 63 voters declared having lived in Canada previous to their enlistment but it was impossible to get the deputy returning officer to enter their full declaration and he satisfied himself with setting down: "Cannot say."

6. The watchword had been generally given to all military voters to give the above answer to the said questions 6,7 and 8, and to mention the county of Chambly-Verchères in answer to question No. 9. The officer commanding the Engineers Depot visited the polls frequently himself and inquired if many of the voters did specify the county of Chambly-Verchères. After his first visit, at about 10 o'clock in the forenoon, when he found out that, in the poll where I was stationed, only a small proportion of the votes had been cast for the county of Chambly-Verchères he said to the deputy returning officer in my presence: "this should work better" (Il faut que ça aille mieux). I immediately discovered and found out during the rest of the day a considerable increase in the number of votes applying to the county of Chambly-Verchères.

7. I saw myself at various places in the barracks posters showing the military voters how to vote and stating the answer "I cannot say" to questions Nos. 6, 7 and 8; and the

county of Chambly-Verchères as being the one to which the votes should apply.

8. Among the voters who have thus cast their ballot for Chambly-Verchères and answered to the said questions there are a few who had previously given me their addresses as having always lived in Canada.

9. I begged the deputy returning officer several times to put the questions 6 and 8 in such a way as to be understood so as to get the voters to indicate the place of their previous residence, but to no avail.

10. Several times I also insisted and told the deputy returning officer and the officer commanding the Engineers that I considered that a large number of the said military voters did not seem to understand that their answers constituted a falsehood declared under oath and that it would seem better to advise them as to the importance of such a declaration. That, in my opinion such a declaration constituted a serious offence; that it seemed the duty of the officer commanding to prevent its repetition and the only answer I could obtain to these remarks was the following: "We are in elections."

And I make this declaration solemnly believing it to be true in my soul and conscience and knowing it has the same force and effect as if it were made under oath and under the Evidence Act of Canada (1903). And I have signed

Stanislas Poulin.

Declared before me at St. Johns, this 1st day of April, 1918.

N. Lord,
Justice of the Peace.

I have also the affidavit of Charles Romeau, which is as follows:

I, the undersigned, Charles Romeau, accountant, residing on Longeuil street, No. 37, in the city of St. Johns, in the province of Quebec, do solemnly declare:

1. That I have acted as the Liberal agent for Poll No. 2, bag 453, at the St. Johns, Quebec, Barracks, on December 17th, 1917, that is to say when the last Federal Elections took place, and I have no hesitation to say that the military vote was there influenced by improper motives;

2. That my above assertion is based on the fact that out of 83 militaries who have presented themselves to vote, 50 have answered to the 6th, 7th and 8th question "Can't say" and have had their vote applied to Chambly-Verchères;

3. That several events have occurred during the polling to confirm and strengthen to a very large extent the above assertion, and I mention the following ones:

(a) A certain Harris Geo. Henry (No. 5005880), when came the time to say where he intended to have his vote applied to, did not remember the place he was to give it, and Captain Wright suggested at once Chambly-Verchères and the said Harris Geo. Henry answered "Yes";

(b) When A. H. Chapman (No. 527117) came to vote he also did not remember who he was to vote for, and Colonel Melville, who had replaced Captain Wright, forwarded this leading question: "Well, vote for the Government, I suppose?"

(c) Captain Wright also voted for Chambly-Verchères after having said to myself, shortly before, that he was from Ottawa and that his family was living there yet;

[Mr. Archambault]

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

And I have signed

Chs. Romeau.

Declared before me at St. Johns this 1st day of April, 1918.

N. Lord J.P.

I ask the indulgence of the House while I read another affidavit as follows:

CANADA.
Province of Quebec,
District of Iberville.

I, Charles Bélanger, residing and domiciled at No. 23, St. Charles Street, in the city of St. Johns, in the District of Iberville, Province of Quebec, advocate, do solemnly declare:

1. That, on the last Federal election day, being the 17th of December, 1917, I did act as Deputy Scrutineer representing the Opposition party at Poll No. 7, bag No. 448, located at the Barracks, in St. Johns City aforesaid, Lieutenant H. R. McBeath, acting as Presiding Officer;

2. That out of 77 votes given at this poll, 57 soldiers answered questions numbered 6, 7, and 8 on the voting envelopes by the words "cannot say," and the 9th question by the words "Chambly-Verchères" according to instructions given to them by an "extra" of the newspaper called "Knots and Lashings," published at the barracks under the control of the proper authority;

3. That this "extra" was not for sale to the public as the ordinary numbers of the said newspaper "Knots and Lashings"; but on our journey to the barracks that same morning, my colleague, Mr. Stanislas Poulin, advocate, C.R., of the said City of St. Johns, found a copy of it, showed it to me, and this gentleman must be still in possession of this "extra";

I may say that I obtained this copy of the extra from Mr. Poulin (reading):

4. That I kept track of how questions No. 6, 7, 8 and 9 were answered, as it appears by my notebook marked "A" and signed by me.

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

Declared before me at St. Johns, aforesaid, this twenty-seventh day of April, A.D. 1918.

(Sgd.) Charles Belanger.

(Sgd.) Armand Brosseau, N.P.

I am also in a position to prove, if an inquiry or an investigation is granted, that the vote was open in nearly all the cases. That does not surprise me now, because those hon. gentlemen who were present at the moving picture shown at the Imperial Theatre in this city on Monday last saw plainly on the screen the representation of a soldier voting at the front. The vote was absolutely open. The soldier was handed his ballot and voted openly in front of the returning officer. It is no wonder that the military vote overseas was so largely in favour of the Government.

Other interesting incidents took place in the barracks at St. Johns. Permit me to cite one which is very piquant. In poll No. 9, Private J. Patton, No. 506605, voted No. 100. When he was asked to reply to question No. 6, whether he had resided in Canada four months previous to his enlistment, he hesitated, saying, "Well——." "Answer, please," said the returning officer. "I cannot say," replied the soldier. When question No. 7 was put to him, he hesitated again, and finally said, "I cannot say." In answer to question No. 8 the poor fellow wanted to say where he had resided, but was prevented from doing so by the returning officer, who simply put down for him, "Cannot say." When he was asked question No. 9, as to where he wanted to apply the vote, being an English-speaking gentleman, he found it exceedingly hard to pronounce accurately the French words "Chambly" and "Verchères." Finally, in reply to this question, he said, "Chanly." The returning officer said, "There is no such constituency." Then the poor fellow said "Verchley." The returning officer said, "There is no such place. Why do you not answer? You have to name a constituency." Finally, the soldier said: "May I go to the door and ask the man?" The returning officer answered, "Certainly." The soldier went out the door, and evidently got his information. But as he appeared not to have a very good memory, and thought that he might forget the name in making the little trip from the door to the polling booth, instead of walking right in and answering at the polling booth, he opened the door and said, from where he was, "Chamble-Verch."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY: An honest election.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The fairest election ever held.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I assure hon. gentlemen that if an inquiry is granted I shall be able to relate many incidents that will probably bring the same laughter, but which, indeed, in a case of this kind I consider very tragic.

I stated that this conspiracy not only was carried on between my adversary and the officers in question, but was participated in also by the Unionist organization. The reason for my assertion is very simple. The same answer—evasive, snake-like; as we say in French, ni chair ni poisson—was found probably on 10,000 envelopes in all parts of Canada, France, England, Asia, United States. As the member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) has shown, 200 electors in Quebec voted the same way, applied their vote in Chambly and Vercheres. And they gave a scare to the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). The member for Quebec South met a couple of Quebec officers stationed at Quebec. Of course, he knew that they were voting, and he asked them how they were voting over there. One of the officers said: "Never mind, Chubby, we will not vote against you. We are plumping our votes against the Liberal candidate in Chambly and Vercheres." Surely all the telepathy in the world could not account for such a coincidence. This answer was well prepared, well devised and studied, and is the morbid result of the unscrupulous, but clever, mind which directed the vote of the Unionist campaign in the last election.

My first intention when I had in my hands the evidence of what took place at St. Johns was to institute criminal proceedings against Col. W. W. Melville and his assistants.

Mr. MURPHY: Do it yet.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am not making a threat, but I must say it will be my only alternative; that I will lay a complaint if nothing is done by the Government in that regard.

But I wish to point out that I believe it is the duty of the Government to have a thorough inquiry into this matter, not only into what happened in my constituency, but into the whole military vote, and I gladly second the motion made by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp). The Government should be just as anxious—

Mr. McKENZIE: More so.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —as I am, for the honour and good name of our army, to make a full search into all these facts and to get rid of officers who, instead of giving to their subordinates an example of righteousness, honour and God's fear, fell so low as to perjure themselves, and what is worse, used their influence to induce their men to do so. Sir, officers with that standard of morality are liable to betray their country before the enemy if they ever go to the front, and they should be cashiered at once. Crime is the antithesis of patriotism.

Mr. R. H. BUTTS: Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I do not wish to take up much of the time of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: The answer of the Government.

Mr. BUTTS: Ten minutes, I think, will do me to answer all that has been said here to-night. I started in to do a little figuring while the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) was speaking, and I think I have now got my figures right. I figured that the speech of the hon. member for Westmorland had cost the country, as closely as I could get to the correct amount, valuing the time of hon. members at one dollar an hour and the time of the spectators in the gallery at fifty cents an hour, somewhere in the neighbourhood of $2,350.35. I do not think I would be striking my hon. friend too hard if I said that this House could go up to Sparks street and go into the Woolworth building and get for fifteen cents more knowledge than it has received from my hon. friend from Westmorland. The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) gave us quite a little entertainment. He exhibited considerable eloquence, but I think at the same time I would be very slow to tell such a tale about my constituency as he has told about his. He says that in one day there were 700 perjurers in his constituency.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Not in my constituency.

Mr. BUTTS: The hon. member said St. Johns, Quebec; Chambly and Verchères is what he told us about.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My constituency is Chambly and Verchères, but St. Johns is outside of that constituency. The barracks are situated at St. Johns, Quebec, in the county of St. Johns and Iberville, and not one of the soldiers came from Quebec.

Mr. BUTTS: I accept my hon. friend's explanation, but I recall very distinctly, and I took down the words of the hon. member when he spoke of 700 perjurers in one election. I am proud to say that there are not many to be found in the four constituencies in the island from which I come. I would say, though, that I would be very much better pleased with my hon. friend to-night if, five months after these 700 crimes of perjury were committed in his province, where men went into the polling booths and called Almighty God from His Throne on High to bear testimony to the fact that they were telling the truth, and then made Almighty God a witness of their perjury, he was able to come before the House and say, as a representative of the people, that he had done his best or made some slight effort to bring those criminals to justice. Perjury is the greatest crime against humanity; it strikes at the very basis of justice, and makes null and void the actions of our courts. Yet one of the representatives of our people, from the province of Quebec, five months after those 700 crimes of perjury have been committed, tells us that he may yet be compelled, if this Government does not take action, to take action himself against some of those criminals. I may be mistaken, but I understand my hon. friend to be a lawyer. If I am mistaken, I wish to be corrected. If he understands the very first principles of law, he must know, that, instead of asking this Government, he should apply to his friends in the province of Quebec, to the Attorney General. Our Minister of Justice is not expected, neither is the Canadian Government expected, to look into all the crimes that may be committed down in Chambly and Verchères. Instead of coming here and blackening his own fair province, and particularly his own county, why did he not go himself and bring some of his criminals to justice?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: None of them were from my province.

Mr. BUTTS: If he did not bring his criminals to justice, why did he not appeal to his Attorney General to see that the fair name of his province was not blackened in such a manner, instead of coming here and telling us to-night about the perjuries and the crimes that seem rampant in his constituency?

In that four-hours-and-five-minutes speech that cost this country, apart from the expenses of Hansard and printing, something over $2,300, the hon. member for Westmorland spoke of votes from Sydney Mines and Glace Bay being counted in constituencies in Quebec, and perhaps in Ontario. I do not think that any of my hon. friends have very much right or reason in their cause when they began to complain about the election. They got 62 out of 65 seats in Quebec. How much more do they want? Do they want the world with a fence around it? My hon. friend spoke of Sydney Mines and Glace Bay, and those are two towns above all in Canada that I can speak of with some knowledge. A short time ago I resigned my position of town solicitor and stipendary magistrate of the town of Sydney Mines, a position I

had held for nineteen years. In that town of nearly ten thousand people I have three brothers who have been elected as town councillors, and whenever they have run they have never been beaten. There is hardly a man in the whole town that I cannot shake hands with and call by name. My hon. friend has spoken of men from Sydney Mines polling their votes in counties in the province of Quebec. Now, I do not wish to violate the Criminal Code, I do not want to get into trouble for gambling, but if my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) will hand me a list of these men from Sydney Mines I will put a five dollar bill over every name, if he will put another one, and every time I win I take the ten dollars and he can have the ten dollars every other time. I do not think my hon. friend is game enough to take that up. He has either to put up or shut up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the language of the hon. member is hardly in conformity with the custom of Parliament.

Mr. BUTTS: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but it did work me up a little bit when my hon. friend spoke of these voters from two towns in my own county. I know there cannot possibly be any justification for it, because I know that every one of those men in Sydney Mines whom he alleges to have voted in the province of Quebec would have been only too glad to use their votes against my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and every man in Glace Bay would have been only too glad to vote for myself or my colleague, Mr. John Douglas.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The motion which the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) has made, he puts before this House under the guise simply of a motion asking for an inquiry into certain matters which he laid before this House at very considerable length this afternoon. He does that, however, by means of a motion in amendment to the motion to go into Supply, which in practical effect means that upon charges, none of them directed against this Government and by none of which he makes any imputation upon any member of this Government or upon any action of this Government, he asks this House to vote want of confidence in this Government. There was open to the hon. gentleman, and it has been open to him throughout this entire session, a perfectly direct method of bringing the charges he has seen proper to bring and asking for the investigation that he desires. He did not choose to avail himself of that method, but at this last moment of the session he makes this motion in the form of a motion of want of confidence, and asks this House in effect to vote want of confidence in the present Government. He interposes between the making and the granting of his request for an investigation the necessity of adopting that vote of want of confidence in the Government. It is needless to say that in adopting that course the conclusion is inevitable that the hon. gentleman could not have expected the acceptance of this motion on the part of this Government, and therefore he could not have hoped by means of this particular motion to arrive at the investigation for which he has asked.

The subject matter in itself is undoubtedly one of great gravity. It is a subject of all subjects, I think, that must be approached, eliminating from its consideration party interest or party advantage, and above all not involving in its decision the fate of a Government which I have no hesitation in saying enjoys the confidence, it is perfectly manifest, of a great majority of the members of this House, and certainly anything that was said this afternoon, whatever may be the truth or the falsehood of the accusations brought against any particular individuals, was not of a nature to shake that confidence. I know of no motion that could be more aptly described as a non sequitur than this particular motion, but, as I have said, the subject matter of this motion is certainly of great gravity. The hon. member who made this motion took up a long period of the time of this House—in what? In bringing most grave and serious charges against men who are our fellow-citizens, men who to-day are not here in this country to make any answer on their behalf to his charges because they are engaged in the great and paramount work of the defence of this country. Now I think that when, as he said—and I assume he was speaking sincerely when he said it—in the performance of what he conceived to be his duty he thought it proper to lay these charges, it was at least incumbent upon him to do it in such a manner as would assure the attainment of the purpose which he states he has in view, and without involving the result which this motion must first attain in order to arrive at the object of an inquiry where these men would be afforded opportunity of reply. The hon. gentleman has made use of an ex parte statement. He tells this House that it rests upon evidence that satisfies him. He does not tell us how long he has

been in possession of that evidence. Presumably, it is not yesterday, and he has allowed this session to run through and has not taken the steps that might have been open to him at an earlier period to bring about, perhaps, an immediate investigation.

I do not intend to go into the discussion of the well or ill-foundedness of the charges and accusation made by the hon. member for Westmorland. It would be impossible for any man immediately upon hearing these charges, coming as they came to us this afternoon, to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion not only as to their truth or falseness, but even upon the question as to whether or not there was a prima facie case made out against any of the individuals whom he so seriously impeached. The hon. gentleman asks us to order a judicial investigation not merely of the particular charges that he made, but of the entire taking of the soldiers' votes. The charges he made, as has been pointed out, are entirely charges of misconduct on the part of officers and men, who, at the time they are alleged to have committed these offences, were stationed in England. Many of these men, if not all of them, today, have gone forward. He recognized that himself in his motion because he feels the necessity of withdrawing from the judge whom he asks to have appointed to investigate the power of summoning witnesses whose presence would interfere with the performance of their duties as soldiers.

What is this so-called remedy that he asks for the condition of affairs that he has described? Let me deal with it as he dealt with it, in so far as it would be applicable, in so far as it calls for judicial investigation at the present moment and held in England, into the conduct of the election so far as military voters were concerned, and so far as that election was held in England. I think the House is satisfied, after the exposition of my hon. friend and colleague, the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) that in the taking of that election, on the whole, and by and large, it was fairly and honourably conducted. If the particular charges that are made here to-night were true it would not alter the fact that upon the whole, on the evidence we have before us, we are in no position to say that there is ground to suspect that there were any general irregularities throughout that election. Such an investigation in England, at the present time, for the purpose of clearing up these charges which the hon. member for Westmorland would make, must, in the first place, involve the most serious possible inconvenience and interference with the military operations on the other side, an interference and obstruction that could only be justified by its being established that some adequate, effective result would be obtained by that investigation. I did not understand that, by either of the hon. gentlemen who spoke, it was contended that any of the irregularities that they alleged affected in any way either the general result of the election, or even the result of the election in any particular constituency. Had it been so contended, one would naturally have expected that a remedy other than that which is sought by the present motion would have been asked or. I think the form of the present motion goes to confirm the impression gathered from what was said in support of it that there is no contention that either the election as a whole or the election in any particular constituency was affected by the irregularities charged, either upon the other side of the Atlantic or upon this side. Were there any such contention it is obvious that the proposed remedy would afford no correction of any unjustified result in any particular election. What, then, is the purpose that could be obtained? It would be the maintenance of these charges if the hon. gentleman is right in his contention. Is it of sufficient importance that at the present time, with all the difficulties that would be in the way of a satisfactory investigation, with the necessary interference that such an investigation must bring about in the military operations on the other side, we should ascertain whether these charges without affecting in any way the result of any election, are, or are not ill founded?

When the suggestion was made from this side that these alleged offences did not affect the result of the election, we were treated with some expressions as to our standard of morality on this side of the House. I do not think there is implied any suggestion—and certainly on my part there is intended no such suggestion—that because these alleged irregularities and this misconduct, if they took place, did not affect the result of the election, they are not to be seriously condemned. But is it of sufficient importance at the present moment, if this motion be carried, to justify our setting on foot an investigation, which, as I have said, must necessarily be carried on in the face of insuperable difficulties and obstacles which most assuredly must constitute a serious interference with the regular carrying on of military operations? For the reason, therefore, that I have

pointed out, I think it is impossible for any one not ready to declare his lack of confidence in this Government, because certain military officers acting as election officers may have misbehaved themselves, to vote for this motion requiring us to order an investigation because the investigation, if it were ordered and held at the present moment, would afford no effective remedy in any way for any wrong or any evil committed by any person in this country or in any constituency of this country by reason of its being represented by one who was not lawfully elected. The only purpose that might be obtained immediately and now, whether certain officers are or are not deserving of condemnation is not a purpose which would justify our resorting to the method which has been suggested, and therefore it seems to me we would clearly not be justified in adopting the present motion, even if it stood as a substantive motion, and in asking for an investigation of the kind that is sought into the operations in connection with the election as held in England and in France.

Now the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) has laid before us to-night what he claims to know to be facts with regard to the election as it was carried on among the soldiers in the constituency which he represents. It may be —I think it is—perfectly fair to point out when he expresses such grave indignation concerning what he alleges to be the conduct of certain officers in the barracks at St. Johns, and such severe condemnation of those officers in themselves, that he, in possession of all this information—and let me say in that regard that I agree with him, if his statement be true, if his statement be well founded, and I do not mean to suggest that he himself does not believe in their truth—and notwithstanding his indignation against those who, in his belief, are guilty of this very grave misconduct, has retained that information through all these months, and notwithstanding the knowledge that he has had up to this time but has only imparted to us to-night, has never felt that there was any duty upon him to take the proceedings that it was open to him to take to vindicate the law and to impose upon those gentlemen to whom he imputes such very grave misconduct, the condign punishment that their conduct, if they are guilty, would deserve. He referred to the fact that he had moved for the production of certain envelopes used in the election in the county of Chambly-Vercheres, and he was scandalized because it was pointed out to him that under the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act those documents, whether in the original bags or in the final ballot box in which they were deposited, were contained in a sealed receptacle, in regard to which the law enjoined that the seals should be broken only in the presence of the tribunals mentioned in the Act and produced before those tribunals only upon the order of the judge presiding over them, and that only when there was either an election contestation or a charge of some kind in which the documents were necessary as evidence, could such order be given —(because this was pointed out to him, and because, furthermore, his attention was specially called to the fact that it was necessary to go into the question of the right or power of this House to order the breaking of those seals and the production of those documents, because he had laid no charge before this House; no charge was made before the House into the investigation whereof those documents would be necessary)—because those things were pointed out to him, representations in which he acquiesces by dropping his motion, he seems to think that those incidents and the action of the Government in regard to them are in some way connected with these charges he has brought for the first time to-night, although he might have had them before the House at an earlier date, when a satisfactory method of dealing with them might have been proposed. I am not going into this question now: it is certainly not possible we should deal with them in that way now, and this motion does not ask that we should do so. Eliminating for a moment the form of the motion—which makes it, as I have pointed out, absolutely unacceptable, and necessarily so—that motion asks for a general investigation into the entire elections so far as regards the extent to which the military vote was polled. The hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres, as ground for his support of that motion, limits himself to making these very grave charges against the officers in command, I think, of a regiment of engineers, who were at the St. Johns barracks during the election. I am not here to plead any extenuation of the offences which he has alleged those gentlemen were guilty of. Neither am I here to say, on the ex parte statement that we have heard this evening, that these men were guilty of those offences; but in so far as that particular charge is concerned, or series of charges, against that particular

group of men—which charges are brought to our knowledge to-night for the first time —I am quite prepared to say that if the evidence of which the hon. gentleman is in possession and of which we are not in possession, makes a prima facie case in support of those charges, they should form the subject of a most thorough investigation. In fact, if the evidence which the hon. gentleman has and which we have not, makes a prima facie case against the men whose names he has mentioned, it would seem to me that that evidence constitutes a better foundation for a prosecution for those grave offences than for a judicial investigation, which can, after all, be nothing else but a preliminary inquiry. But I am quite prepared to say—I do not want to make any distinctions—that at the least they are a proper subject matter for judicial inquiry.

And as regards this case which has been brought to our attention, when this House has disposed of this motion in the only way which is open to this House, which by its large majority has confidence in this Government, and which has heard this evening nothing impugning or attacking this Government or affording ground for any lack of confidence in this Government —when I say, this House shall have disposed of the motion which is now before us in the only way which it is open to a House composed as is this House to dispose of it, that is by rejecting it,—the Government will, nevertheless, realize, as we all realize now, the propriety of there being investigation into the case that had been laid before us—judicial investigation.

Mr. MURPHY: When?

Mr. DOHERTY: As promptly as that can be done. Let me say this: I do not want to introduce into this discussion anything that might give it any tinge of bitterness. But I am glad to believe that it was thoughtlessness, but it was most painful, I am sure —it certainly was most painful to me, and I am sure, when my hon. friends on the other side come to think it over, it will be painful for them,—to remember that they sat here this evening and cheered to the echo the evidence which, if it was true, would show that certain of our soldiers have shown themselves unworthy of the confidence that this Parliament reposed in them. When the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) brought out what he considered this conclusive evidence, it was met by the resounding cheers of gentlemen upon the other side.

Surely, when they come to think it over, they with us all, if these men are guilty, will be sorry that these men should have been guilty. I am sure, after all, they, with all of us, would be glad if, notwithstanding the evidence which the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères informed us he had in his possession, it should be found that there was some explanation of this conduct that would make it consistent with innocence on the part of these men.

And let me say this: I do not want to prejudge the case—it is easy to run away with the most condemnatory conclusions. Sometimes you find that, even in what appear to be strong prima facie cases, your first impression was very much mistaken.

I am not going to discuss the propriety of the publication of this newspaper which we had to read here, nor am I going to go into the question whether the opinions expressed in it were well or ill founded; nor whether they were expressed in just the language that would be considered most desirable. I do not want to prejudge now a case that is to be the subject matter of investigation by others. But, after all, if we all of us look back to the past election, and to elections which preceded it, shall we not perhaps realize that under the influence of strong conviction the language of some of us has perhaps been as strong as the language that was read from that newspaper? There was the difference in the last election that exists between men of strong convictions when they differ on a question of first importance. And I think we should all of us be willing to forgive, even to the soldier, what may appear to us sitting here this evening to be perhaps the exaggerated expression of a strongly-entertained conviction, that appealed after all, whether he was right or wrong, to his profound sense of devotion to our common country.

As to the charges that are made as to the conduct of the election itself, we heard very positive affirmations of perjury and subornation of perjury. These are grave charges. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, believes that he is in possession of the evidence to substantiate them, which moved him to throw all this matter before this House to-night, I do not say with the purpose but with the necessary result, that the men that he has accused here to-night must remain under suspicion until someone initiates proper proceedings that will lead to their condemnation or to their exoneration; and, as I have pointed out already, he might have, carried these serious charges

to a tribunal where both sides could be heard and where the public would have had an opportunity of knowing in a reasonable way whether those charges were well or ill founded. Now we have heard this absolute assertion of perjury and subornation of perjury. I am not here pleading for these men; I do not know what the circumstances were; I know nothing of them beyond what the hon. gentleman has told us. But I do know this of my own personal knowledge, that many and many an honest man, absolutely an honest man in the province of Quebec, believed that under the Military Voters Act it was the privilege of the soldier to choose his constituency. And how was that belief brought about? By the persistent assertion, by the persistent mis-statement, coming from almost every platform of the party in opposition to this Government, that that was the state of the law. I spent much of my time in the course of that election making it clear to people that that was not the state of the law—perfectly honest people who had been misled into that belief by those who, being interested as they all were to bring about my defeat in particular, and the defeat of this Government as a whole, were industriously engaged in charging me with being the author of a law that told the soldier: "You can vote anywhere you please." And gentlemen who sowed that seed are astounded and indignant when there comes back to them what I do not say in this particular case was, but what very well in this case may have been, the result of the doctrine that they themselves had been preaching. It may be that all of these men committed perjury. It may be that many of them acted in the honest belief that they were entitled to vote at the place that they selected.

Before we come to absolute condemnations, it would be well for us to know that these men were sworn at all. If things were as irregular as they are said to have been, it is not impossible that these soldiers were not sworn. If so, these wholesale charges of perjury are certainly unfounded. I have not said these things because I want to defend these men if they be guilty, or because I want to prejudge the question whether they be innocent or guilty. When hon. gentlemen adopt a method of bringing these charges to the public which gives no opportunity of reply to the men accused, some one should point out in the meantime that it would be well for the public to withhold their judgment. To-night we are asked for an investigation; but the whole tone of the ground upon which the investigation is asked for is the condemnation as guilty without further proceeding of the men against whom the charges are brought. I have no desire to introduce any feeling into this discussion; matters of this kind are bigger than parties and bigger than governments and ought to be regarded from both sides and in as judicial a frame of mind as we are capable of bringing ourselves into. But in view of the fact that so many methods were open of bringing about a clear and satisfactory investigation followed by proper punishment or deserved exoneration, all fair-minded men will regret, with me, that the method adopted, which must be unfair to the accused, should have been considered the proper one. I think it is generally conceded that it is the duty of a good citizen, when he has information justifying the belief that crime has been committed, to lay that information before those who are charged with the enforcement of criminal law, and thus set the law in motion. But as the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres has not seen fit to adopt that course, and has—for what reason I am at a loss to imagine, because I should not like to impute to him any motive that I should not wish to have imputed to myself in like circumstances — adopted this particular method, the Government will take the steps that may be necessary to bring about judicial investigation of the case that has been put before us in this way to-night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what way?

Mr. DOHERTY: That has been put before us by the member for Chambly and Vercheres; this case that is alleged to have happened in Canada and that it is, therefore, possible for us to deal with directly.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the inquiry be limited to that?

Mr. DOHERTY: As far as I can say, the inquiry will be limited to the case that is brought before us. If other hon. gentlemen have other cases in which they can show us that there is cause for inquiry, we shall be glad to inquire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then you will grant an investigation right away?

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards the case that has been put before us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With regard to the motion now before the House?

Mr. DOHERTY: With regard to this case of Chambly and Vercheres which has been

put before the House this evening. Let us have no misunderstanding; we will see that it is properly and judiciously investigated. As to the incidents referred to as having happened in England, I have given sufficient reasons why it would be highly improper, even if we could hope to arrive at any practical result, to embark upon an investigation in England and France, the bulk of the necesary witnesses in which would be men who have other work to do than that of giving testimony before the courts, whether to inculpate their comrades or to exonerate themselves. In respect of the matter put before us by the member for Westmorland this evening, individual cases may justify some action in the way of further inquiry, and, perhaps, the taking of some measure looking to the disciplining of officers who may have been guilty of some offences. Should that be so, some action from this Government may be called for, even in England. But of one thing the House can rest assured: that the Government has no desire to cloak any guilty man or to encourage any of its officers in violation of the law. In saying that, I do not say that there was made to us this afternoon a case that would justify our ordering an inquiry in such a large and general way as has been suggested.

The Government feels that this is a motion with regard to which only one course is open to it and to those who have confidence in it. The Government realizes also the duty that has come to it with regard to this matter of Chambly and Vercheres and is alive to such duty as may come to it, in proper cases and under proper circumstances, to look into charges involving the due performance of duty on the part of its officers, with an eye to such disciplining as circumstances may call for. But we should be doing anything but the work we are here to do if we cast over our forces overseas at this moment a general dragnet to see whether or not we might gather into it some soldier who had been guilty of some misdemeanour, some irregularity, or even some serious offence. If there be soldiers of that kind there will be time and place for dealing with them.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, when a man walking along the street finds that some one has unsuccessfully attempted to purloin his pocket-book, he is apt to be almost as angry with the intended thief as he would have been had the attempt been successful. I am one of the candidates who was marked out by the Union Government to be defeated. I do not know how many ministers in the present Government formed part of the Unionist organization.

Mr. MURPHY: Two.

Mr. McMASTER: Had the plans laid by the Unionist organization been successful, I would not have had the pleasure of meeting hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in friendly converse in the corridor or have had the honour of representing the constituency I represent in this House. I shall endeavour, as I trust there is no bitterness in my make-up, to follow the suggestion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) to discuss this case in the calmest and most judicial manner possible.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) addressed the House at some length. His main objection to the speech made by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) was that it was too long. His second objection was that those irregularities which had happened across the seas were irregularities which must have happened by inadvertence or carelessness, and the fact that many military voters had forgotten to answer questions Nos. 6, 7 and 8, was to be put down only to the feebleness of human memory and not to any ulterior or improper motive. The Secretary of State, after attacking the plantiff's attorney, also attacked one of the plaintiff's witnesses. I do not think the character of that witness is in issue here to-night. What is before the House is a statement made by an hon. member of this House, seconded by another hon. member, that they believe that certain irregularities and frauds were committed in connection with the taking of the soldiers' vote, and they ask for an investigation. They have brought before the House certain facts which, in my opinion, make out in many respects a prima facie case for an investigation. Apart from that, we have had a very able exposition of the electoral crimes committed in the barracks at St. Johns, Quebec. Those have so impressed the Government that the Government has promised an investigation into them. Would I be unfair in laying down this principle?—that, if I show that similar actions are likely to have occurred elsewhere, in connection, for instance, with my own election, that a similar investigation should be granted into that, and if I showed that the facts make out a prima facie case that those irregularities and frauds were general, I make out a case that the investigation should be

general and not confined to one particular case? I think I do.

The Minister of Justice says that the hon. member for Westmorland could not have expected his motion to carry. Why not? If there are serious grounds for believing that irregularities and electoral crimes were committed in connection with the taking of the soldiers' vote, either across the seas or in Canada, why should not this Government grant an investigation? We have been told, with a modesty so peculiar to this present Government, that it represents, as the President of the Council has told us, the best elements in both parties. Surely the best elements in both parties will not allow any doubt to be cast upon the purity of their escutcheon. Surely, if any reasonable grounds for granting an investigation are brought before the House, they will hasten to show that they are true and honest men, above reproach. Why should we, on this side of the House, expect that the motion made by the hon. member for Westmorland should be defeated? The Minister of Justice referred to the fact that those men who are charged with having committed those irregularities—to follow the example of the Minister of Justice, we shall call things by their pleasantest names—are soldiers. We know that. We are not suggesting to the Government what punishment they should mete out to those men if they are found guilty. It may be and it certainly is true that, as far as the private soldiers were concerned, they were not free agents to begin with, and many of them will now, by their efforts, by their spilt blood upon the field, have expiated any commission of an offence. But I shall ask the Minister of Justice—does he lay down the principle that because a man is a soldier he is relieved of his moral responsibility towards his fellow Canadian citizens? I do not accept that. That has never been the manner in which the British people have looked upon the responsibility of their soldiers. I would go back to history and say that one of the greatest soldiers that ever commanded a British Army in the field, John Churchill, was once accused of serious crimes, and was very heavily punished. But now a more serious argument is brought forward by the Minister of Justice. He says: You cannot have such an investigation as you propose, without seriously interfering with military operations in the field. On the face of it, that is a serious objection if it is well founded in fact. But is that the case? The soldiers, when they voted, all placed on their envelopes, if their ballots were counted, the place where they lived in Canada, or they stated that they did not live in Canada at all. Those envelopes are in the possession of the Government. The ballots are in the possession of the Government. The names and addresses of the soldiers are in the possession of the Government. The whole investigation may, in very large measure, be made by an examination of the envelopes and the ballot papers which are in the possession of the Government. That course was followed in connection with the British Columbia soldiers' vote, and it is a matter of interest to this House to recollect that a precisely similar investigation was held under a commission appointed by the British Columbia Government, and that by examination of the voting papers and the envelopes, they were able to determine that out of a total of 8,488 military votes, 3,796 were legitimate. What the British Columbia Government did was to cast aside the soldiers votes and refuse to accept them, because there had been such wholesale misconduct in connection with the taking of that vote.

I should like to deal with these points calmly and seriatim as they come to my mind. The Minister of Justice blamed the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères because, having this information as to those electoral crimes in his possession for some months, he had not moved the criminal courts of Quebec to arrest and punish those men.

I do not know whether the Minister of Justice meant by his suggestion that my hon. friend should have arrested some 750 men. If he did suggest that I beg to tell him that a lawyer practising in Montreal cannot contemplate the expenditure of some $3,000 for warrants alone as a mere bagatelle. But there is a much more serious reason for my hon. friend having stayed his hand in that connection. The members across the floor of this House, as well as the members on this side, will remember that for some time after the election in this country there was a considerable amount of public excitement, public friction, a feeling between one portion of the country and another, a feeling which I am glad to say has largely disappeared and is disappearing day by day, and we can thank Heaven for it; but if at that time my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault), a French-speaking gentleman from the province of Quebec, had done what the Minister of Justice proposes, and had arrested these English-speaking officers of the

provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick it would have been a very unwise thing to do, and would have caused a lot of hard feeling in this country. Surely the Minister of Justice cannot blame us when we come to him who is supposed to be the fountain of justice in this country, for redress.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Besides, he did not know until he got the return.

Mr. McMASTER: My hon. friend says that he did not know until he got the return, but he had a very shrewd suspicion of these matters. He had not, however, his complete evidence until he obtained it during the session of this Parliament, and as the Orders of the Day have been pretty well encumbered day by day, I do not think it becomes very highly the Minister of Justice of this department, when a serious matter is brought before him, to meet it by dilatory exceptions or exceptions to the form. Let us go to the very heart and essence of this matter, casting aside the juridical niceties about jurisdiction and procedure.

The Minister of Justice says that these articles which appear in Knots and Lashes must be more or less forgiven—that was the inference—because people say harsh things of each other in times of elections. They do, and they have done so in this country, but I am glad to say that never before in Canada have we had such an election as regards bitter attacks as we had last December. I do not think there were very many bitter attacks directed from this side of the House to the other; there may have been some, but I say that for months and months before the last election there was no epithet too grossly insulting to be hurled by the Conservatives or Unionists at the Liberals of this country. The Minister of Justice blames us because he says we circulated the impression throughout this country that the soldiers could cast their votes where they liked. Nothing is more mistaken than that. The soldiers were not free agents at all. But I think there is a good deal of proof in the record, or will be before I have finished the case, that soldiers had to give their votes in many instances, not in all, where their officers who were acting as election officials told them they must vote.

Now I will proceed to discuss why I think this general investigation should be given. First of all, let us look at the soldiers' vote in general. In North America the soldiers' vote amounted to 54,500, and the total votes rejected amounted to 17,114, or 31½ per cent; that is almost one man out of three improperly marked his ballot. How does that fact square with the pretension of the Secretary of State that it was all done by inadvertence, that the people forgot to answer Nos. 6, 7 and 8, or made some other mistake. Does the Secretary of State suggest that we at least on this side of the House have such a low idea of the intellectuality, the mentality, and ability of those men in Canada whose brothers form the finest fighting unit on the Western front as to think that one man out of three marked his ballot improperly by inadvertence? I cannot believe that; I do not believe that. In England—in Great Britain I should say because those of us of Scottish race do not like the old country to be called England; Great Britain is the name which suits us better—in Great Britain 104,377 soldiers votes were cast, and of these 19,251 were rejected, or 18½ per cent, and the same argument that I have made in respect to the votes in North America applies, though in not quite so strong a degree, to those votes cast in Great Britain. In France 128,073 votes were cast, and 15,025 were rejected, just about 12½ per cent. Is it likely that twelve men out of every hundred more or less improperly marked their ballots in France by inadvertence? I do not think so; I do not think any member on this side of the House thinks so; I think few members on the other side of the House think so.

And now, if I may be pardoned a personal reference, let me take up the county of Brome, in which I ran, to show how the soldier vote worked out there. Brome is a small agricultural county in the eastern townships. It has no urban centres dignified by the name of "town." The largest village contains about one thousand people. Brome had sent some 225 boys to the war, and at the time the vote was taken, from deaths, wounds and discharge, sickness and discharge, there were not more than 175, or at the most 200, Brome men in the Canadian military forces. Now how many men do you think voted in Brome? I cannot tell you how many ballots were cast in France to apply in the county of Brome, but 84 were counted, and I presume a large number were rejected. If we take 84 from 200, that leaves 116 Brome men yet to vote. In Great Britain how many Brome men voted? There were 216 votes rejected and 57 votes counted. In Canada there were 112 men voted in Brome. Perhaps I should not have said that men voted in the Old Country, because while my hon. friend from Westmorland was addressing

the House, we learned that some lady was induced by a chaplain to vote, in Brome, on the ground that she had "been kind to the Canadian soldiers."

One hundred and twelve men or women voted in Canada under the provisions of the Military Voters Act in the county of Brome. If we take the same proportion for the votes cast in France as for the votes cast in England—and of course these figures are in the possession of the Government and they can verify everything I say—you will find that about three times the number of men who were in the army at the time of the election voted in the little county of Brome. Had all these votes been counted, the splendid majority the people gave me, the largest majority which was ever given in the county of Brome at a really fought out election, a majority of 609, would have been wiped out and I would not have had the pleasure of meeting hon. members on the other side of the House.

Let me deal, in connection with the vote in Great Britain with the argument advanced by the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) that if a few mistakes were made, they were merely mistakes and inadvertences. I nave a copy of the list which has been certified to by Mr. Fraser and Mr. Soles. Mr. Fraser was the special returning officer and Mr. Soles was his clerk. I do not know Mr. Fraser but Mr. Soles is a gentleman occupying a responsible position in the Civil Service. He is a well known civil servant and he was sent to France for the purpose of counting the vote. I think he is one of the inspectors engaged in laying out rural mail routes, he has his headquarters in Sherbrooke, and he is a perfectly responsible gentleman. I wish to state that the purse was not made away with, that I still retain my seat which I won, and that the 216 men whose votes were rejected failed to answer questions, 6, 7 and 8. Where did these gentlemen come from? Were they all gentlemen who came from the old country and who had a right under the Military Voters Act to apply their votes in whatever county they wished? No. I do not propose to read a long list of these men. I have not the address of every one of them but from the investigations which have been made, and the examination of the rolls of the regiments, it was ascertained that 62 of them came from counties, stretching, to use the expression frequently employed by orators in this county, from the stormy waves of the Atlantic to the calm waters of the Pacific.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Spare us.

Mr. McMASTER: Perhaps I should. As it is getting late I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. Out of the 62 names on this list investigated only one belonged to the county of Brome, a man called Plouff, who came originally from Sutton and who had become a United States citizen.

Now let us come to the question of the vote in Canada. 112 votes were cast outside of the county of Brome, for the county of Brome. Of those 56 were counted and 56 were rejected. We have a record of how the questions were answered by those 56. Some 40 answered to the effect that they had resided in Canada at the time of their enlistment, but like those poor, unfortunate forgetful fellows in the barracks at St. Johns, Quebec, they did not know where they had ever lived in Canada, or they could not say where they had lived in Canada. Some 40 or so answered the questions. Others who had tenderer consciences or had not been so well coached answered questions that they lived in Canada at the time of their enlistment and then did not answer 6, 7 and 8 and applied their vote to Brome. Does any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House desire me or any member to believe that these votes were cast by inadvertence or by a strange coincidence in the county of Brome? No, I will tell you why I was picked out for slaughter from the first. I do not think that I am a particularly bad man; at least my badness has not made me notorious. I was picked out for slaughter by this Union Government because I was running in one of the two essentially English-speaking constituencies in Quebec, where the population is English yet by a very considerable majority. In the county of Brome about two-thirds of the voters are English-speaking and about one-third French-speaking. The population is divided about 60 per cent English and about 40 per cent French. The difference between the voting strength and the population is due to the fact that there are a great number of people whose children have left them to go to out West or to go into the city of Montreal, and a great number of French Canadians with large families of children have come into the county in comparatively recent years. I was picked out for slaughter because this Union Government did not want it to be shown that there was an English-speaking county in Quebec that could be carried for Laurier and the straight, grand old Liberal party. They failed, and if I speak with some warmth about this matter it is because I think I have a right to. I ran as clean a campaign

in the county as any man ever ran in the Dominion. I had as my opponent a gallant and distinguished soldier across the seas. What did this party, that includes the best elements in both political parties, do? They stuck placards on every barn door and on every rock in Brome saying, "Draper is fighting the Hun, McMaster is fighting Draper; for whom would the Kaiser vote?" The old, old Tory trick, to endeavour to pretend that they have a monopoly of the patriotism of the country and any one who does not agree with them is not patriotic. I ask why the soldiers voted as they did? I ask why there were so many irregularties committed in connection with the soldiers' vote both in Canada and across the sea. I will tell you; it was on account of the campaign of misrepresentation and abuse that this Union Government put up in the last general election. Let me just rehearse very briefly why the people of Canada lost their heads in the last general election. On the first day of December the Prime Minister made a speech in a certain western Ontario town and was not very well received. And the next day there was held in Toronto, at the house of a very godly gentleman there, a meeting of some twenty people, who were very prominent in Y.M.C.A. work, and who were also endowed with a goodly portion of this world's goods. Diligence in business was united with fervour of spirit, and these gentlemen who protested that they were followers of the God of love made up their minds that the Ontario farmer was in a very difficult and uncomfortable frame of mind for the Unionist party and that something must be done. And out of that meeting there came a committee—out of that meeting, or similar meetings, out of that class of men there came a Citizens' Union Committee. These men, who said they were followers of the God of love, went out for the purpose of winning an election, to sow hate between different sections of our Canadian people. Was there ever more horrid, hideous and odious hypocrisy? I do not think there has been. These men—I wish they were within the sound of my voice—are familiar with the history of the Founder of our religion. They know that although He dismissed with a kindly word the poor woman taken in flagrant sin, that although He forgave the penitent thief on the cross, He preserved the vials of His righteous indignation for those whom He called scribes, and Pharisees, and hypocrites, those who liked to broaden their phylacteries and stand at the corners of the streets making long prayers to be seen of all—these men

went out, and this is the sort of stuff they spread through the papers of Ontario:

> Is a united Quebec to rule all Canada?

The glaring advertisement in which this appeared had the Union Jack and the British lion prominently displayed at each of its four corners.

> To-day in our national crisis Quebec along among all the provinces stands more united than ever before. She knows what she wants:
> (1) Withdrawal from the war.

A downright lie as black as any that ever came from the abode of the father of lies himself.

> (2) Bilingual schools everywhere.
> (3) Weakening of the ties of British connection.
> (4) Political control of Canada.

Political control of Canada! As if one province of a population of a little over two millions could control other provinces whose aggregate population amounted to six millions. And listen, Mr. Speaker, to this gem:

> Within the last few weeks, Quebec has mobilized all her forces to dominate Canada under the unified leadership of Bourassa and Laurier.

The united leadership of Bourassa and Laurier. Why, if there has been one man in the province of Quebec, who, for the last forty years, has been standing four-square against the prejudices of his province it is my revered, and honoured, and beloved leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The Montreal Weekly Witness well said that such a statement was effrontery worthy of the Prussian general staff. But they had another untruth to tell about those people who did not agree with him politically:

> All Canada knows that Germany has been working through agents, spies and bribes in every country in the world. The latest evidences are the revelations recently made to the world by President Wilson. Do we Canadians think the Kaiser has overlooked Canada? If we do, what a fool's paradise!

Now, I have in my hand the Ottawa Evening Journal of Monday, December 10, 1917, and this paragraph appears in all its wicked untruthfulness in full in that paper. But in the Ottawa Citizen of about the same date I find that the last most odious statement and inference that German gold was being used at the last election is left out. I do not know who is responsible for it. Perhaps this was a little too strong for the Citizen's stomach, although the Journal was able to swallow it. There is something I want to say—I think it should be said, although it may not be agreeable to say it: I have no quarrel with people who believe

that their political duty obliged them to join the Union Cabinet, because they considered that conscription was a large enough and broad enough issue upon which to base a government. It always struck me, Mr. Speaker, that conscription was a very narrow platform on which men of different political traditions and different political outlooks should get together, because, after all, it is a matter of procedure, and the somewhat interesting thing is that the conscription law on which these gentlemen joined together has been, by their own declaration, practically admitted a failure, and they have had to change the very essence of their law and get rid of the selective feature which characterized it. But I have no quarrel with any one who joined that Government because he sincerely thought it was his duty to do so—I respect the convictions of all. I have expressed what I think of this sort of thing:

The Citizen's Union Committee. A Non-Partisan War-Time Organization to Support Union Government. J. W. Lyon, Guelph, Chairman; Norman Sommerville, Toronto, Vice-Chairman; G. A. Warburton, Chairman Executive Committee; Albert H. Abbott, Secretary.

G. A. Warburton is a name, if I mistake not, I have seen connected with the prohibition movement in the province of Ontario, and also with Y. M. C. A. campaigns in the same province. That sort of thing is just the very worst and most wicked thing that we could have in Canada, and that was spread abroad throughout Ontario in both Liberal and Conservative papers. I asked myself this question: Did the leader of the Unionist party in Ontario try to stop that sort of thing, or did he profit by it? Because if he profited by it, if he allowed that to go unchallenged, and if he did not do everything he could to stop that sort of thing he did wrong. I am willing to pause to find out from him now whether he tried to stop that sort of thing, because I do not want to accuse him unjustly and I await his reply.

Mr. BUREAU: He will not reply.

Mr. McMASTER: No answer. I do not want to say anything that would not be fair and right to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). What did the President of the Privy Council do in this campaign that was going on? He went up to North Bay and made a bitter attack upon the French Catholic orders that had come to this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if his words were true, I would not have very much to say. I would permit myself, perhaps, to criticise the wisdom, in an election of this sort, of raising a personal attack upon those Orders of a religion to which I did not belong. I think that would be fair criticism. But the President of the Council, eight weeks ago, was told in the most firm and unmistakable manner, and with proofs, that his assertion was incorrect. And although we have had a statement handed out to the press, which is, possibly, a new way in which men belonging to this Government answer their adversaries—or some of them; I don't want to be unfair to those who use the old fashioned way and come into the House to make their own defence—eight weeks have passed without reply; and except for this statement handed out to the press, we have had no statement from the President of the Council either adducing the proof that he was right when he made those charges or that he withdraws them like a man.

Now, you may ask, why should I say this, what object have I? I have no desire to hurt the feelings of the President of the Council. I admire his ability and his devotion to the public service; he is a hard-working man. I say it for this purpose: that very shortly the President of the Council is going over to the old land, and I do not want him to represent himself as a Liberal there, as a sort of modern George Brown, who has joined a Union Government for the sake of saving Canada. I think I know what you are looking at, Mr. Speaker. You are wondering whether I am keeping to the motion. And therefore I have said all I need to say on that question. With his usual acumen and nimbleness of mind, the President of the Council knows exactly what I mean. I will see his career in the Tory party with pleasure, but I do not want him to represent himself as a Liberal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will confine his remarks more closely to the subject.

Mr. McMASTER: I will, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your indulgence. Now, have I made out a case, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, not yet.

Mr. McMASTER: I was addressing my remarks to the Speaker. Have I made out a case, Mr. Speaker, for a general investigation? I believe I have. It will be for the Government now to grant an investigation now, or not to grant an investigation. And if they are successful in getting their followers to vote against their desire

and against their will for the maintenance of the power of creating life titles in Canada, I do not know how the vote will go, but I leave it before the House.

Hon. A. L. SIFTON (Minister of Customs): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House very long at this time of the morning in regard to the discussion of the election that took place on the 17th December last, and which, for the first time, we are discussing this evening in this House. I have been a little disappointed, in connection with this matter. Having for a great many years taken an academic interest in the conduct of the affairs of the Dominion of Canada, I have noticed that, after every general election, in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, or the very first available opportunity in the House, the members of the Opposition, whichever that Opposition might happen to be at that particular time, devoted the greater part of the first session to showing the country that they had obtained a moral victory. That has been the custom ever since Confederation; and here we have waited now for two or three months, and to-night is practically the first time that it has been brought to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Opposition obtained a moral victory in December, 1917.

The reason that has been brought to your attention to-night is peculiar. A gentleman has just arrived from England with the evidence, according to the first speaker in this debate, which has proved that the Opposition obtained a victory, or should have obtained a victory, if they had had their rights. They ignore absolutely—and it is absurd to discuss the question—that the people of Canada, utterly regardless of all the soldiers' votes, returned the supporters of this Government by a very considerable majority. They ignore the fact that if they consulted the figures they would probably find that if all the soldiers had not voted at all, or if in the bulk of the constituencies they had all voted against this Government, the result would have been very much the same in a great number of cases. These things are absolutely immaterial to the members of the Opposition in connection with this matter. They are not so much material to them as they are to the particular member who last addressed you in regard to this, because he has taken a low stand, as if a gentleman of his eminence and ability, representing an English-speaking constituency in the Province of Quebec, should not receive any opposition from the members of this side.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. SIFTON: I have had some part in elections for a great many years, and I have always proceeded upon the basis that every member of the Opposition and every supporter of the Government should be opposed honestly to the best strength that all the members of these respective parties have, and no member has a right to get up and say that he received special attention and that was made an object to defeat him. They did not succeed to do it in all; nor in the County of Brome they did not succeed. And they did not succeed, because, as the hon. gentleman has shown, the officers of this Government, whom he now blamed for not taking part properly in the conduct of this election, threw out the soldiers' votes that he says would have defeated him if they had been counted. And because the officials in the conduct of the election carried out their duty as it was carried out, because a number of soldiers' votes that were improperly cast either in England or in Canada were thrown out by the officials of this Government, and the member for Brome was elected by the resident voters of that district, therfore he says that he was the subject of special attack and singled out to be defeated. Apparently the gentlemen who were in charge of the campaign either in Toronto or otherwise were not competent for their job.

Mr. McMASTER: Something slipped.

Mr. SIFTON: They apparently succeeded in a great many places in accomplishing what they were for, but they fell down in the constituency of Brome. And, as a consequence, Mr. Speaker, we have the privilege of listening to the address we have had to-night. And the hon. member for Brome forgets all about the soldiers, he forgets about the importance that it is to the Dominion of Canada to see that there is an investigation into the conduct of soldiers abroad; he forgets the important things that were mentioned by the first gentleman who moved this resolution in regard to the effect on the country. He devoted the greater part of his speech to a political address in opposition to the people of Toronto and to the President of the Council. What has this to do with the motion with which the member for Westmorland has occupied the time of the House in connection with the vote of the soldiers overseas? As a supporter of this

Government and as a private member of this House, I am opposed to any judicial investigation of what took place in England and in France in connection with the soldiers' vote. Every one knew when the War-time Elections Act was passed—any one who did not know should have known—that it was impossible in a time of war to take the vote of the soldiers overseas in the same manner that the civilian vote at home is taken. Every one recognized the fact that you could not pass a law making perjury in England perjury in Canada; that you could not pass an Elections Act that could be enforced in England and France as it could in the constituency of Brome, for instance, or any other constituency of Canada. When Parliament passed that law they left it to the honour of the soldiers to vote in accordance with the dictates of their consciences and in what they believed to be the best interests of their country. If Parliament could not trust the soldiers, they had no right to provide for the taking of the vote overseas, because under no circumstances can the soldiers in France and England be made subject to the same rules that are applicable to an election in this country. Either the matter had to be left to the honour of the soldiers, or the soldiers had to be left without votes. At the last session Parliament chose the other course; they gave the votes to the soldiers overseas, and so far as I have been able to discover, the election was carried out as well as it could possibly be carried out under the circumstances.

We are told that the soldiers were influenced by their officers. Hon. gentlemen who make that suggestion know perfectly well that the soldiers did not need to be influenced by their officers. Only to-night a man who has just come from there and who was present in one of the units on the occasion of the election told me that three soldiers in that unit who desired to vote for the Opposition, and did so, immediately asked to be locked up in the guard-room in order to escape from their comrades who unitedly supported Union Government. It was not necessary for the officers to issue any instructions; the privates would have risen in rebellion against them if the officers had not allowed them to vote as they did vote, almost unanimously, for the Government pledged to carry on the war to the very utmost of its ability. That is the view I take with regard to this matter; that is the view which I believe will be taken throughout the length and breadth of Canada and by the vast majority of the members of this House.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I do not want to trespass at length upon the time of the House, and I shall confine myself to a very few minutes. Most of the ground has been traversed well by my three colleagues who have spoken on this side of the House, but there are two or three points that I think we might touch upon before the vote is taken.

There is a saying—it is hardly a saying, for it consists of only two Latin words,—which has come to me out of the degree of my former Latinity, whatever I may have possessed. I refer to the expression "cui bono"—to what good purpose? These words have been on my mind all the time during which this debate has been going on, and they were running through my head more rapidly during the speech of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Viewing the matter in the light of the present situation, in the light of this gathering of 200 busy men from every part of the Dominion of Canada, in the dying day of the session, with the weight and the burdens of the war in their hearts, upon their minds and on their shoulders, and in the light of the duties awaiting them at home,—to what earthly good the speech that was made by the member for Brome? Let each one try to answer that question. As the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Sifton) said, my hon. friend drifted entirely from the impersonal question of the soldier and the war, and made the mistake that a young preacher often makes: That of putting himself in the front and not getting behind the pith and essence of the gospel which he is preaching. My hon. friend did not add to the weight of moral tone or the firmness of moral fibre in this country when he—held up to the ridicule of this House? no; he could not do that; this House is a little bit too serious to look upon it as a matter of ridicule—but when he attempted to hold up to the ridicule of this House men such as he mentioned as forming a committee in Toronto or in Ontario. Cui bono, to single out worthy christian workers in any line—the Y.M.C.A., or workers on behalf of prohibition, temperance or any other good cause. Why single them out and hold them up to the scorn of a hundred or two hundred men and to the scorn and the laughter, if he is able to provoke it, of the people of the country? We have none too much of this moral fibre in our country, and I never like to hear a man chiding or

jeering at men whose chief object in life is doing Christ's work in the way they consider to be the most honourable and the most effective way of doing it. Cui bono? Is it an aimless curiosity that prompts such talk as we have had here to-day? It is curiosity to look into the workings of a watch and to tear it to pieces, to see how the wheels go around, well knowing that it is an old watch which will never be used to keep time again. I can see that there would be some purpose in having an investigation into the methods of the election in England and France if that mode of election were ever supposed to be used again in choosing the members of the Parliament of Canada. But that method of selection has been forced upon us by a great war. It would never have been possible under other circumstances, and we hope that it will never be used again because it is made necessary by another great war. It would be infinitely interesting and amusing to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) if he knew exactly everything that took place in the trenches when soldiers were voting, how they were led to vote and everything like that. But cui bono? Where is he going to apply it as a lesson to aid and help, for the good of this country or of his own constituency? May I say to my hon, friend that when, as he well observed in the early portion of his remarks, there was a change in the relations of peoples and sections of peoples in Canada at the present time, as compared with what was the condition six months ago, twelve months ago, more or less—what earthly good would it be to bring again into the arena and fight at the old causes of separation and dissention, and renew, so far as he could pour oil upon the fire, the smoke and the flame of a contest and conflagration which we were all hoping had died down never to be relighted again? To what good again, I say? No argument has been given here this evening at all to show that, if all those investigations were carried on and all the information was gathered, there would be one iota of change in the parties, and the policies, and the principles, which govern this country as a result of the election of the 17th of December, 1917. There is no national political interest in the matter at all, because no amount of investigation could ever cause any change in the policies and principles being carried on in this country at the present time. I think this is a fair method of criticism. There were several things which could have been done. But just now the thought comes to my mind—to what good again? There are in this country, people who do not like the war, people who do not care much for our soldiers, some people—I hope there are not very many—who roll under their tongue as a sweet morsel anything which will derogate from the war party, from the soldier, from that portion, that effort of the Dominion of Canada which is behind this war and is pushing it to the conclusion to which it must be pushed if we are to keep our lives and liberties and status intact. Does it help to throw the blur and fog and mist and darkness of mistakes that have been committed by soldiers, if mistakes have been committed; of irregularities that have been committed by soldiers or officers, if irregularities have been committed? Does it help in the united purpose of this Dominion of Canada that such should be dug up and thrown out? I do not think it does. I have, flashing before my mind just now, two illustrations of that in the history of the present war. Galipoli and Mesopotamia were dark features in the campaigns of the last two or three years. There were allegations; there were thoughts; there were ideas; there were even facts which in normal times would have carried like a whirlwind investigation of the very keenest and deepest kind. Great Britain did not investigate. The war was on, and nothing was done which would dim the public ardour, nothing which would tend to make confusion or disorder or lack of unity and purpose in the carrying on of the war, either as affecting Great Britain herself or her standing and that of the army and that of the war in the view of the warring enemy. So, many things that otherwise would have been looked into have been left over until the war is at an end. Will it do any good at all for us to fling out a drag-net investigation into soldiers, lieutenants and captains, and with that drag-net proceed through Great Britain, and, if we are logical, through France as well and elsewhere? Will it help in any way? To what good again? It is a matter which appeals to my mind as being one of infinitesimal importance in comparison with the great purpose for which we are banded together and which this country is doing its very best to carry out.

There is close at hand an element which has been imported into this discussion. My hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) had three courses before him. He has chosen one. He has ignored the other two. There was one course,—I do not know whether this

course is politically possible or not. He has had the knowledge of what he calls irregularities and if his statements are proved, if the prima facie evidence turns out to be true evidence, he has made statements which reflect upon the honour of soldiers and which involve strongly a moral question. One course open to him would have been to come with his information the very first moment he got it and lay it before the Government and ask them to deal with it and make such investigations and mete out such discipline as they thought possible. My hon. friend smiles—that is not the party way of doing such things; that would not have had the effect for him nor for his party that he hopes has been had by the method of procedure which he did ultimately adopt. But I take it that, in many a case, in grave situations like this, the quiet way of scotching an evil and preventing it from spreading is the best way, and that was one way open to my hon. friend. But he did not take it. There was not enough light and shadow about that. There was another way. The moment that the hon. gentleman got into this House, the moment that the House came together, why should he not, burdened with all that information which showed to his mind dire and dreadful iniquity, the influence of which could not be good for soldier or for national life, bring that information and put it upon the table of the House and press for an investigation early in the session when the House would have had an opportunity of dealing with the matter? Instead of doing that, he waits until the day before the House is to prorogue and then on an independent motion he and his confreres bring those matters and chuck them into the House. Such a motion, under those circumstances, no Government could allow to pass. In spite of all the camouflage and smoke screens that may be thrown up, there is no possibility, on a motion such as this of a discussion which would be fair or an investigation which would be thorough by a Committee of the House or by the House itself in any capacity. One of those two courses he could have taken, but he has taken a third. I am only criticising the method.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is my hon. friend not aware that on the 16th of April I put a question on the Order Paper asking for the production of documents, which, if received, would have enabled me to move for this inquiry earlier?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend put on the Order Paper questions which if they had been answered or could have been answered would have enabled him to bring in two sets of information; first, the information that he has read out as to where these men were born, where they enlisted, their residence and the like of that. He had the sworn affidavits of his own men as to that in his pocket all the time. Men of his own choosing, in whom he had confidence had furnished him with the prima facie case he has put before the House to-day. That was made a little stronger by the documents which he did get. I take leave to say that the stand taken by the Minister of Justice, which the Government has stuck to, was the fair thing, namely, that it is not the right of any person to go in and take hold, for any purpose whatsoever, of the documents which are the records of the elections of the country, and which are guarded as great secrets. They can be brought out for use in a judicial commission or in an investigation by a Committee of the House, if they are ordered, but it is irregular, and it would lead to dire consequences if these documents could be fished into for information at any time and every person. So I say that my hon. friend having sufficient evidence, evidence of his own choosing, furnished by his own scrutineers in whom he had confidence and who had charge of his election, if he had laid it before the House at an earlier period of the session, it would have brought the House to a discussion of the matter under such conditions as would make it a real discussion and would enable a conclusion to be come to by the House on the merits of the case. But to throw into the House to-day, as has been done, a vast mass of stuff that took four hours and a little better to read—how can a Government or how can the House itself make any valuation of these things? A thousand and one incidents may have to be probed in order to test whether those things are worthy of an investigation or not. However that may be, the matter has come before the House; the Government has met it, and the Minister of Justice and my other colleagues have spoken in detail to the House.

I have but one thing more to say. The moral quality in the question which has been raised by my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres is a different phase of the matter. To what good may well be asked with reference to the other phases I have discussed, because they are ephemeral; they cannot have any very great advantage as a guide for future action. But moral

delinquency stands on a different plane. The moral question was what was raised by my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres, and that cannot be ignored by any House of Parliament or by any Government. With reference to that, while I am not going to say on prima facie evidence that officers of the militia or military formations of this country have done anything that is dishonourable or wrong—we cannot say that until the matter is investigated—I am bound to say that when things of that kind come before the House the Government and the House itself must take cognizance of them, because the moral quality is one which pervades the community to-day and pervades it always, and it must be kept as pure and as strong and as elevated as we can possibly keep it. And so when evidence of that kind is put before it the Government is prepared to say—it could not do less—that it will be probed to the very bottom, and that in so far as the evidence goes to show wrongdoing, the wrongdoing will be punished, even though we may be sorry in our very heart of hearts that such things do occur and have to be made examples of. The Government purposes to do that.

My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) started out with the idea that he could put up as direct a case as was put up by my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres, but he forgot his case in attending to himself, and so he put up no case for an investigation.

As to a general dragnet thrown over this country in one of the crises of our country's efforts impugning the whole military organization of Canada, putting it under suspicion and having it menaced by the coming investigation, whether anything has been proved or not in the first case, no man of good common sense would think that a good thing to help on the war at the present time. But we will take this particular case, and it will be looked into thoroughly and speedily, and as the evidence is brought forth so will the punishment rest on individuals who have been guilty of wrong-doing. The Government must go on; we must have our Supply, and we must stand by the motion to go into Committee of Supply. That, I believe, is a sensible thing to do, and that is what I think will be done when the vote is taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, we have heard from four ministers, and now the motion comes at last to what we might have expected; the Government take it as a motion of want of confidence. Now an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply is a motion of want of confidence if the Government wants to make it a motion of want of confidence, and it is not a motion of want of confidence if the Government does not choose to make it so. Again and again in this House amendments have been made to the motion to go into Committee of Supply by members of the Opposition, and again and again Conservative governments and Liberal Governments have accepted those motions, and not treated them as motions of want of confidence.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Those occasions are exceedingly rare.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Such cases have occurred in the Government of which my hon. friend was a member. I remember a case in the eighties, when my hon. friend was a member of the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, on a motion for Supply Mr. Mills, the member for Bothwell, moved an amendment that public buildings should not be built except in places where the revenue justified it. Sir John Macdonald accepted the motion at once, as it was a proper motion. He did not treat it as a motion of want of confidence, and my hon. friend assented to it also. I can remember a case in which the Government of which I was the head accepted an amendment to the motion for Supply moved by Sir Charles Tupper and seconded by my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster).

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I suppose my right hon. friend's memory will carry him back to the occasions where he refused it over and over again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Only yesterday a motion was made in this House, as to the merits of which every one was agreed, but the Government chose to take it as a motion of want of confidence.

But the Government made this a party question, and therefore everybody has to bow. Yesterday the Government was concerned. They had just passed an Order in Council which to a certain extent negatived the motion, and then wanted their supporters to stand by them. But in this case the Government are not involved. Neither my hon. friend who moved the motion, nor my hon. friend who seconded it, accused the Government. They made charges of wrong-doing. In those charges the Government are not concerned. Up to the present time not one word has been said against the Government. Will the

Government step in and have an investigation? No, they say, we will not grant this inquiry, we will make it a party question, and therefore every follower apparently will have to do what he did yesterday, swallow his convictions and support the Government.

My right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) stated a lot of objections to this motion. It comes too late; why did it not come earlier? My right hon. friend asked my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) why he did not bring this matter to the Government. Whoever heard of a matter of this kind being brought to the Government. This is the great inquest of the nation, this is the place where all accusations are brought, and I will ask my right hon. friend, if he will permit me, if he ever heard of an accusation of this kind going to the Government? Did he ever hear of it? Such a thing never took place. It is a phantom of the imagination of the right hon. gentleman to try and bolster up a bad case.

Then my hon. friend from Chambly-Verchères was asked by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) why he did not take this to the courts of law. He might have accused somebody of wrongdoing. He certainly might have done so, but does any one pretend that when such grave charges are brought to the attention of the House as those which my hon. friend from Chambly-Verchères has placed before us to-night, that justice would have been done to the public if there had been an appeal to the courts of law? Some parties might have been punished. But what we want is not to punish parties, but to uphold and vindicate the honour and dignity of the law. That is why this motion is made. My right hon. friend told us that even if the charges were true no national interests would be served by an investigation. Let me answer at once that we know we cannot change the complexion of this Parliament, and such is not our intention. But, is the matter confined to that? Does my right hon. friend pretend that when an election has taken place, as it took place under the circumstances of the last election, the honour of the country is not a consideration, that the law of the land is not a consideration, and that we are not interested to know whether or not the law has been observed? It is not to change the complexion of this House, it is not to change the Government, but it is to maintain the principle of the electoral law of the land, without which there is no liberty whatever. We are fighting to-day for liberty. That is our pride, but will my right hon. friend tell me that, when we are fighting for liberty to-day, if such charges as these are brought they should not be investigated? These charges are either true or they are not true —I think they are—but we do not condemn anybody. We simply ask that the Government should have an opportunity to have an investigation, in order to find out whether these charges are true or not. It is not necessary to tell us that there are no national interests involved. It is the honour of the land that is involved. It is more than that. It is the foundation of the institutions under which we live. If there is anything that is sacred in this country, or wherever British institutions exist, it is the freedom of elections and the sanctity of the vote. That is what is at stake to-day. We are told that we should not vote for this motion. It is a principle of British justice, a principle of British institutions, that whenever and wherever a crime has been committed, no matter what it is, that crime must be investigated. If I find on the wayside a dead body, it is my duty to notify immediately an officer of the law; the coroner comes, empanels the jury, summons witnesses, and leaves no stone unturned, until the murderer is discovered, and justice is done. It is the same thing here. The principle of electoral freedom lies prostrate, killed in the House of its own friends, and this is simply a coroner's inquest called to inquire into the matter so that the culprits may be brought to justice.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Copp, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lafortune,
Boivin,	Lanctôt,
Bourassa,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Brouillard,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bureau,	Lavigueur,
Cahill,	Leduc,
Cannon,	Leger,
Cardin,	Lemieux,
Casgrain,	Lesage,
Copp,	McCrea,
d'Anjou,	McKenzie,
Déchêne,	McMaster,
Delisle,	Marcile (Bagot),
Demers,	Mayrand,
Desaulniers,	Michaud,
Deslauriers,	Murphy,
Devlin,	Papineau,
DuTremblay,	Parent,
Ethier,	Pedlow,
Euler,	Pelletier,
Fafard,	Power,
Fontaine,	

Fortier,	Prevost,
Fournier,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Gauthier,	Robb,
Gauvreau,	Ross,
Gervais,	Savard,
Gladu,	Trahan,
Jacobs,	Truax,
Kay,	Vien,
Kennedy,	White (Victoria).—61.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Long,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Maclean (Halifax),
Anderson,	McCurdy,
Andrews,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Argue,	McIsaac,
Armstrong (Lambton),	McLean (Royal),
Arthurs,	McQuarrie,
Ballantyne,	Maharg,
Ball,	Manion,
Blair,	Marshall,
Bolton,	Martin,
Boyce,	Mewburn,
Brien,	Middlebro,
Buchanan,	Mowat,
Burrell,	Munson,
Calder,	Myers,
Carvell,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Casselman,	Pardee,
Charters,	Porter,
Clark (Bruce),	Reid (Grenville),
Clarke (Wellington),	Reid (Mackenzie),
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Cockshutt,	Rowell,
Cowan,	Scott,
Crerar,	Sexsmith,
Cronyn,	Shaw,
Crothers,	Sheard,
Crowe,	Sifton,
Cruise,	Simpson,
Davidson,	Smith,
Davis,	Spinney,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),	Steele,
	Stevens,
Elkin,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Finley,	Stewart (Lanark),
Foster (Sir George),	Sutherland,
Foster (York),	Thompson (Weyburn),
Fripp,	Thompson (Hastings),
Glass,	Thompson (Yukon),
Green,	Turriff,
Guthrie,	Tweedie,
Harrison,	Wallace,
Hay,	Whidden,
Henders,	Wigmore,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Knox,	Wright.—92.
Lang,	

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Clements,	Molloy,
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Tremain,	Chisholm,
Green,	White (Alberta),
Douglas (Strathcona),	Hunt,
Tolmie,	Duff,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Borden, Sir Robert,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Blake,	Lapointe (St. James),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Nesbitt,	McCoig,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Meighen,	Seguin,
Harold,	Verville,
Butts,	Denis,
Tudhope,	Baldwin,
Edwards,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Armstrong (York),	Tobin,
Bowman,	Boyer.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I was paired with the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion agreed to and the House went again into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I move that order No. 19 (Bill No. 62 to amend the Insurance Act, 1917) be discharged.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the Bill that came up to-day?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: This is a Bill that was recently referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and their recommendation is that it be not proceeded with this session.

Motion agreed to.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 41 to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act be read the second time and concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What are the amendments in question?

Mr. CARVELL: As the Bill was drafted it provided that the Minister of Public Works alone should have the right to say what works might be forcibly removed from the navigable streams, and also that he alone should have the right to state what works might be placed in the stream. When we came to examine the situation we found that the harbours of Montreal and Vancouver, and wherever there are harbour commissions, are really under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Therefore when the Bill went to the Senate we had its provisions changed, otherwise it would have taken away from that department their jurisdiction over those national harbours.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada be read a second time and concurred in.

He said: The amendment to section 34 is the insertion of the word "transfer" in the first line after the word "appointment" so that the section will now read: "So much of this Act as relates to appointment, transfer and promotion," and so on. Section 41 is amended so as to provide that no person shall be admitted to any examination unless he has been a resident of Canada for at least three years. As the section stands now it reads "one year." The last section of the Bill, which is the repeal clause, was changed in three particulars. In the first place, certain provisions respecting the selection of reporters and assistant reporters and clerks and servants under the provisions of the Supreme Court Act, are repealed. The provisions regarding employees of the Post Office appointed in the statutes of 1912, known as case examiners, are repealed also. They hold the examination of the railway mail clerks. Just why they are called case examiners I cannot recollect at the moment. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) might tell me that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend mentions the reporters of the Supreme Court.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The provisions of the Act—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not apply?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, they have been repealed.

Mr. BUREAU: Under what clause would that come?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is in the repeal section.

Motion agreed to, and amendments agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND CHAPTER 39 OF THE STATUTES OF 1917.

On the order for the second reading of Bill No. 72, to amend chapter 39 of the statutes of 1917—Sir Robert Borden:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a contentious Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is it contentious?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then we will not take it to-night.

LEAD BOUNTIES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved that Order No. 25—resolution in favour of continuing in force the provisions of the Lead Bounties Act, 1913—be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

THE ZINC BOUNTIES ACT, 1918.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN moved the second reading of Bill No. 109, to provide for the payment of bounties on zinc produced from zinc ores mined in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that there may be some discussion upon this Bill. I would suggest that it stand until the next sitting.

Motion stands.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We might take Bill No. 117, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act. It is not on the Order Paper, but it is printed.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It is not distributed yet.

Mr. DOHERTY: Some copies were distributed this morning. The purpose of the Bill is merely to amend the Banking Act to provide that a bill of exchange may be protested at half past two in the afternoon instead of three o'clock. It is a great convenience to the bankers, and does no harm to any one.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has it the fiat of the Bankers' Association?

Mr. DOHERTY: It has been asked for by the Bankers' Association. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1:

Mr. LEMIEUX: What will the public think of this change?

Mr. DOHERTY: It merely makes a man's note subject to protest half an hour sooner than it otherwise would be. A very large number of young men have voluntarily enlisted from the staffs of the banks and others are taken under the Military Service Act. If the banks are obliged to defer action until three o'clock in the afternoon, they have to keep their staffs, now greatly reduced, working very late.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this intended to be permanent?

Mr. DOHERTY: Only during the war, and a year after.

Mr. CAHILL: Suppose a man's note was protested at half past two and the bank is open for deposit until three? He might expect by three o'clock to have money in the bank to cover the note?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is proposed that the banks shall close during the period of the war at half past two o'clock. The banks might do that without any amendment to the Banking Act, but the Act provides that obligations not paid cannot be protested until three; and that is the purpose of the change.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 2.39 a.m., Thursday.

Thursday, May 23, 1918.

The House met at eleven o'clock.

REPORT OF PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Bruce N.) presented the Report of the Joint Committee on Printing, as follows:

The Committee desire to commend to the consideration of the Government the matters referred to in the following resolution adopted by the Committee:

Resolved, that in the opinion of this Committee, the building now occupied by the Printing Bureau contains ample space for the work to be done:

That the policy of the King's Printer should not be to extend the premises, but to make a better selection in the character of the plant, by discarding obsolete machinery and replacing it by more up-to-date machines better suited for the character of work;

That the system of carrying a large amount of standing matter should be done away with as far as possible to save space and expense;

That a system of pension if necessary, to old employees whose services may warrant such action should be adopted and the staff thereby reduced in number, which in the opinion of this Committee, would not interfere with but would add to the efficiency of the plant.

In recommending the renewal of the plant it is the opinion of the Committee that fewer and more up-to-date machines would increase the product and reduce the number of men required for the operation of the plant, making a saving in the amount of wages paid.

[Mr. Doherty.]

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Mr. NICKLE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government, in the event of voluntary repayment not being made by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick of the $5,000 paid him to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for the fiscal years 1915-1916 and 1916-1917, and not incurred nor disbursed, to take steps to recover this amount?

2. If not, why not?

3. Does the explanation given by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in the memorandum read to the House by the Prime Minister on May 15, for the acceptance of the said sum, express the practice and policy of the Government?

4. Are payments of the nature of those referred to in the statement of Sir Charles made without the concurrence or consent of the Auditor General?

5. If so, why?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No. In view of criticism made in the House of Commons, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has offered to return the amount mentioned although he strongly urges that he is legally entitled thereto under the Act of Parliament which authorized the payment. In this opinion the Department of Finance and the Auditor General concur.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The explanation referred to as given by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick does not purport to express any practice or policy on the part of the Government but merely the views of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as to the effect of the legislation governing the payment of the allowance and his rights thereunder. In this connection the following additional letter has been received by the Prime Minister from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick:

My dear Prime Minister,—

May I trouble you again with reference to the payments made to me as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General to which objection has been taken by two or three members of the House of Commons as having been accepted by me contrary to the terms of the Parliamentary appropriation which authorized them.

Dealing first with the "special allowance to the Chief Justice to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General"; as you are aware, during the early years of Confederation, the rule assigned to the Administrator one-half of the Governor General's salary. Subsequently this provision was considered neither just nor advantageous when applied to a Governor General when absent from his Government for a brief period either on leave or on the Public Service. As a result the emolument was reduced, about 1875,

from one-half to one-fourth. In 1906 the question was again reconsidered and it was then decided that it did not comport with the dignity of the high office of Representative of the Sovereign in this country to make abatements of his salary and the regulations which authorized them were revised so as to provide that in case the Governor General of Canada was absent for a period of thirty days consecutively there should be no reduction of his salary for reason of such absence. In 1907, another change was made which provides that in any case of absence although exceeding thirty days no deduction should be made for the period of twenty-nine days.

Subsequently it was thought proper that the Administrator should receive a fixed sum of $2,500 in lieu of those allowances. At a later date the Government thought proper to increase this allowance from $2,500 to $5,000. That this latter amount was voted with the sanction and approval of Parliament cannot be doubted. For two years, the amount was put in the estimates and voted in the regular way and paid without protest. In the estimates for 1917-18 as originally brought down, that special allowance was reduced to $2,500, but on the 19th September, 1917, as will be seen on reference to Hansard, p. 6049, an item was introduced in the supplementary estimates "to complete the special allowance for the Chief Justice so as to make it equal to that allowed the previous years, $5,000." This did not pass unnoticed; Mr. Edwards, M.P., drew attention to this increase and asked for an explanation, which explanation was given by Mr. Reid, the minister in charge of the estimates, who said it had always been the custom to pay this amount to the Chief Justice "and the Government feel that as he has been receiving $5,000 for the positon it is hardly fair to reduce it at the present time." It was also intimated that the payment was made partly for the purpose of implementing the salary of the Chief Justice. Although the allowance is made to me personally I have always paid over the proportion due to the senior puisne judge of this court who has acted as Administrator during my absence.

Dealing now with the two payments of $2,500 each, made to me as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, one during the fiscal year 1915-16 and the other during the fiscal year 1917-18.

The amounts in question were voted by Parliament as "special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council"—the provision in regard to "travelling expenses" attending sittings of the Judicial Committee which was a condition of payment in previous years, having been intentionally omitted—and were paid in monthly instalments on application from the Privy Council office to the Auditor General who evidently certified in the usual course that the cheques asked for might be properly issued by the Finance Department.

I perhaps never gave the matter as much consideration as I ought to have done but my view was that an allowance to cover expenses differed from the payment of actual expenses and was at any rate not dependent on their being incurred in any particular period. The expenses of attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee must always vary with the length of the sittings and of course attendance is not necessarily confined to one sitting in the year. If there were more than one attendance in any one year the expenses would certainly exceed the allowance.

The war has brought about an exceptional state of things. Though I have offered each year to go over to assist at the sittings of the Committee I have been advised that it was not considered necessary to ask me to do so under the conditions actually obtaining.

The fact that this exceptional position had continued for two years no doubt properly called for an alteration in the vote and this was made for the fiscal year 1917-1918.

I do not think that any representations of mine can be responsible for the view which I suppose both the Auditor General and the Finance Department must have held that the payments could be properly made.

If, however, it is now considered that the intentions of Parliament have been misunderstood I can only say that I shall be prepared to return the amount of the allowance received during the two years in question. My first object is to avoid all personal embarrassment to you.

Yours very truly,

C. Fitzpatrick.

4. No. The allowances in question were drawn with the concurrence of the Auditor General and of the Department of Finance.

5. Answered by No. 4.

CONCURRENCE IN ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move, seconded by Mr. Carvell:

That the Orders in Council, copies of which were laid on the table of the House on the 2nd of April, be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As a rule these Orders in Council are considered in Committee of the Whole because it is more convenient to discuss them in Committee than with Mr. Speaker in the Chair. I have looked at the Orders in Council referred to in the motion and I see nothing of any importance in them, so that possibly we can approve of them, without going into Committee, if my hon. friend will call attention to any particular one of them which may be of importance. As I am advised at present, and from a cursory glance at them, I see nothing objectionable. They appear to be in most respects merely technical Orders in Council.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I most respectfully protest, as one member of the House, against this procedure. Yesterday morning there was a Bill brought in here and not ten members of the House knew what the Bill was about, nor could we hear one word of what transpired in the discussion of it. I speak in all kindness, and I say it is most painful to have to sit here and

not know what business is being discussed before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the House is a motion for concurrence in certain Orders in Council, notice of which has been on the Votes and Proceedings for some time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would appear that most of these Orders in Council are purely technical, and so far as my information goes at the present time, they are unobjectionable. The objection of my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) is well founded. We have to take these rather on trust than anything else. For my part I am satisfied, because I have looked at them, and possibly I am the only man in the House who has done so.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the fault of hon. members themselves if they have not looked at these Orders in Council, because they have been on the table of the House for a considerable time. The statute provides that such Orders in Council shall be laid on the table of the House within a certain number of days after the session opens, and that was complied with, and they have been here for the use of hon. members.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is the fault of the Government who brought them down so late.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The Order in Council that was brought down yesterday did not lie on the table of the House all session.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was not speaking of that one; I was speaking of those Orders in Council which have been on the table of the House ever since thirty days after the opening of the session.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS.

MOTION THAT THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE UPON PENSIONS BE COMMENDED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Power:

That the recommendations contained in the third report of the Special Committee, appointed on the 10th day of April, 1918, to consider and report upon the Pension Board, the Pension Regulations and the sufficiency or otherwise of the relief afforded thereunder, the Pension lists in force in Canada for disabled and other soldiers and the dependents of those killed while on active service, and any other matters relating thereto or connected therewith, be commended to the consideration of the Government.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. ROBB: I draw attention to the fact that Mr. Power is not in the House.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to let the motion stand until Mr. Power comes in. Mr. Power was a member of the Pensions Committee and it was arranged that he should second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion can be seconded by Mr. McCurdy.

Mr. ROWELL: It was understood it would be seconded by a member of the committee representing the other side of the House.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why don't you whisper what you are saying?

Mr. ROWELL: I said it was understood that the motion would be seconded by a member of the committee on the other side of the House.

Mr. D. C. ROSS: I will second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is seconded by Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROWELL: As the report contains two or three recommendations of great importance in reference to the regulations governing the granting of pensions it is perhaps due to the House that I should say a few words in explanation of some of the most important recommendations.

The members of the House will recollect that the existing pension regulations are based upon a report of a committee of this House made in the year 1916, who at that time carefully considered the whole question. That committee presented certain recommendations which were approved by the House and passed on to the Government, and the Order in Council creating the Pensions Board and establishing the principles upon which pensions should be granted were based upon the report of that committee.

In order that we may better understand the recommendations of the committee now before us, I wish to draw the attention of members of the House to two or three clauses in the existing regulations.

The first clause of the existing pension regulations provides for the appointment of a Board of Pension Commissioners each of whom shall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years from the date of his appointment. A permanent commis-

sion was created, it being the view of the House at that time that the pensions should be administered by a board independent of any department of the Government. Then by regulation No. 2 it is provided:

2. Subject to the regulations hereinafter set out, the Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction and authority to consider and make all grants and payments of military and naval pensions, and of gratuities, allowances and assistance to persons wounded, injured or incapacitated in the military or naval service of Canada (hereinafter called members of the forces), or to their dependent relatives, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction and authority to deal with all matters pertaining to such pensions, gratuities, allowances and assistances. (P.C. 1334, June 3rd, 1916.)

Sir SAM HUGHES: What has the board power to do? We cannot hear two consecutive words; we can only hear a word occasionally.

Mr. ROWELL: The board has exclusive jurisdiction and authority to consider and make all grants and payments of military and naval pensions and all gratuities, allowances and assistance to persons wounded, injured or incapacitated in the military or naval service of Canada, or to their dependent relatives; the board has exclusive jurisdiction and authority to deal with all matters referring to such pensions, gratuities, allowance and assistance. The Board of Pension Commissioners has exclusive jurisdiction within the scope of the regulations to deal with the matters enumerated.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that subject to any appeal?

Mr. ROWELL: There is no appeal. That was the recommendation of the House at the time. Regulation No. 5 provides:

There shall be no appeals from the decisions of the Commission, but every applicant for a pension, gratuity, allowance or assistance may present his or her case either personally or by counsel before the full Commission sitting for the purpose of hearing the complaints of those who may have been dissatisfied with the decisions given in the ordinary course of administration.

This provides for a review by the whole board, at which the applicant can be present in person or by counsel.

Mr. MORPHY: Is it intended that the commission shall sit only in one central place, or will it be a commission which can go to sit in different parts of the country so as to reach the people?

Mr. ROWELL: There is no limitation with respect to that. The members of the commission may travel through the country, and I understand they made a trip west last year or the year before. In this respect they can sit in the same manner as the Board of Railway Commissioners in different places. But the permanent headquarters are in Ottawa, where the administrative work is carried on.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A great many of these applicants for pensions are persons who are not accustomed to conduct business transactions. Is there any provision that there shall be any barrister or other officer who will look after the interests of those whose petitions for pensions have been presented? In the earlier period there were a great many cases where petitions fell down because of the failure of such persons to properly present their claims.

Mr. ROWELL: There is no provision in the existing regulations for the appointment of any person to represent the applicant.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think there should be.

Mr. ROWELL: It was stated before the committee that the proceedings were very informal and that any person by writing a letter or forwarding a communication could have his or her claim taken up and considered. That was the statement made to us by members of the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It might be worth while considering whether it would not be well to have a regularly appointed officer for that duty. Some man or some woman should be appointed to an official position, who would properly present these claims. For example, I have had a claim forwarded to me this morning but I have not had time to go into the details. I do not think this duty should be imposed on the Militia Department because after all it is not within the scope of the business of that department. There should be an officer who would prepare the case for the board and see that justice is done to those persons who do not know the technicalities surrounding these applications. That is a suggestion which I throw out to the Government.

Mr. ROWELL: When the Government comes to consider the other suggestions the suggestion of my hon. friend will be considered. I refer to clause 7 of the existing pension regulations which says:

All pensions awarded to members of the forces shall be determined by the disability of the applicant without reference to his occupation prior to enlistment.

And clause 9 says:

No deduction shall be made from the amount awarded to any pensioner owing to his having undertaken work or perfected himself in some form of industry.

The principle underlying the existing regulations in respect to the award of pensions approved of by the House in 1916, is that the amount of the pension should be determined by the percentage by which the applicant's ability to earn a livelihood in the general labour market has been impaired by service, and that his prior occupation should not be taken into consideration in determining the amount of the pension, nor should his earning subsequent to the disability be taken into account in considering the award.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do they take into consideration the physical condition of the man previous to enlistment? I shall put it this way—I have heard of some cases where disability has been claimed by the returned soldier and the report has been to the effect that he was partially physically incapacitated at the time he enlisted, and a deduction is made from the pension on that account. I take the ground that if a man passed the examination and was put in Class A and sent overseas, we should assume that he was in perfect physical condition at the time he enlisted, and that no board has the right to assume that his physical condition was not perfect when his services were accepted for overseas.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will find that the point he mentions is dealt with in the recommendations, and I shall refer to it later. The existing law requires the Board of Pension Commissioners to take into consideration the disability of the man, if disability existed at the date of enlistment, and the pension is based on the aggravation of that disability. In other words, the State pays for the additional disability from which the man suffers due to service. However, that particular matter is dealt with in the recommendations of the committee and, as I say, I shall refer to it later on.

There is a scale of pensions established under the existing regulations. I need not take the time of the House to go into details this morning, further than to state that I think the House would be interested in knowing how our scale of pensions compares with that of other countries at war. That matter came before the committee in view of the suggestion that there should be certain changes in the existing scale of pensions in Canada. The scale of pensions as recommended to the House by the Pensions Committee of 1916 and adopted by the House at that time, together with the present scale of pensions and the pensions in force in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, France, the United States and Italy, will be found in the comparative statement on page 121 of the proceedings of the Committee on Pensions now before the House. That comparative scale is as follows:

(1) COMPARATIVE TABLES—PENSIONS PAID BY ALLIED COUNTRIES.

	Canada. (new scale).	Canada. (old scale).	Great Britain.	Australia.	New Zealand	France.	United States.	Italy.
	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.
Total disability....	$600 00	$480 00	$351 00	$379 00	$505 00	$240 00	$360 00	$243 00
Widows.....	480 00	384 00	175 50	253 00	379 00	92 00	300 00	121 50
Parents.....	480 00	288 00	increased to $191.75 when widow is 45 years. not to exceed $195 00	Mother of unmarried son same as widow. Dependent parent awarded some pension.	379 00	.....	240 00	If without widow or children pension awarded to parents (same as widows pension)
Children.....	96 00	72 00	$65 00 1st child $54 00 2nd child $43 00 3rd child $37 50 for each subsequent child.	$130 00 1st child. $97 50 2nd child. $65 00 each subsequent child.	130 00	20 00	$120 00 1st child. $150 00 2nd child. $60 00 each subsequent child up to two. $240 00	

(1) COMPARATIVE TABLES—PENSIONS PAID BY ALLIED COUNTRIES—*Con.*

	Canada. (new scale).	Canada. (old scale).	Great Britain.	Australia.	New Zealand	France.	United States.	Italy.
	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.	Yearly rate.
Orphan children...	192 00	144 00	$91 00 1st child $78 00 for 2nd and subsequent children when maintained by the same person.	$130 00 to 10 yrs. $162 50 10–14 yrs. $195 00 14–16 yrs.	195 00	20 00	1st child. $120 00 2nd child. $120 00 3rd child. $60 00 each subsequent child up to two.	Will receive widows pension while minors.
Special allowance for helplessness..	Not to exceed $300 00	Not to exceed $250 00	Not exceed $253.00	Not to exceed $253 00	Not exceed $130 00	No special allowance	Not to exceed $240 00	
Number of classes of disability	20 classes and gratuity	5 classes and gratuity	8 classes and gratuity.	....	.....	10 classes.	Compensation for partial disability is a percentage of total disability equal to the reduction in earning capacity. A schedule of disability ratings will be adopted.	3 classes.

It will be seen from this scale that the pension for total disability in Canada is higher than that in any country at war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there any distinction drawn between "honourable wounds" and "dishonourable wounds," or is it just the physical condition of the man that is considered when his pension claim comes up.

Mr. ROWELL: There is a provision in the pension regulations which bears upon that. Section 20 of the existing pension regulation is as follows:

> 20. No pension or allowance shall be paid to a member of the forces or any person dependent upon him when the disability or death in respect of which the claim is made was occasioned by the intemperance or improper conduct of such member, unless the Commission otherwise consent.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is in the old pension regulations?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I heard it was omitted from the new regulations.

Mr. ROWELL: Nothing was taken out of the old regulations, but certain recommendations have been made for modifications of these regulations. It will be seen by a reference to the above table that in the provision of pensions for widows the Canadian scale is higher than that of any other country at war.

The net result is that Canadian pensions are substantially higher than the pensions of any of the other countries at war. It is only fair, however, to point out that in the case of the United States, in addition to the pension, they have a provision for insurance whereby any soldier enlisting in the American forces may take out insurance ranging from $1,000 to $10,000. But the cost of the insurance is deducted from the soldier's pay; he pays for it himself. Of course, he gets the insurance at a very reasonable rate as the extra premium because of war hazard is not added to the ordinary premium.

Mr. SHEARD: How is the insurance for the American soldier taken out?

Mr. ROWELL: It is under an arrangement with the United States Government.

Mr. FIELDING: And not through insurance companies?

Mr. ROWELL: My recollection is that it is under an arrangement made by the Government of the United States. The result is this: That in a case where a United States soldier takes out insurance ranging from $1,000 to $4,500, the Canadian soldier would receive more under our pension scale than would the American soldier, under both pension and insurance, although the Canadian soldier is not called upon to pay the premiums that the American soldier would have to pay on a policy ranging from $1,000 to $4,500.

Mr. MORPHY: Is the American soldier's insurance against disability as well as death, or what is the nature of it?

Mr. ROWELL: I am informed by my hon. friend (Mr. McCurdy) that it is only life insurance and does not cover disability. But, if the insurance taken out by the American soldier is $5,000 or exceeding $5,000, then under certain conditions the dependents of the American soldier may receive more under the American system of pensions plus the insurance than would the dependents of a Canadian soldier. But, in the meantime the American soldier has had to pay for carrying the insurance.

It was suggested to the committee that we should adopt the system of state insurance for our Canadian soldiers and add it to the existing pension system. The view of the committee was that if some such system had been adopted at the beginning of the war and if our pension system had then formed part of it, the two might have been worked out in a practicable way. But at the present time in view of the fact that we have adopted a scale of pensions which is higher than that of any other country, and in view of the fact that so many casualties have already occurred, the committee did not favourably consider the proposition to introduce at the present time a system of state insurance for our soldiers in addition to the present pension scale.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That matter was considered at the very beginning but uncertainty as to the length of the war and lack of general information on which to base a judgment were factors in the determination that it was not worth introducing an insurance system at that time.

Mr. ROWELL: In any case, under the existing regulations our soldiers will come out as well, if not better on the whole, than the soldiers of any other country.

Another question was pressed upon the attention of the committee—and I mention it because it is dealt with in the evidence but is not touched upon in the report—that is of the inequality of pensions between officers and men. There again, if the principle of equal pensions had been adopted at the outbreak of the war, many members of the committee would have approved of the principle, and they do approve of it in theory. But in view of the fact that the war has been going on for four years and officers and men alike have gone overseas on the basis of the existing regulations which give higher pensions to officers and men, the committee thought it would not be fair now to suggest a change in the principle and provide for an equality of pensions for officers and men.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is that on the ground that there was a contractual agreement?

Mr. ROWELL: Some put it on the ground that there was a contractual agreement and, while others did not put it on that ground, the conclusion was that it was not desirable to recommend a change in the system at this time.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Do not all nations recognize inequality in this respect as between officers and men?

Mr. ROWELL: I believe so, with the exception of the United States. The committee was informed that the United States did not recognize that distinction.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The United States pensions for the officers are far greater than the pensions for the men.

Mr. ROWELL: We were advised in the committee by the solicitor for the Pension Board, and he stated it very clearly, that in the present pension regulations of the United States officers and men stood upon the same footing.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nothing of the kind, unless there has been some change recently.

Mr. ROWELL: Another matter urged upon the attention of the committee and with reference to which no recommendation appears in the report was that we should supplement the pensions now being received by the reservists of allied countries who lived in Canada at the outbreak of the war, so as to bring them up to the standard of the pensions now being paid in Canada.

In connection with that suggestion, the committee secured information as to the number of reservists of the different allied countries who had left Canada to fight in the armies of their own countries.

There were 3,232 British reservists in Canada at the outbreak of the war. Of this number 2,779 left at once and joined the colours; 153 were serving in the permanent forces, 194 were found physically unfit for active service, and 106 were unaccounted for.

The Belgian Consul General estimated the number of Belgian reservists at about 1,100. The French Consul General estimated the number of French reservists as 5,000. The Italian Consul General put the number repatriated through the consulate at 5,000, and those repatriated voluntarily between 2,000 and 3,000.

After giving the matter the most careful consideration, the committee reached the conclusion that at the present time they could not recommend that the pensions of these reservists should be supplemented. The committee thought that, in view of the obligations Canada has undertaken we were discharging our duty by providing pensions on the scale at which they are established for our own soldiers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There were a great number of these reservists, belonging to various countries, who at the beginning of the war came from the United States and were forwarded from Canada overseas. They certainly should not be charged to Canada.

Mr. ROWELL: The existing pension regulations only cover those who enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and the committee did not see its way clear to recommend any extension of that at the present time.

There was presented to us the question as to whether we should not supplement the pensions of the Canadians who have enlisted in the Imperial Service: the Royal Flying Corps, and other branches of the Imperial Service. That appealed very strongly to many members of the committee, but on the whole the committee considered that in view of the situation at the present time we should not enlarge the scope of the regulations, but confine it as the regulations now confine it, to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and Canadian naval force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is a Canadian fighting in a British regiment not recognized under our Pension Act?

Mr. ROWELL: No. He is recognized under the British Pension Act.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And we do not recognize him?

Mr. ROWELL: He gets his pension from Great Britain.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We deliberately induced a great many Canadians to leave the Canadian service and enter the British service. Surely these men who enlisted in our service and who, by an arrangement with the British Government were taken over to the Imperial service, should receive a Canadian pension. It is not fair to these boys not to recognize them. I think they should be given Canadian pensions.

Mr. ROWELL: The committee considered the matter, and it appealed very strongly to many members of the committee, but I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the report of the committee recommends that a committee be appointed at the opening of next session with the view of considering the whole matter and of drafting a pension law which will be submitted to Parliament. Many of these questions will be considered then when we come to pass a permanent law.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: In the brief time at the disposal of the committee they did not feel they could do justice to a matter of that kind.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Do the regulations provide that the pension shall begin immediately when the military pay ceases? In other words, will the pay of the soldier continue until the pension begins? That is a point about which we have had a great deal of trouble.

Mr. ROWELL: That is an understanding between the Department of Militia and the Pensions Board. I think they are working at the present time on the basis that the separation allowance and assigned pay should continue for three months and then the pension commences. I think there is a conference now being held with a view to shortening that period and having the pension commence at an earlier date. At all events, that is the desire of the department.

Paragraph 9 of the recommendations of the committee deals with the question raised by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), and I shall read that paragraph:

9. That no deduction should be made from the pension of any member who has served in

a theatre of actual war, other than the United Kingdom, on account of any disability or disabling condition existing prior to enlistment, provided that the pre-enlistment disability or disabling condition had not been wilfully concealed by the said member, or was not obviously apparent in said member at the time of enlistment.

In other words, the Committee recommends that the existing regulations be changed so as to provide that if a man actually gets to the front and serves in France, that fact shall be deemed adequate evidence that he was physically fit at the time of enlistment, and the question of any prior disability shall no longer be taken into account in the case of a man who has actually served at the front, unless it was concealed at enlistment or was obvious.

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose he did not serve in France but served in England?

Mr. ROWELL: The Committee did not see fit to suggest a change in the existing regulations in that respect. They considered that if he was in fact partially disabled at the time of enlistment and did not actually get to the theatre of the war and take part in it, the existing regulations would continue to apply, and the pension would be based on the aggravation of the disability rather than on the total disability.

Mr. MORPHY: May I cite a case that I have had communicated to me. A young man had what they call a football knee, the infirmity attaching to which only appears at certain intervals. He went over to England, and is now back drawing a pension of $20 a month, and the only disability he has is his football knee which he took over with him.

Mr. ROWELL: That would be a case in which the Pension Commission had not discovered the prior disability when awarding the pension. In a case of that kind an opportunity for revision is open to the Pension Board, and I assume it would be their duty to review it when further information comes to their knowledge.

Mr. MORPHY: I remember being in the House when wholesale charges were made by members of the Opposition concerning defective medical inspection, particularly at the time of the first rush of volunteers. There may be very many cases similar to that which I have mentioned, and I think the Pension Board should have machinery at its disposal to eliminate all fraudulent claims for pensions.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Is there any time limit within which a pension must be applied for? If a man should defer his claim for a number of months or for a year, is he debarred from making his claim for a pension? In fact, his injury may not have developed at the time of his discharge and he can only learn it from experience.

Mr. ROWELL: He has two years from the date of his discharge within which to make his application. In fact, it is not necessary under the regulations to make application for a pension. When a man is discharged, or prior to his discharge, the report of his medical board is passed on to the Pension Board, and if it is a case for a pension it is the duty of the board to investigate and to award a pension.

Then, recommendation No. 10 makes a change in the existing regulations:

10. That pensions should be awarded for disability in accordance with the rank or acting rank of the member at the time the disability was incurred; that no variation in rank after such disability is incurred should affect any pension. The word "disability" as used in this paragraph means such a disability as unfits a member for service in a theatre of actual war, other than the United Kingdom; and that any award heretofore made should be reviewed and determined for the purpose of future payments in accordance with the provisions herein mentioned.

Under the existing regulations a pension is awarded on the basis of the rank of the pensioner at the date of discharge, and the man who has suffered a disability, and thereafter serving either in Great Britain or in Canada, away from the actual theatre of war, might be promoted in the ordinary course of military service and thereby receive a larger pension. The committee reached the conclusion that a pension should be awarded on the basis of the rank held by the man at the time he incurred the disability, and the committee has so reported.

Section 25 of the recommendation introduces another important principle to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. Section 25 is as follows:

25. That the regulations now in force with regard to the awarding of pensions to dependents should be amended so as to provide that a parent, or a person in the place of a parent, who was not wholly or materially maintained by a member at the time of his death, and who at a subsequent time becomes dependent, may be awarded a pension provided he or she is incapacitated, either mentally or physically, from earning a livelihood, and if in the opinion of the Commission the member would wholly or to a material extent have maintained such parent or person had the member not died.

The House will see that this introduces to a limited extent the principle of prospective dependency. Where a man has not up to the date of his enlistment materially

contributed to the support of his parents, and the parents subsequently become dependent, pension may be awarded under the conditions mentioned in this regulation. It was designed to apply to cases of this character: parents in humble circumstances have provided out of their limited resources for the education of their boy, and he has gone to the front and has fallen in action. He had not contributed anything to their support up to the time of his enlistment, but his parents had reasonable expectation that he would contribute to their support in their old age. Under these conditions the committee thought that provision should be made for a case of that kind.

These matters to which I have referred outline the more important changes in connection with the recommendations of the committee, and I have much pleasure in moving that the report of the committee be received. I recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. SHEARD: Are these changes merely suggested for the consideration and approval of the Government? Shall we have a chance to consider them at a future date thoroughly in detail before they are finally adopted and passed into law?

Mr. ROWELL: That would depend, of course, on the view the Government would take of these recommendations. The Pension Board have urged upon the Government that some of these recommendations should be put in force without delay, to meet serious cases of hardship which have arisen and which are now pending. It would be quite within the power of the Government to give effect to these recommendations by Order in Council amending the existing regulations. But a general Pension Act will have to be passed sooner or later, and that must necessarily stand over until another session.

Mr. H. F. McLEOD (York-Sunbury): I understand the regulation is contemplated to cover a case such as this which I have in mind—a woman has a son who is just reaching the age at which he would become her support, and he enlists and goes overseas, and is killed. The Pension Board takes the ground that because this boy was not the sole support of his mother at the time he went overseas, she is not entitled to a pension on account of his death. Does this recommendation in the report of the committee change the existing regulation so that that woman may receive a pension on account of the prospective support she would have received from this son had he lived?

Mr. ROWELL: Paragraph 25 of the recommendation of the committee makes provision for such cases of extreme hardship. That is what is contemplated, and that is the change proposed.

Mr. MANION: Will these recommendations be printed and sent to members of the House?

Mr. ROWELL: A resolution already adopted calls for the printing of these recommendations of the committee, together with the evidence given before the committee.

Mr. D. C. ROSS (Middlesex W.): In order to expedite the business of the House I have, in the absence of Mr. Power, seconded the motion of the President of the Privy Council for the reception of this report. I would ask every hon. member of this House, if he can possibly spare the time, to peruse with care the evidence taken before the Special Pensions Committee, and I think he will find it not only very instructive but very interesting. I would refer particularly to the evidence of Colonel Russell in regard to the dealing of the Board of Pension Commissioners with cases of shell shock. The success they are having in the hospitals of this country in treating these cases is so remarkable as to be almost romantic. The committee had before them not only the members of the Pensions Board and their physicians, but also those who might be interested as soldiers, or returned soldiers, and the officers or organizations who have the interest of the returned soldiers at heart. These gentlemen stated their complaints and offered suggestions. If you look at the report of the committee, you will find that the first recommendations are along the line of administration, and suggestions are made that the commissioners were not themselves in as close personal touch with the affairs of the Pensions Board as the interest of the returned soldiers required. As a matter of fact, your committee found that pensions were granted without even the signature of a commissioner.

We thought that, in the interest of the administration of this most important matter, we would recommend that one commissioner at least should append his personal signature to every pension awarded, and that a regulation be passed that these commissioners who were receiving good salaries should devote all their time to this im-

portant task. We recommended, also, in order to meet a complaint made by the soldiers, that returned soldiers who have been granted a pension should be notified at once, or as soon as practically possible, of the decision of the board. These matters were all recommended by officers of the Returned Soldiers' Association. Another change was recommended by your committee on account of the evidence given by returned soldiers and by examiners on local medical boards. The question arose—and it was a very important question—as to which was the better board to decide the amount of disability a soldier suffered. It was contended by the returned soldiers—very moderately, but very firmly—that the original examining board, before whom the man appeared and told his story, and where a personal examination was made, was in a better position to determine the amount of his disability than the board at headquarters. On the other hand, it was contended that that examining board was very apt to be influenced by personal sympathy and friendship for the returned soldier, and was likely to make a recommendation in regard to his disability altogether out of proportion to that disability. Therefore, a middle course was adopted and the committee recommended that, in case of a wide variation between the recommendation made by the original board and the recommendation of the board at headquarters as to a soldier's disability, they shall confer together and then, by conferring together, arrive at a conclusion that seems satisfactory and fair to both. In this way the returned soldier will likely get a more careful consideration of his claim than he otherwise would. All these recommendations have been made in the interests of the returned soldier.

The further recommendation is made that these boards be conducted as civil boards and not so much as military boards. The contention was made by the returned soldier—and I can see how it can be justly made—that he comes before two or three doctors, sitting as a medical board, with all the fuss and feathers that go with that sort of thing, the stiffness, the discipline and the fear of his superior officer, so that he can hardly ask a question that he is not contradicted by an officer, and that he is not getting that sympathetic consideration which he thinks he is entitled to. He is not on equal terms with the officer. The contention is also made that an officer receives more favourable consideration than a private. I think that, if we make the recommendation that these medical boards should deal with all soldiers as if they were dealing with civilians, man to man, and not as soldiers dealing with inferiors, or as an officer dealing with a private, it will be in the interest of the soldier and will, I am sure, meet with the approval of the House.

I may say, as has already been said, that we went into the evidence in regard to the pensions given in this country and the pensions given in other countries, and came to the conclusion that the pensions given by the people of Canada to their returned soldiers were more liberal than the pensions given by any other country. We also came to the conclusion that, on account of the promises made to officers who have gone overseas, it would, at the present time, be hardly fair, and hardly in keeping with our pledges to these officers to recommend equality of pension between officers and men. As a matter of sympathy, or of consideration of the station of life in which these officers and men live, there is a great deal to be said in regard to the equality of pensions granted to officers and men. In many cases living in just as elevated a social position as the officers who have gone to the trenches as privates, have done their work just as well, have taken the same risks, and have left the same dependents at home, for whom they care just as much as the officers. If this country were going to war again and establishing a pension list, for my own part, I would favour equality of pensions to our officers and men in the service.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROSS: These recommendations have come from the returned soldiers. One matter which has caused a great deal of anxiety and a great many complaints on the part of the returned soldiers is the fact that when a man goes up to be re-examined he has no assurance that his expenses will be paid. We have made provision for that in section 13, which reads:

13. That whenever a pensioner is required to be medically re-examined he shall be entitled to be paid a reasonable amount for travelling expenses and subsistence or loss of wages.

I think that is only fair.

There are two important changes recommended in this report. Under the old practice pensions were granted to men as at the date of their discharge. I think the pension commissioners were following the rules and regulations in granting pensions on that basis, as those rules and regula-

tions stood, but I do not think it is the right way to do it. It leaves the door open to all kinds of fraud and log-rolling. A man may suffer a disability to-day as a lieutenant, and be entitled to a lieutenant's pension. He may be afterwards promoted to a captaincy, a majority, a colonelcy, probably without good cause, at the instigation of his political friends, and not for merit, and before he is discharged he may be serving in the rank of major. Under the old regulations he would be entitled to a major's pension. I think the recommendation of the committee in this regard will meet with the approval of every member of the House.

Mr. ARTHURS: Where a man of a good family goes over as a private, is injured several times, is afterwards made an officer, and becomes partially disabled, does he receive a private's pension?

Mr. ROSS: It depends on the last disability of the man. If a man went over, was wounded, was promoted to a lieutenantcy and was wounded again, or promoted to captaincy and wounded again, he would be pensioned on the basis of his rank at the time the last disability occurred. But the committee has gone further than that. They have passed another resolution to provide for past cases. They say that if log-rolling has occurred in the past, and men have been given a pension when discharged, we think they should have been given a pension according to rank at the time of their disability, so that they will not be asked to pay back to the country the money they have received in addition to what they should have received, and that in the future their pensions will be based upon the amount they would be entitled to receive as pensions at the date of their disability.

The next important recommendation made by the committee is one already spoken of by the President of the Privy Council, in regard to prospective dependents, and I do not intend to add anything to what the hon. minister said. Many cases have arisen which the Pension Board could not consider under the regulations. They were cases of very great hardship. A woman had been educating a son, for instance, and she had probably taken all the insurance money which she received on account of the death of her husband to educate that son. Many other instances of great hardship could be cited. That woman has sent that son to university, and spent all her money on his education. She was not dependent upon him at the time of enlistment. He was not earning anything, but, under the present regulations, if the boy were killed she would not be entitled to a pension. The committee thought she should be entitled to a pension. The time would have come in that young man's life when he would have supported his mother, and when she would have been dependent upon him. We thought that that was one case in which a pension should be given to a widow. We thought that similar cases should be provided for in like manner.

This committee does not pretend that they have covered the whole field of pension awards. With the evidence we had, we made the best report we could. Our report is along the line of alleviation of the complaints of the returned soldiers, and is an endeavour to give them more liberal consideration than they received under the old pensions. We thought that they deserved this consideration, and I trust the House will approve of the recommendation contained in the report.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I would not trespass on the time of the House at this late stage in the session, were it not for the fact that I think I should say a few words in regard to a matter with which my name was connected, which came before the committee—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not interrupt with any idea of suppressing discussion, but we are endeavouring to prorogue to-night, and I would suggest that members make their remarks as concisely as possible and say as little as possible.

Mr. STEVENS: I had no desire to prolong the discussion at all. I have not trespassed on the time of the House at any great length this session. Unfortunately, on account of this question of pensions, I have already incurred the displeasure of some of the ministers, and I desire the opportunity of saying a few words in explanation of my stand on this question. On April 23 I sent a letter to the President of the Privy Council and Chairman of the Pensions Committee. That letter was published in the press, and some hon. gentlemen have stated that I did not extend the proper courtesy to the President of the Privy Council, or to the committee, in that I published the letter before giving them an opportunity of discussing it in committee. That is absolutely not the fact. I did not know the letter had been published, or even that it was before the

committee, until I received a communication from the President of the Privy Council. I had nothing whatsoever to do with the publication. I do not regret that the letter was published, or that the matter to which it referred was aired before the committee. My object in bringing it to the attention of the President of the Privy Council was this; that the granting of the pension to Col. Labatt, referred to in that letter, gave clear evidence, in my estimation at least, of a method of administration of the pension laws of this country which was entirely unfair to the rank and file, and showed undue partiality to those in higher ranks. In order to warn the Government of that course of action, and to have it rectified—because I could not conceive that such a course had been pursued with the Government's approval—I sent the letter to the minister. I had no idea whatever that it would be published, or even given to the committee. I still contend, in spite of the report of the Committee, that this matter must receive the attention of this House, of the Government, and of the Pension Board, and must be rectified, or otherwise the country at large will not consider that the pension regulations are being properly and fairly administered. I will give the House a very short comparison of pensions. A man walked 160 miles from the Northland, enlisted at Edmonton, was overseas for two years, was wounded, suffered shell shock, and had one lung permanently affected. He returns to Canada totally useless as far as soldiers work overseas is concerned, and he receives the handsome sum of $20 a month. Col. Labatt comes back to Canada. Whatever may be the justification for the granting of a pension to him, I am not concerned with if the regulations were properly carried out. The regulations need radical amendment. Col. Labatt comes back and receives $2,300 a year. That includes the amount for the children.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And Senator Bradbury.

Mr. STEVENS: I will take the case of a brakeman. A brakeman naturally must be in possession of his physical faculties to carry on his work. I know a brakeman who returned to Canada permanently disabled and unable to carry on his work. He received another job, it is true, but he is incapacitated for the work of a brakeman. He receives $7 a month. I could give many other cases, but I will simply cite the case of a fisherman in my own town. This man worked for years to my personal knowledge as a fisherman.

These three men to whom I refer were physically examined and accepted as perfect specimens. This fisherman went overseas, fought for the country in the trenches, was wounded and came back to Canada. He was given $50 as a sort of gift and told to go. He cannot carry on his former occupation; he cannot fish. When he tries to fish he is crippled with rheumatism, as a result of the winter in the trenches in France. I desire to ask the Pension Commissioners, if Col. Labatt's pension was properly granted, what amount should these men I have referred to be awarded. If, as stated by the Minister of Militia and others, this pension was properly granted to Col. Labatt under the regulations, my contention is that the regulations are woefully amiss. This report tells us that, according to the regulations, labour power is the basis upon which the pensions should be granted. If a man is incapacitated, and unable to go into the open labour market and earn a living alongside of a man digging a ditch, that is the basis upon which his disability is to be awarded. Any man with common sense knows that the major portion of the senior officers who have gone overseas could not, at the time they entered the service, go into the labour market and earn anything. They may be doctors, engineers, lawyers, business men, bankers, or insurance men. It may be that for ten, fifteen or twenty years they were not physically able to go into the labour market, and why in these cases should we make a man's capability of going out into the labour market and earning a day's pay digging a ditch the basis upon which a pension should be granted? The absolute fallacy of this argument is clear, for this reason. Col. Labatt came back to Canada and served for some months in Niagara Camp as manager, or director or commanding officer, or whatever you like to call him. If he was suffering from total disability he was certainly not fit to command the Niagara Camp efficiently. But he comes back and he is capable of commanding this camp. They tell us he is an excellent soldier. He is not only capable of doing that work, but he is placed on the Pension Board. One of the commissioners was unable to give his attention to the matter, but Col. Labatt, on account of his superior ability, gave supervaluable services to the Pension Board, and yet he was suffering 100 per cent disability. If you are going to make the basis of the disability allowance a man's physical strength to go into the open labour market, I say it is absolutely ridicu-

lous and absurd to use that basis, if, on the other hand, you are going to allow men to go into professional life and earn a full living, $5,000 a year. Therefore, I say, if you adopt that as a principle upon which you are going to consider a man's disability, then you have to accept the principle of the levelling of the pensions. You cannot have as the basis of pensions the ability to earn a livelihood in the market on the one hand, and, on the other hand, have a grade of pensions from $7 a month up to $2,300 per year. If you are going to accept as the basis for considering the disability of a man, his capability of earning a living in the labour market, then you have to adopt the policy or principle of the levelling up pension.

Mr. McKENZIE: Must we not, at the same time, recognize the rank of the individual? One thing is a disability, but when you come to the stage of granting the pension, must we not recognize, under the regulations, the position which the individual soldier occupies?

Mr. STEVENS: The principle upon which it is based is this: here is a man who is an officer and therefore is supposed to be of a little superior stamp to a private, and more cultured. His methods of life are more costly, and, therefore, we should give him a higher pension. I call your attention to this. In the volunteer army there are thousands of men who leave good positions, lawyers who have quit their practice, doctors who forsake their practice, business men who give up their business; men by the hundreds and thousands who have ruined themselves financially. These men have gone over, and many of them are in the ranks to-day. These men are just as much entitled to consideration from the social standpoint, or from the standpoint of the standard of living, as the officer, and if you are going to introduce into our pensions system the graduation of pensions, you must recognize the standing of a private or corporal in his social life, but it is not so under the regulations. My point is that the regulations are certainly a long way from being even practicable or reasonable.

Another point I wish to make is that we could prevent the payment of pensions, as far as public servants are concerned, to men who are, we will say, earning a good salary. I am not going to say what that salary shall be, but if a man can come back to Canada and earn $5,000 a year, to be paid out of the public treasury, I contend that he has absolutely no right to claim a pension also from the country in addition to his salary. I do not wish to single out the case of Col. Labatt, but his case has been under consideration. He was receiving from the public treasury, $7,300 per year. I say that is unreasonable. Many of the soldiers of our forces overseas will have been there four or five years before they will return, and we will give them small pensions, as we are bound to do, when they return, because the country will not sanction a handsome pension to 400,000 men. We will offer them a small pension, and I do not think the Government would have the face to go to these men and offer them that small pension, and allow another man to draw $7,300 a year from the public treasury.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: What would you do with a private who came back and took the position of postman? Would you not give him a pension?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes. I would make the distinction only when the salary was a reasonable amount, say $1,800 or $2,000—an ordinary livelihood, keeping well above what you might call the poorer classes. It is not the poorer class that go into the public treasury for the amounts I have mentioned. I wish to impress upon this Government, not with any desire to harass the Government, but in all kindness, that they cannot play fast and loose with the soldiers in this country, nor can they play fast and loose with the treasury of the country in regard to pensions or any other expenditure of public money. We have to deal fairly with these matters, and if we want the soldiers to accept the small pensions which we are bound to give them—because we cannot give a high pension to them all— we must not single out any individual class or person for special consideration in regard to the payment of pensions.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If there is a disposition to have a further debate on this question, I desire to intervene at the present time in order to facilitate business, and I move that we proceed to Government Orders, so that we may dispose of some of the Bills we have recently received from the Senate, and discuss this matter later.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill 69, to amend the Criminal Code, be read the second time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: They consist in the elimination of what I believe to be the most important provisions of the Bill. As I have had occasion to say in regard to another similar question, I would very much prefer to word my motion in this way, that I submit for the moment to these amendments rather than that I concur in them. The provisions of the Bill dealing with the important subject of the raising of the age of consent, concerning which there was, I think, practical unanimity in this House—which, under present circumstances, I think may fairly claim to represent the public opinion of the country—have been stricken out by the Senate. I cannot truthfully say that I am prepared to concur in any action of that kind. On the other hand, there remain in the Bill provisions which have been earnestly asked for, particularly by persons interested in the guardianship and protection of the child, which I would be sorry to see fail of enactment. There are also provisions which have been urged upon me as of great importance to cure a grave evil, more particularly in British Columbia. I refer to the clause amending the provisions with regard to gambling. That, too, is an improvement in the law urgently needed which I would be sorry to see delayed. In order to avoid the postponement of the enactment of these provisions which are left to us—and I cannot but feel that the Bill in its main purposes fails of achieving its effect by reason of the action taken in the other House—I am prepared to accept these amendments.

I understand the reason moving the honourable gentlemen of the Senate in their action striking out these important clauses was mainly that they thought the change effected in the law was so serious that the Government should give it further consideration. And I shall see to it, if I should be here in the coming session, that at the earliest possible moment these hon. gentlemen shall have an opportunity to reconsider the action which they have taken in this instance.

Amendments concurred in.

INCOME WAR-TAX ACT, 1917 AMENDMENT.

AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE CONCURRED IN.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 85, to amend the Income War-Tax Act, 1917.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, by the Income Tax Act of this session, clause 4 of the Act of 1917 was amended so as to make taxable the income received by any person from any source within Canada; that has no relation whatever to incomes derived from business or from investments within Canada by persons ordinarily resident in Canada. For instance, in the Income Tax Act as it now stands, the interest of moneys invested in Canada by persons in Great Britain or the United States was not taxed. The Bill of this year proposed to make such incomes taxable, but it was represented to the Senate and very strong representations yesterday were made to me by certain members of the House, and by persons outside of the House also that this would probably retard the investment of foreign capital in Canada at the present time, or in the near future after the war period. There is a good deal to be said in support of that view, and under the circumstances, the Senate having seen fit to make this amendment to the Bill, and after consultation with my colleagues I am of the opinion the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Is the effect of the amendment to reduce the income liable to taxation, and will it affect materially the revenue from that source?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Only in one respect, that of the income derived from capital investments, that is all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It does not relieve the investor in Canada?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: It relieves the resident of the United States who has money invested in Canada.

Mr. ROBB: A resident of Great Britain who has money invested in Canada would be relieved under this?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday I thought there were several minor amendments made by the Senate to this Bill, but in the Bill which I now have there is only one amendment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is only one amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is all we are accepting?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do we understand that the minister accepts under protest this amendment of a money Bill by the Senate?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, under protest.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved that the Order of the second reading of this Bill be discharged. He said: We have reached a very late hour of the session and there is a general desire to prorogue as soon as possible. Representations have very largely been made by new members of the House to whom the argument was put that, because the Bill had received the assent, after thorough discussion, of the last Parliament, therefore it might be assumed to be representative of the views of the present Parliament. Taking all this into consideration it is thought better not to proceed with this Bill this year, but to take it up at the session next year, and press it to a conclusion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I have sat on committees of this House in connection with the consideration of this very important railway measure, and we have given consideration, and very serious and long consideration to that Bill, in the last Parliament. This is a measure which the requirements of the country call for, and it is still in committee, and now it is proposed that it shall go over for another year. I am quite willing that it should go over, but on the understanding that it is to be introduced early next session, and that we shall have an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. gentleman wanted to put a question. Debate is not in order on this motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like to know what is the policy of the Government as regards the amendments that have been made by the Senate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think we might well defer any statement as to the policy of the Government until the time of the introduction of the Bill next year when the policy of the Government will be stated. If that policy were stated now it might only disturb the summer leisure of my hon. friend.

Resolution agreed to.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. Carvell moved the second reading of Bill No. 72, to amend chapter 39 of the statutes of 1917.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This Bill has only two clauses; the first clause is in these words:

(1) Paragraph (g) of Section two of the War-time Elections Act, Chapter 39 of the Statutes of 1917, shall apply only to a General Election.

And the second clause is:

(2) This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the eighteenth of March in the year one thousand, nine hundred and eighteen.

This Bill is to come to the relief of my hon. friend the member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart), who was elected a few days ago. Section (g) of the War-time Elections Act, which is repealed by this Act, provides that the delay between the nomination day and the election day shall be one month, amending the general Act, which says that the delay, or the space of time between the nomination and the election day shall be one week. The object of this amendment is to restore the former delay and to provide that the space of time between nomination day and election day shall not be one month, as it was during the last election under the War-time Elections Act, but shall be one week. There was an election in the county of Lanark, owing to the death of our friend and member for this House, the late Dr. Hanna. The Order in Council ordering the issue of the writ was made on the 11th April, and the nomination day was fixed to be on May 2, and the polling day on May 9. The election took place, the nomination being on the 2nd May and the poll on the 9th of May, and our colleague the present member was elected. But the whole election was against the law. The delay between nomination day and the polling day should have been, not one week, but one month, and the second paragraph of this Bill is to validate the election. So far as the election of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Stewart) is concerned, I have no objection that his election should be validated, but I have very strong objections to its being made valid in the way in which it is being made valid by this Bill, that is, by amending the War-time Elections Act. For my part, I would say that that Act should not be amended, it should be abolished altogether; it should

be repealed, and if the Government were ready, or saw fit, to repeal that Act I should have nothing to say about it. But unless they will do so—I will not discuss the question at length, but I wish to record my vote absolutely, at all stages, against this Act, which I regard as an abomination, and, therefore, I move in amendment:

That all the words in the motion after the word "that" be left out, and the following substituted therefor. "In the opinion of this House the War-time Elections Act should be re-repealed."

The House divided on the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Boivin,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bourassa,	Lavigueur,
Brouillard,	Leduc,
Bureau,	Lemieux,
Cahill,	Lesage,
Cannon,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cardin,	McKenzie,
Casgrain,	McMaster,
Copp,	Marcile (Bagot),
d'Anjou,	Mayrand,
Déchêne,	Michaud,
Delisle,	Pacaud,
Demers,	Papineau,
Desaulniers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Pedlow,
DuTremblay,	Power,
Euler,	Prevost,
Fafard,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fielding,	Robb,
Fournier,	Ross,
Gauthier,	Savard,
Cauvreau,	Trahan,
Gervais,	Truax,
Jacobs,	Vien,
Kay,	White (Victoria).—53.
Lanctôt,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Anderson,	McCurdy,
Andrews,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Argue,	McIsaac,
Armstrong (Lambton),	McQuarrie,
Arthurs,	Maharg,
Ballantyne,	Manion,
Ball,	Marshall,
Bolton,	Martin,
Boyce,	Mewburn,
Boys,	Middlebro,
Brien,	Morphy,
Burrell,	Mowat,
Calder,	Munson,
Carvell,	Myers,
Casselman,	Reid (Grenville),
Chaplin,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Clarke (Wellington),	Richardson,
Cockshutt,	Rowell,
Cowan,	Scott,
Crerar,	Sexsmith,
Cronyn,	Sheard,
Crothers,	Simpson,
Crowe,	Smith,
Davidson,	Spinney,
Davis,	Steele,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),	Stevens,
Edwards,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Finley,	Stewart (Lanark),
Foster (Sir George),	Sutherland,
Fripp,	Thompson (Hastings),
Green,	Thompson (Yukon),
Guthrie,	Turriff,
Henders,	Tweedie,
Lang,	Wallace,
Maclean (Halifax),	Wigmore,
Maclean (York),	Wilson (Wentworth),
MacNutt,	Wilson (Saskatoon). —74.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Clements,	Molloy,
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Tremain,	Chisholm,
Douglas (Strathcona),	Hunt,
Tolmie,	Duff,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Borden, Sir Robert,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Blake,	Lapointe (St. James),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Beland,
Nesbitt,	McCoig,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Meighen,	Seguin,
Harold,	Verville,
Butts,	Denis,
Tudhope,	Baldwin,
Armstrong (York),	Tobin,
Bowman,	Boyer,
Foster (York),	Kennedy, Wm.,
Best,	Fontaine,
Nickle,	Murphy,
Fraser,	McCrea,
Charters,	Deslauriers,
Charlton,	Ethier,
Elkin,	Fortier,
Maclean, W. F.,	Gladu,
Hughes ,Sir Sam,	Leger,
Fulton,	Lafortune.

Motion, Hon. Mr. Carvell, agreed to, and Bill read a second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. BUREAU: When this Bill was introduced there was something said about the date of its going into force. Might I ask why this Act was made to go into force as on the 18th of March instead of, as in the ordinary course of procedure, after it had received the sanction of His Excellency?

Mr. CARVELL: There is no question whatever about the reason for it. It has been stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) before the War-time Elections Act came into force seven days elapsed between the day of

nomination and the day of election. The War-time Elections Act changed that delay to a month and the proposal now is to bring the law back to where it stood prior to the War-time Elections Act of 1917, and to provide for a lapse of seven days between nomination day and the day of polling. In the election held in the county of Lanark a few weeks ago, the returning officer issued his proclamation giving seven days between nomination and the day of polling. There is a question, and a very serious question, as to whether or not it should have been twenty-eight days, and, in order that there may be no question whatever about it or about the validity of the election, this second clause has been placed in the Bill. I hope there will be no misunderstanding whatever as to the reasons for the introduction of the second clause.

Mr. BUREAU: It is another case of confirming an election by legislation instead of having the proper tribunal decide upon the election according to the law.

Mr. CARVELL: There was no election in this case.

Mr. BUREAU: Then there is no reason for making this Act retroactive to the 18th of March. This gentleman was elected by acclamation, but there was a mistake made in the issue of the writ. As far as the Yukon election is concerned, the House was told that in that case it was at fault, but I hope that this time the country will know that it is not the fault of the House, so that if there is any presumption that the House was guilty with regard to the first error, as to this second error the blame will be laid at the proper door.

Mr. CARVELL: I would like my hon. friend to bear in mind that the writ issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery does not fix the date of polling, it orders that the election be held and fixes the day of nomination. The mistake, if such there be, was made by the returning officer who fixed the poll at seven days after the nomination instead of twenty-eight days. My hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) says this is an attempt to confirm an election by legislation I hope he will remember that this election was by acclamation, because only one candidate was nominated, and therefore it could make no possible difference.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Is my hon. friend right? Were not two candidates nominated?

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is right, two candidates were nominated, but one withdrew a few days after the nomination, so that the difference between seven days and twenty-eight days elapsing between the date of nomination and the polling day makes no difference, because two days after nomination one candidate withdrew so that there is no invalidity so far as the election is concerned, except the mistake of the returning officer, and the object of this second clause is to remedy that mistake, and to validate the election, and I think that there is no harm being done by this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No harm done, but this is confirming previous harm that has been done.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not going to argue that point.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a doubt, and there is the difficulty. There has been a mistake or there has not been a mistake. And it is not a mistake of this House or of this Parliament, but a mistake of those who have charge of carrying out the provisions of this War-time Elections Act. What I wanted is to have the blame placed where it belongs, whether it be with the returning officer or with anybody else. The returning officer is the officer of somebody, he was not appointed by the House.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I am very glad indeed that anything should be done to validate this election, because it certainly was not the fault of the member that there was any irregularity. Yet I cannot help thinking that when the nomination was fixed for a certain day, and the polling day was fixed illegally for another day, the whole thing is void, and even an acclamation would not be good. There must be jurisdiction for fixing the day of election as well as for fixing the day of nomination, and if the whole thing is wrong the mere fact that there is acclamation does not validate what was all wrong.

Mr. CARVELL: Does not my hon. friend consider that when the naming of the day of nomination was all right and valid, and where it turned out that there was acclamation, is there anything else necessary further than the fixing of the day of nomination?

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. minister does not quite catch my point; I am sure I am right. The whole thing is the bringing about of an election, that is what we started out to do, so that you must do the whole

of it right. It is not admissible that a part of it may be right and a part of it wrong. The officer must have jurisdiction to name two days, a nomination day and an election day, and if he is wrong in the day that he names for the election, the whole thing is wrong, and requires ratification by this Bill,—and I am quite willing that it shall be done. I want to bring out the point that if this election is partly wrong it is all wrong.

There is another thing I want to call attention to, and that is that the old Act was repealed when we established the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, and must there not be something to bring the old law into force again?

Mr. CARVELL: Subsection g of section 2 of the War-time Elections Act amended section 131 of the election law, which reads as follows :

> Except as hereinafter provided the day for holding the polls shall be the seventh day next after the expiration of the day fixed for the nomination of candidates.

This Bill simply proposes to amend it by saying that the amendment as provided by the War-time Elections Act shall only apply to a general election, the result being that when it comes to a by-election, the original section 131 stands, and that that will be the case in future in by-elections.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, but you have repealed the section, and put "twenty-eight" in place of "seven" days, and the seven days will not automatically come into force again without legislation.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the legislation.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I want to record my objection to the principle of retroactivity. I am not sorry to see the hon. member for Lanark sitting in this House, but this is a question of principle. It is confirming the new principle that was created a few days ago by the several votes which took place in this House in the Yukon election case. In that case we passed a resolution which was creating virtually a change in the law and giving it a retroactive effect. In this Bill, not only do we declare that paragraph (g) of section 2 of chapter 39 shall apply only to a general election—to that I have no objection, but it makes it applicable to an election which has already taken place, and to that I do object. I do not care for this particular instance, but it is a dangerous precedent to create; it was a dangerous precedent to create in the Yukon case, and that dangerous precedent is now being confirmed by another Bill. Of course, we have a Union Government, and I hope that people in Canada will in future remember that Government as having created a dangerous precedent in this country.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not come out boldly and say: This Act is to confirm the election of Mr. Stewart as member for Lanark? There is no question as to the purpose of the Bill, we all know it; it has been said openly in the House. I move in amendment that subsection 2 of clause 1 shall read:

> This Act shall be deemed to be passed to confirm and validate the election of Mr. Stewart, held on the 18th of March, 1918.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am very serious in my representation to the hon. the minister that this clause does not restore the seven days at all. Every lawyer in this House knows that once an Act is repealed, if the repealing Act is taken away, that does not restore the old law unless it is specifically restored. The result is that if this section passes there is no time at all fixed for holding the elections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think it would be well to assure ourselves upon the point made by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that the Act of 1917 would be repealed, and that by the section as it now stands the former Act would not be restored.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose we were considering Bill No. 73, to amend Chapter 39 of the Statutes of 197. Section 1 had been read and is being discussed. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the clause?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Has the Minister of Public Works given any consideration to the objection raised by the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie)?

Mr. CARVELL: I will give my view of the matter. I must confess I have not had much time to study it, because I have been very busy since the House rose at one o'clock. But I would like my hon. friend to go back to the War-time Elections Act, section 2, which I will read to my hon. friend.

Mr. BUREAU: Amending section 131?

Mr. CARVELL: Not even that. That is not in the pamphlet at all. Section 2 of the War-time Elections Act reads:

During the present war and until demobilization after the conclusion of peace, Part III of the Dominion Elections Act shall operate and apply as if amended, and shall be deemed to be amended in the following respects:

That is the theory of the War-time Elections Act, that the operation of certain portions of the Dominion Elections Act was suspended. First, I think, Part I was suspended entirely during the period of the war and demobilization. Then Part II was suspended in part. Part III was suspended in part. And by paragraph (g) of section 2 of the Act, section 131 was amended by striking out of the second line of section 131 the word "seventh" and inserting instead the word "twenty-eighth." Now, the original idea was that the operation of section 131 would be suspended during the pendency of this Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is specifically amended.

Mr. CARVELL: "Amended, and shall be deemed to be amended."

Mr. McKENZIE: It is amended.

Mr. CARVELL: It is amended, not repealed—that is the point exactly. It "shall be deemed to be amended." It is not actually repealed; it is not actually amended, but during a specific time it shall be considered as if it were amended. When that time arrives, it goes back to normal conditions just as though this Bill had never been passed. Then the present proposal says that " Paragraph (g) of section two of the War-time Elections Act.... shall only apply to a general election," that is, the suspension is removed so far as by-elections are concerned. I put that forward to my hon. friends; and my sole object—I will tell him frankly—that as I view this thing I think this section is properly drafted. I admit it is somewhat involved; I admit that you have to go back to the whole theory of the operation of Part III of the Dominion Elections Act under the War-time Elections Act. But if my hon. friend would prefer it, I am prepared to propose an amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it would be better to use such language as would restore " seventh " for " twenty-eighth." I have no purpose in the matter except to be as scientific as we can.

Mr. CARVELL: But there is the other side to it. I have had some discussion in the last two hours with the gentleman who prepared this Act. I will give his views. His idea is, and I think there is a great deal in it, that the War-time Elections Act was a lot of changes that were deemed to exist for a given time, and that if the war ceased and the time of demobilization arrived, then the War-time Elections Act would cease to exist and the Dominion Elections Act would stand out exactly as it was without an amendment to it. Now, if we amend section 131, we are making a positive amendment, and when the time comes to change over then you would have a positive amendment or positive enactment, that would necessitate special legislation to repeal. I do not know that it makes very much difference, because I imagine that before another general election takes place this whole election law must be redrafted and codified. Surely we can all hope that the war will be over with before there is another general election. When the war is over, certainly the Dominion Elections Act must come back into force. But in view of the fact that there is a change in the franchise, and that female voters will have the right to vote, at least in all the provinces except two—and I think we can pretty safely say that in all the provinces except one—a change will be required in the Dominion Elections Act. And so I do not think the theory I am now putting forward amounts to very much in practice, because, before there can be another general election, new legislation will probably be required in order to modify the Dominion Elections Act as may be found necessary.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister read the amendment he has prepared to show which of the two would be preferable?

Mr. CARVELL: The amendment suggested is:

Notwithstanding anything contained in Chapter 39 of the Statutes of 1917, Section 131 of the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, shall be deemed to be amended only in the case of a general election and shall apply without amendment to any other election of a member of the House of Commons.

Mr. BUREAU: That covers it. If I remember rightly, by the War-time Elections Act, in section 131, the words "seven" is struck out and the word " twenty-eight " substituted. Why not add at the end of the section: " This shall only apply to a general election." It is the same thing.

Mr. CARVELL: It is so involved that I would want to consider that amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: You cannot have the word "seven" in and out at the same time.

Mr. CARVELL: This amendment states the proposal in positive language.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it is all right.

Mr. CARVELL: And it has also the advantage that it does not interfere with what is supposed to be the general scheme.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister understands what I mean? It is a principle that a certain section repeals another; the repealing one may repeal itself.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite agree.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

THE ZINC BOUNTIES ACT, 1916.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) Bill No. 109, to provide for the payment of bounties on zinc produced from zinc ores mined in Canada, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—Bounty on zinc produced in Canada when price is less than £41, 8s 6d.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to amend this section, not to change it in essence, but to make it more understandable. I move:

That section 2 be amended by inserting in the fourth line thereof, after the word "England," the words "or St. Louis, United States, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce may determine"; by striking out the fifth line thereof and the words "hundred and forty pounds" in the sixth line, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "nine cents per pound"; and by substituting the word "pound" for the word "ton" in the sixteenth line and the words "nine cents" for the words "£41"; and by striking out the words "8s and 6d per ton" in the seventeenth line and substituting therefor the words per pound"; and by striking out the word "and" in the nineteenth line and substituting therefor the word "or."

That is, if the standard price is nine cents the producer receives nothing as a bounty. If the price is eight cents, he receives one cent per pound; if the price is eight and one-half cents, the bounty is one-half cent per pound. It is improbable in any event that two cents per pound will be earned as bounty. The section as amended will read as follows:

Whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is charged with the administration of this Act, that the standard price of zinc or spelter in cakes, blocks or pigs, in London, England, or St. Louis, United States, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce may determine, is less than nine cents per pound, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of a bounty on zinc or spelter, containing not more than two per centum of impurities, produced in Canada, at the time the price is as hereinbefore stated, from zinc ores mined in Canada. Such bounty shall be equal to the difference between such standard price per pound and nine cents per pound, as aforesaid, but shall in no case exceed two cents per pound, and in no event shall any bounty be paid when the price received for such zinc or spelter by the producer is nine cents or more per pound.

There may be no London market for zinc within the next two years, and St. Louis is always a very large market. It is in the interest of the industry and of the Government that an alternative market be provided in the event of the London market being destroyed.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TURRIFF: When this bounty was granted two years ago it was pointed out to the Government of the day that these producers would soon be back for increased bounties or for renewals. We renewed the bounty on lead—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: I know that the price of lead has doubled since the bounty was given two years ago. While I am not as well posted on the price of zinc, I have no doubt that it has increased very materially since the bounty was granted. I am aware that the cost of refining zinc is very much greater than it was, but the circumstances show that the moment you grant increased protection or give bounties on these products you start to feed these babies and they come back to the Government from time to time. A great many interests throughout the country are trying to make the war an excuse for seeking consideration to which they are not entitled and which they would not otherwise be given. It is well to point out to these industries that while we in the West are satisfied not to bother about the reduction of duties until after the war, if they try, because of the war, to obtain consideration to which they are not entitled, they may look for trouble in the near future.

Mr. GREEN: There appears to be some misconception in the mind of the hon. gentleman as to what is intended to be accomplished by the placing of this bounty upon zinc produced in Canada.

I hold no brief for the smelter company which, so far as I know, is the only one producing refined zinc in Canada and which is located at Trail, B.C., but I hold a brief for the operators and owners of the mines that are producing the ore from which the zinc is manufactured. Until the time of the war no zinc was smelted or refined in Canada. The industry was built up practically at the request of the Munitions Board which found it very difficult to secure a sufficient quantity of zinc for the purpose of making munitions. They, therefore, entered into an arrangement with this particular concern to build, equip and operate an electrolytic zinc plant. At the time that this plant came into operation the Munitions Board were paying, the Acting Minister of Finance informs me, forty cents a pound for zinc. But at that particular time, the Munitions Board, having made this particular arrangement with the smelter to go into the zinc producing business, also made a contract that what zinc they bought from the smelter they would receive at the price of fifteen cents per pound. That means that while the markets of the world were offering forty cents per pound for this particular kind of zinc, this smelter, under its contract, supplied to the Munitions Board all that it produced at fifteen cents per pound. The ordinary zinc of commerce, or prime spelter, is produced not electrolytically but by what is known as the Belgian or distillation process. That is a very much more economical and cheaper process. At the same time it is a process that takes very much more time for the metal to pass through the various stages before it gets into the finished state. If we in Canada are going to produce from our natural resources the finished product, then we must keep alive this electrolytic process in Canada until one of two conditions is attained, either that the smelter is able to produce zinc electrolytically as cheaply as it is now produced by the Belgian method or that we supersede this method with the Belgian method. We have in Canada vast quantities of zinc ore. We require the zinc in the finished state. In the past any zinc ore that we had in Canada was shipped to the United States and smelted there. This particular industry has been built up, not by the bounty, because as yet it has received no bounty, but by the fact that this company was able to enter into this contract with the Munitions Board.

I wish to say a word or two in connection with the smelting from the point of view of the operator in my part of the country. The operator there has been demanding, and in my opinion rightly so, that a duty be placed upon raw ores coming into Canada, because this company has within the last two years imported something in the neighborhood of twenty thousand tons of ores from the American side. The company gives as its reason that those particular ores were wanted for fluxing purposes, and I am not going to say that their statement is not right, but as we have those ores in Canada, our people should be protected sufficiently to compete with those ores which are imported from the other side of the line. There is amongst the operators a strong feeling that, in the past, they have not received fair treatment from the smelter; that the smelting rates have been too high; that the smelter has not taken the ore from them when they had it to sell; that the smelter in the main favours its own mines as against those of the country generally. I do not know how much of this is true, but I have, in season and out of season, pressed upon the Government my view that they should hold an investigation under a commission so that this matter may be thoroughly gone into, and if the smelter, which is in a sense a public utility, is not treating the public rightly. If this is so, then some action should be taken to make it do so. On the other hand, the managers of the smelter say to-day that if they do not get the protection afforded them by this bounty, they will have to close down their smelter.

Mr. TURRIFF: If the smelter company, which is a very wealthy concern, owned chiefly by the Canadian Pacific, could sell its product at forty cents a pound and it is getting a bounty of only two cents and is selling its zinc at fifteen cents per pound, why should it close down its smelter?

Mr. GREEN: To-day there is absolutely no market in Canada for electrolytic zinc, unless the smelter can produce electrolytic zinc below seven cents per pound, because the price of prime spelter is seven cents per pound to-day, and prime spelter is the particular grade of zinc that is being used commercially, not only in Canada, but in other places. The Munitions Board have absolutely refused to buy any more zinc from this smelter, giving as their reason that large quantities of this particular grade of zinc were purchased for the Russian Government and paid for by the British Government. This particular zinc was not de-

livered to the Russian Government and is, therefore, on the hands of the British authorities and is being used by them, and they are not in the market for any Canadian electrolytic zinc. The whole proposition is to put this electrolytic zinc on a parity with the prime spelter, so that it can be sold in the same market at the same price.

I was going to say that the Government have agreed to appoint a commission to investigate the whole situation as between the smelter and the producer. That being the case, I think it will be a calamity for the mine owners throughout British Columbia, and possibly in other parts of Canada, if this particular portion of the process that is carried on at Trail should be closed down owing to inability on the part of the smelting company to compete with smelters in other parts of the world.

Mr. CAHILL: I want to voice my objection to bonuses or bounties or protective tariffs in any shape or form. I am not in favour of, and I do not believe in, taking the people's money for any special interest, and this seems to be the same old protective tariff proposition. My hon. friends are bringing out the poor mine owner, but really the party which gets the benefit in this case is the smelter, the rich corporation. If this is a case for special consideration and is an industry which the War Purchasing Board are anxious should be maintained, it seems to me that the smelter company could make a contract with that board for their products and that we could do away with bounty business. It is not right at this time to be loading up the country with additional bounties.

Mr. ELKIN: I notice the minister proposes to change the point at which the price of the smelter will be considered by adding the words "St. Louis." Since this Act went into effect—and I understand practically no bounty has been paid under this Act—the seven and one-half per cent war tax has been imposed, which at the present price of prime spelter gives an increase on the bounty of three-quarters of a cent or seven and one-half per cent on practically ten cents. It is an utter impossibility for this spelter that is made in British Columbia to compete in a commercial way with the ordinary spelter, and I think we should have a little more information as to how the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who will administer this measure, proposes to figure the price at which prime spelter shall be sold in Canada.

If we were to take the prime spelter at St. Louis and permit the British Columbia smelter to compete with it, that will perhaps be very good business from the manufacturer's standpoint, but this spelter that is made in British Columbia is not a good spelter for ordinary commercial purposes, and it seems to me that before we add three-quarters of a cent to this bounty, making it two and three-quarters cents per pound, we should know how the Minister of Trade and Commerce proposes administering this measure. If he is going to figure the price at St. Louis plus the freight and plus the duty of seven and one-half per cent, figuring the price of prime spelter in Canada at eight or nine cents per pound. that is not a serious matter; but if he is going to figure the price at St. Louis, without adding the war tax of seven and one-half per cent which came into effect since this Act was passed, we shall really be giving these people a bounty of two and three-quarter cents per pound instead of two cents.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In this respect the Act is just as it was when it was introduced two years ago. In this Bill, as in the Act now in force, the bounty is payable if the standard price at London or, as in the amended Bill, at London or St. Louis, is nine cents per pound, I suppose, of course, the duty and freight will have to be taken into consideration, but that would not operate in favour of the Canadian producer.

Mr. ELKIN: It gives the producer a further protection of three-quarters of a cent per pound on to-day's prices, and of one cent per pound on the prices of a few months ago. In other words you are protecting this industry by way of bounty to the extent of practically three cents per pound. That is going pretty far in the case of a smelter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This company at the instance of the British Government and the Munitions Board of Canada, was induced to enter into the manufacture of electrolytic zinc in order that the British Government might have a supply for the manufacture of munitions here and in Great Britain, and for some of the Allied countries. The company made an investment of $2,500,000, and it was agreed between the Government and this company, as an inducement to the latter to enter into the manufacture of this high grade zinc, that the company should receive a bounty under certain conditions as to price, of

two cents per pound for two years, payable only after the war. When the company commenced to make the investment, it naturally anticipated that, during the war period at least, it would have in the Allied countries a market that would consume its entire production.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Was not the price limited to fifteen cents per pound?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. This company eventually produced a great quantity of zinc which was purchased by Great Britain and Russia. When Russia withdrew from the war, that market was, of course, closed to the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company which, at the beginning, always anticipated it would have this market. Great Britain was also expected to be a continuing purchaser of the product of this company. For some reasons, largely financial, Great Britain is obliged to purchase zinc in the United States. Now the smelter company is in the position that it made an investment of $2,500,000 to manufacture this high-grade zinc expecting that it would always have a customer, but now it finds itself without a market and it will have no market unless it can reduce the cost of production of electrolytic zinc to the cost of production of ordinary zinc, that is about seven cents per pound. In 1916, an Act was passed by which it was agreed to pay this company a bounty of two cents per pound whenever the price fell below the standard London price, but that bounty was not to be paid until after the war. The purport of this Bill is to allow the payment of this bounty at once if earned under the conditions stated in the Bill. The amount is limited to $400,000. My hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) was, I think, a member of the original Shell Committee that induced the company to go into the business.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The original Shell Committee had the honour of establishing the zinc industry. At that time the British authorities were paying from forty-two to forty-five cents per pound for zinc in the United States, and under the contract entered into the zinc was to be supplied at fifteen cents per pound. Unless I am misinformed, the price in the United States is not fifteen cents per pound to-day.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The price in the United States as fixed by the Government is twelve cents per pound, but the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company cannot sell at twelve cents, they must sell at nine cents to compete with the other companies producing the lower grade of zinc.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The British authorities were paying forty-two cents per pound at the time we made the arrangement by which the industry of smelting zinc and copper in Canada was established. I did not know that the price of zinc in the United States had fallen to twelve cents. How about the ores imported from the United States? The only objection I have to this measure is that it does not protect our own ore producers sufficiently, but treats the Yankee producers of ore the same as it does the Canadian producer.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think there are any zinc ores imported from the United States.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. BURRELL: Lead ores, but not zinc ores.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The lead is in the zinc.

Mr. BURRELL: No, in the class of ore they have been importing, the zinc would be an extraneous element, so that they do not want it. They do not import ores that have zinc in them. There is one thing that seems to appeal to one pretty strongly, and the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) touched on it. It was the paramount necessity for this zinc for munitions of war that really induced these people to go into the zinc business at all. Certainly, after an expenditure of $2,500,000, they have accomplished wonders, and they would not have required one cent of help if the British Government had been able to live up to their promise that they would take every pound of zinc that could be manufactured, but they have not taken it simply because of the Russian situation, and as they had a credit established in the United States they took an immense quantity of zinc from there, and consequently had to turn around and say: We cannot take any more.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is the reason that our zinc is not being taken by the British Government to-day because the Chairman of the Munitions Board did not advance Victory Loan money for it? That money seems to be for beef and bacon and things of that kind.

Mr. BURRELL: I have never heard that statement.

Mr. ARGUE: How long are we to continue paying this bounty?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is limited to two years and a total of $400,000. Nothing has yet been paid.

Mr. EULER: If it is impossible for this company at the present time to produce the zinc so as to be able to sell it at a price which would give them a return, why should they not follow the practice followed by other concerns under similar circumstances and discontinue business? If the British Government are not in the market for their product, why not discontinue the production of this particular commodity until such time as there is a market for it the same as others have to do?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There will never be a market for it unless they can reduce their production-cost down to the cost of producing ordinary zinc. They embarked in the enterprise practically at the request of the British Government and the Canadian Government, in order that the allied countries might have a supply of zinc. Circumstances have so developed that these countries will not buy, and there is no market for the product. They must sell a high-grade article at the price of a lower-grade article.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What information has the minister as to the reason why the British Government will not buy this zinc? I never heard of it before. I know that they were paying 42 cents a pound and that we saved the British Government millions and millions of dollars by producing it at 15 cents a pound. It is very strange that the British Government, which has been paying 42 cents a pound for zinc, will not buy zinc from us unless they get it for 15 cents a pound. There is something about this that requires looking into. I have heard it said that the reason the Imperial Munitions Board will not buy this zinc is very much the same as the reason why the British Government would not buy fish. The fish had to come from Newfoundland, and $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 was lost to Canada while Newfoundland got the sale of the fish. Probably the zinc will go through the hands of some Yankee concern and they will get the profit. We might as well look into these things.

On section 5—regulations:

Mr. JOSEPH READ: It is apparent to all that when the Government gave notice of this Bill they also gave notice of a Bill to authorize the payment of a bounty on lead. I noticed that in the original lead bounty Bill, clause 5 read in this way:

[Mr. Argue.]

> The Governor in Council may make such rules and regulations, including regulations as to rates and charges for refining, as are deemed expedient in the public interest for carrying out the purpose of this Act and all payments of bounty shall be subject to the due observance of such rules and regulations.

It looks to me as if they had switched from the lead to the zinc in order to avoid that clause. I made a reference to this subject in the Budget debate, and by leave of the House I will recall the fact that on that occasion I read a letter which had been written by a resident of British Columbia. When I read that letter one hon. gentleman said that the man who wrote it was a miner. He is not a miner; he is a medical doctor, and he has taken care of the families of soldiers free of charge ever since the war broke out. He is an altruist and not an egoist. He says—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to read from a previous debate on another subject in the same session.

Mr. J. READ: It is not on another subject.

The CHAIRMAN: It is absolutely against the rules of the House.

Mr. J. READ: It is the same subject exactly.

The CHAIRMAN: But it is an altogether different debate.

Mr. J. READ: It is a letter that I read on a previous occasion, but on the same subject.

An hon. MEMBER: It is on Hansard; it is all right.

Mr. J. READ: It is on Hansard. I am only going to read a few words:

> There has been talk about a committee being named to investigate smelter charges. Well, whatever one is named, the Consolidated will put it all over them, because there are very few mining operators in British Columbia who are not in their employ, or who dare find any fault with them. The only plan that would be any good would be a Royal Commission where any one could go before them and volunteer evidence, like what happened to Sir Joseph Flavelle. Any other solution of the difficulty would be a delusion and a snare and worse than nothing.

I would ask the promoter of the Bill to make a substitute for clause 5. That clause reads:

> The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

I suggest the following for a substitute:

The Governor in Council shall appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the rates and charges for refining, transportation, importation of foreign ores and such other matters as is deemed expedient in the public interest for carrying out the purposes of this Act and shall make such rules and regulations and fix such rates for refining as will promote the mining industry of Canada.

If the minister would kindly incorporate that in the Bill it would avoid a great deal of unnecessary discussion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Quite recently a committee was appointed by the Government to investigate complaints made by independent mine owners in British Columbia against the Consolidated Mining and Smelting company. It was charged that they discriminated against the independent mine owners in favour of their own mines. This committee was appointed upon the suggestion of the mine owners of that district in British Columbia, and I think the personnel of the committee was that suggested by the mine owners who came to Ottawa to confer with the Government. Now, I am told that they desire wider powers in their investigation and require a further sum of money to spend upon that account. But these requests only reached the Government during the last twenty-four hours and we have not had an opportunity of giving them consideration. If it is necessary to create a commission instead of a committee to investigate the grievances of the mine owners the Government would probably agree to that. The Supplementary Estimates contain a vote of $3,000 for this very purpose. I think we are very substantially meeting the suggestion of my hon. friend and I think he should be content with that. I submit that this is very good evidence of a desire on the part of the Government to give every consideration to the complaints of the mine owners of British Columbia against the Consolidated Mining and Smelting company. It is hardly fair to suggest putting this into the Bill in any event.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. J. READ: You are very anxious to create a monopoly, are you not? If what the minister has just said was correct, or if he had not been deceived, I would not say anything about this. But he has evidently been deceived, if he has been told that the miners' association has appointed that committee.

As a matter of fact, the Miners' Association sent down a gentleman named Mr. Caldwell, and he made the statement that they did not want this committee—that the committee was simply a farce and was going to put it over on the miners. They want a royal commission, that will deal fairly and justly as between the Smelting Company and the people of British Columbia. You already have an appropriation in the Estimates and for that sum, or perhaps a little more, provision can be made for an inquiry by a royal commission. The Smelter Company and the Consolidated Company are one and the same thing. That is the worst feature of the matter. And these people have already formed a great monopoly in the province of British Columbia by reason of having this smelter, which is going to be supported by the Government. They are already producing, in fact, the returns for the past year show that the output of the Consolidated Mining Company of British Columbia, which is really the same as the smelter, is 30,659 tons of ore, whereas the production of the rest of the mines of East Kootenay would not total one-sixth of that amount. In other words, the Consolidated Mining Company have put all the small miners out of business, and are now in possession, practically speaking, of the whole mining system of the Kootenay district. If hon. gentlemen are very anxious to perpetuate that sort of thing, I, for one, certainly am not. I put myself on record against such a giant monopoly as that is. I am only asking the Government to protect the ordinary mine owners of the Kootenay district by giving them a royal commission to discover whether the allegations they are making are correct, and to fix the smelting charges so that they shall be on a reasonable basis.

Mr. BURRELL: This matter is one of very great importance to the whole of the district referred to. There may be something in my hon. friend's contention that there is a difference of opinion between certain mine owners and the mine owners as a whole, and that the committee which is suggested would not have powers wide enough to investigate the charges which the smelter is making. A convention of the Associated Boards of the Kootenay district was held on February 26th at Kootenay, at which this whole thing was threshed out. It is possible, as my hon. friend intimates, that the mine owners were not thoroughly represented there. At all events, all interests were represented to some extent, and as a result of that convention they asked for a commission to investigate whether charges

made by the smelter were fair, because they thought the existence of the whole industry was imperilled. Two gentlemen were sent from that convention to Ottawa who placed the whole matter before me, 4 p.m. when we had a two hours' talk and discussed the subject thoroughly. Subsequently I had a discussion with the Prime Minister on the subject. The smelter had raised no objections whatever to an investigation, in fact they were prepared to throw open their books, accounts, and processes to inspection, because they believed that their charges were fair and they were willing to meet the contention of the mine owners in a fair spirit. As a result of that discussion we concluded that, as there was some objection to the perpetual appointing of royal commissions —because there is undoubtedly a good deal of restlessness in the country in regard to the multiplicity of commissions,—the purpose in view might be achieved by a friendly investigation carried on by the committee suggested, in which we would assist them financially. An Order in Council was thereupon drawn up setting forth all the facts, and the sum of $3,000 was placed in the Estimates for the purpose of meeting the expenses and giving power to enlist the services of a metallurgical expert and accountant in connection with the conduct of an investigation. Since that time, it is true, representations have been made to the Government—and there have been very strong representations in a telegram received as late as this morning—to the effect that the powers that were given to the committee in question are not sufficient, that the committee is not sufficiently in the nature of a royal commission. It is asked that the powers granted should be enlarged, and permission given to take the sworn testimony of witnesses, and so on, and thus get what the complainants believe to be the essential facts of the case. I have not had much opportunity to discuss this matter with the other members of the Government, but I think I might go so far as to say that consideration will be given to the representations made, and I believe I can fairly say that we will try and meet those requests as far as possible by enlarging the powers that have been given. We do not necessarily pledge ourselves, even if we go that far, to appoint the same committee, but we will take up the question of giving further powers, if such powers are necessary, and of perhaps granting a little more financial assistance, and put the matter in such shape that these disputed questions can be adjusted to the satisfaction of both the mine owners and the smelter. The main thing to be achieved is to stimulate production from all these mines of the Kootenay district which are so immensely important, not only to that district but to the whole of Canada. Under those circumstances, I would ask my hon. friend not to press his amendment.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

YUKON TERRITORY BILL.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 112, respecting the election held in the electoral district of Yukon.

Mr. J. BUREAU (Three Rivers): Before the Bill is read a second time I wish to again protest against the principle contained in it. In doing so I need not go into a recital of what has transpired at each successive stage of this Bill's progress. As I have stated before, the question of the qualification of the member, or of the candidate, for this electoral district, is not at stake. We on this side deem the question involved to be one of law, and we consider that a grave injustice has been done to the candidates in this election by the passage of the Order in Council concerning it, which we believe to be ultra vires and illegal inasmuch as it deprives one, or both, of the candidates of the rights granted by the Dominion Elections Act to appeal to the courts to correct any error which has been committed in connection with the election, or to decide the case itself definitely upon its merits. The present Bill is simply a camouflage which has been introduced by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie). He and his friends say to the candidates in this election, "We have illegally deprived you of your rights, as a result of which you could not go before the courts. Now we are going to restore those rights, but we will do so on one condition," and that is that any rights which you may have shall be annulled, any means of submitting to the court the grievances or wrongs of which you complain shall be taken away." This is another case, Mr. Chairman, where the Government have decided that they should have their man in the House, and they have now got him. It is another case where the House has ratified the substitution of the Governor in Council

for the legislation of Parliament and the will of the people. We have protested. I do not want to weary the House with the arguments which we have brought forward —and which have not been answered, may I be allowed to say, by the Government—as to the legality of the steps taken by them or of the Order in Council suspending the statute without any authority or justification whatever. The only thing that we on this side of the House can do this year is to protest, because we know if we go any further and move an amendment the Prime Minister cracks the whip and everybody on that side votes as he is told to vote. I won't give him the trouble of doing that, or put his followers to that humiliation. But I register my protest as an independent member of this House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think the protest as it stands should go unanswered. The Bill is only brought before the House on account of the objection made by Mr. Congdon at the last sitting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. During the discussion he urged, and I took his words down: "The Order in Council," he said, "prevents me from going to the courts under the Controverted Elections Act, upon questions of bribery and corruption, and I claim that right." It is on account of that objection that the Bill has been introduced at all. The Committee on Privileges and Elections itself dealt with the question of the soldiers' vote. I assume their finding on that was conclusive, and it has been concurred in by this House.

Now, in order to meet Mr. Congdon's objection, and for no other purpose—because he is the only man in Canada who can take advantage of this Bill—this Bill is introduced to give him a chance of invalidating the election through election irregularities, if he has the evidence necessary. If my hon. friend who has just spoken speaks on Mr. Congdon's behalf, and desires the Bill withdrawn—

Mr. BUREAU: On my own behalf; I speak for nobody else.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —I do not know that the Government has anything to gain by passing the Act.

Mr. VIEN: I think that the remarks of the Solicitor General are not an answer to the point at issue. It is not the fact that we speak on behalf of Mr. Congdon that is at stake, but that the Bill is now introduced to remedy something which cannot be remedied. I think that the country at large should know that the Bill introduced at this stage provides a remedy to a certain extent, but it does not give the full remedy to which Mr. Congdon is entitled. I think the private members of this House are justified in recording their protest on the ground that a full remedy is not granted.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I desire to protest also. I am absolutely surprised at the Solicitor General saying that this Bill gives back the rights of Mr. Congdon, when, as a matter of fact, it only gives back part of his rights. And then he makes the proposition that if we do not like it they will withdraw the Bill. Half a loaf is better than no bread. I would not favour withdrawing the Bill, because I assume the possibility—I do not know anything about it—of Mr. Congdon establishing his right to sit, or, at any rate, unseating his opponent, with the Bill as it is. But I do know this, that the Bill has omitted that which should not have been omitted, that is that part referring to the soldiers' vote. That is the part of the Bill, as is quite apparent to every man in this House, including the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), on which, if it went before the court, there could be only one decision, and that decision would be in favour of Mr. Congdon. I am not speaking in behalf of Mr. Congdon; I am speaking in behalf of fair play. There is no question in my mind or in the mind of any unprejudiced member on either side of the House, that if the two candidates had been nominated before the election the result of the overseas vote would have been different. That is very plain, and it is a question of law whether it is or not. There has never been such a thing known in the history of parliamentary government where a man was elected before he was nominated.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Extension of date for filing an election petition.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is some ambiguity there, at least there is the possibility of ambiguity. There were two returns made, one to the House of Commons, and one returning the member. I think it would be better to specify the date of the return in the Bill, so that there will be no doubt about which is meant.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The one meant, of course, is the one made within a day or two, electing the member.

Mr. McKENZIE: No doubt the one intended is the one electing the member.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We might add to the section the words "on the twenty-second day of May, 1918."

Mr. BUREAU: Why not say "by the return of the returning officer proclaiming the election?"

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will move that the words "on the twenty-second day of May, 1918" be added to section 1.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 2—Votes of military electors, how to be counted.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried on division.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I understand that this clause is only for the purpose of providing that the votes shall be counted "notwithstanding the date or dates upon which the said votes were polled." But I think it is not very clear that it will only be for that purpose. As the clause now reads, the votes will be deemed to be legal, however objectionable they might be for other reasons, within the date or dates upon which they were polled. I would therefore move that the following words be added to section 2:

Provided said votes were polled according to and in conformity with all the other provisions of the said Acts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think that is a little too general. This Bill seeks merely to ratify any votes cast between November 19 and December 17, both dates inclusive.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Why not make it clear that that is the only purpose of the Bill?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The section is quite clear. It says:

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Dominion Elections Act . . . the provisions of the said Act in respect to fixing the time for polling the votes of military electors shall apply and extend to the electoral district of Yukon . . . . notwithstanding the date or dates upon which the said votes were polled.

Mr. BUREAU: But it says that the votes shall be counted.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The committee has found that they shall be counted for the parties for whom they were marked.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: What is the objection to the amendment which I propose?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There may be something else in the Act which is not before my mind at present. This section was carefully drawn by the parliamentary counsel to cover only the point respecting the time at which the votes were cast, and leaving everything else open to Mr. Congdon. I should not like to interfere with the language of the section on that point.

Mr. BUREAU: The Solicitor General might give us an idea of what the intent of the section is. If it is to make valid the votes cast between November 19 and December 17, as if the Yukon election had taken place concurrently with the election in the rest of Canada, is it understood that that will not prevent Mr. Congdon or anybody else from protesting the election, from going into the legality of these votes, the manner in which they were polled, and all other errors or irregularities which may have been committed at the time of polling?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the understanding. The provisions of the Act are made to apply in respect of the fixing of the time for polling the votes; that is all. My hon. friend's amendment is also in contravention of the Military Voters' Act, section 18 of which provides that the validity of an election shall not be questioned on the ground of irregularity which has not affected the result. I do not want to override that section.

Mr. BUREAU: The wider the provision against irregularities affecting the result, the less you have to fear from the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not take that view.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the insertion of the word "valid" in the eighteenth line, before the word "votes," not cover the point?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the section reads properly now. It says:

And the votes of the military electors polled at the last general election . . . . shall be counted and applied.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The provision says: "shall be duly counted and applied." The fact is that the votes have already been counted and applied, and one of the candidates declared duly elected.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That was all considered when the clause was drafted.

Amendment negatived, and section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

On the Order for Committee of Supply:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had made arrangements with the Prime Minister to bring up a matter on going into Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had no knowledge of such an arrangement. According to the rules, I must leave the Chair on Thursday without question being put.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Bring it up when we are in committee.

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

Administration of Justice—salaries, including H. Demarais at $1,000, $166,387.50; contingencies, $21,000.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is there any truth in the rumour that the Chief Justice has paid or will pay back the $5,000 to which allusion was made early in the session?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The answer will be given later in the evening.

Mr. LEMIEUX: During the Budget debate I called the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance to a very serious incident which took place before the Supreme Court a few days ago, and which I think might well occupy the attention of the House for a few moments. As we are all aware, the Government some years ago decided to construct certain works at the estuary of the river St. Charles in the province of Quebec. The other evening when his Estimates were before the House, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) stated he would not continue the construction of these works. When speaking on the Budget, I drew attention to the enormous and indeed shameful waste of money that had been perpetrated in expropriating land on the shores of the river St. Charles, at or near the point where the works contracted for are being erected by the Public Works Department. As a result of the determination of the Government to dam the river St. Charles, expropriations became necessary and the property of one of the riparian owners by the name of Bélanger was expropriated. The Crown initiated proceedings, and one of the judges of the Exchequer Court was dispatched to Quebec in order to hear the evidence and arrive at a proper valuation of the land to be expropriated. At the expropriation proceedings the Crown was represented by Mr. Bernier, K.C., of Levis, and Mr. Bélanger was represented by his counsel. Many witnesses, so-called experts, were heard and the record of the proceedings, which I have here, is more voluminous than the Hansard of this session. Mr. Bélanger filed before the Exchequer Court his petition, in which he claimed the land to be expropriated was worth the sum of $800,000. Several claimants nearby have had their lands expropriated at fantastic prices, but as these cases were settled out of court the public does not know what the awards were. But the case of Bélanger, fortunately for the public and for the taxpayers of Canada, has gained some noteriety by reason of the fact that an appeal has been lodged in the Supreme Court of Canada. After a number of expert witnesses had been heard. Mr. Justice Audette gave the reasons for his judgment, in which he says:

> The lands in question were acquired by the suppliant for the sum of $18,165.32, and were practically yielding no revenue, save the renting of one house on lot 513, and pasture on lot 560. These lots lie in the estuary of the River St. Charles, and are nothing but a stretch of muddy soil upon which in the case of lot 560 some marine grass grows, upon which cattle may feed; but the land is entirely covered by water at high tide, and the lot has been practically idle and no use has been made of it for years and years. Wharves may be built upon the same, as wharves may be built in fields, but it has no access to deep water, except to the height of the water brought in by the tide. Lot No. 513 is impracticable for building purposes. It is a beach lot. Retaining walls and fillings would have to be resorted to. Some of the witnesses contend that lot 560 might be used for a railway yard. Is it, indeed, conceivable that a railway could afford to spend thousands and thousands of dollars in building wharves for a railway yard, when other property is available inland? Some of the witnesses were candid enough to say they thought the property had very little value, but it might have value for public purposes and assessed it on that basis. In other words, that the property was of very little value to the owner, but might be of some good value to a party expropriating for public purposes or for a scheme like the present works. However, it is now settled law that in assessing compensation for property taken under compulsory powers, it is not proper to consider as part of the market value to the owner, such value as the land taken may have to the party expropriating when viewed as an integral part of the proposed work or undertaking. But the proper basis for compensation is the amount for which such land could have been sold, had the present scheme carried on by the Crown not been in evidence, but with the possibility that the Crown or some company or person might obtain those powers and carry on their scheme. And, in the present instance, who, outside of the Crown, should undertake such colossal works?

Further on he says:

The policy of the Expropriation Act is to enable the court to compensate the owners; but not to penalize or oppress the expropriating party. The court must guard against fostering speculations in expropriation matters, and must not encourage the making of extravagant claims, and more especially must guard against being carried away by the subtle arguments of real estate speculators or expert witnesses and thus render the execution of public works impossible or prohibitive. While the owner must be amply compensated in that he is no poorer after the expropriation, it is no reason to charge the public exchequer with exorbitant compensation built upon imaginary or speculative basis.

These remarks, I must confess, are provoked by the extravagant amount of the claim of the suppliant, namely the sum of $800,085.65 for a property which has cost him, a few years before, the sum of $17,165.37, as above set forth—and more especially when the property has been idle for years and years, and the public work in question herein is but the only thing which will give it any value.

Further on he says:

Under all the circumstances of the case I will bracket the two lots together and will allow an average price of ten (10) cents a square foot for the same, making the total sum of $215,925.40; and in fixing such compensation, although remaining within the evidence adduced, I feel I am perhaps allowing too high an amount for a property composed of waste flats and beach entirely covered with water at high tides, which a few years ago cost in round figures $18,000, and which had been for years practically unproductive and has been a charge upon the owner, the taxes being larger than the revenues, and but for the public work in question would have very likely remained idle for years to come.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has stated that the evidence was very voluminous, and the judges stated that according to the evidence adduced they allowed ten cents a foot. Was there any reputable evidence upon which a lower estimate could have been made?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will come to that in a moment. Mr. Justice Audette concludes:

To this sum of $215,925.10 will be added the usual 10 per cent for compulsory taking, the land having obviously been taken against the will of the owner, making in all the sum of $237,517.61.

Mr. CARVELL: I wonder if it was really taken against the will of the owner.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is clear from the reasons for the judgment that the whole of the evidence to protect the Crown was not adduced in this case, and I should like to have from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) some information as to the instructions given for the conduct of this case. I am informed that this property was acquired some years ago by Mr. Bélanger and another gentleman by the name of Delisle. Delisle was living with his wife under the régime of communauté de biens, and on her death had to file at the registry office in Quebec in connection with the payment of taxes on the estate of his wife the valuation he placed on his own property, and I am informed that the Crown could have secured that very important and very valuable document when the case was heard before Mr. Justice Audette, but this document was not filed. It would then have been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the owners themselves placed a very, very low value on the property. At all events, Mr. Justice Audette, with much reluctance, to use his own words, awarded the sum of $215,000, in round figures, and added to that 10 per cent for compulsory expropriation, which made the total $237,517.61. The Crown appealed from that judgment. The Crown was represented there again by Mr. Bernier, K.C. Much to the surprise and astonishment of the Bench, when Mr. Bernier appeared before the Supreme Court a few weeks ago, he accepted on behalf of the Crown the award of $215,925.10, and only contested the remaining ten per cent for compulsory expropriation.

Mr. CARVELL: According to the factum, did the Crown protest against the award or only against the ten per cent?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Only against the ten per cent.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what counsel did. But what was in the factum?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have the factum filed by the Crown, and here are the conclusions:

We therefore pray that the said sum of $21,592.51, representing ten per cent on the amount of $215,925.10 fixed as the value of the lands expropriated, be struck out from the sum of $237,517.61, awarded by the Exchequer Court.

So the Crown only contested the ten per cent. Otherwise it accepted the judgment.

Mr. CARVELL: As this has something to do with the department over which I preside, I am naturally interested in getting the facts. My hon. friend has produced the factum filed by counsel representing the Crown. I have some knowledge of the procedure in these cases, and I know there would be a notice of appeal given by the Crown preceding the factum.

Is there any protest in that by the Crown against the award of $215,000?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have here the statement of the Crown through the attorneys, Bernier, Bernier & deBilly, and I have just read the conclusion of their petition. My hon. friend knows from his long practice at the Bar that a factum is filed weeks and months before the hearing of a case. The judges of the Supreme Court read this factum, and the factum of the respondent, and when Mr. Bernier appeared before the court and stated that his only appeal was against the ten per cent for compulsory expropriation, the judges expressed their surprise because they had read very closely the reasons for judgment of Mr. Justice Audette, and the proceedings were stopped by the court, and if my information is correct—the Minister of Justice is better informed on this point than I am—the Supreme Court sought new instructions from the Department of Justice.

This is clearly a case where the Government should investigate and where the Department of Justice should be exceedingly careful. There seems to have been gross neglect in connection with this important litigation. A sum of $237,000 deserves some attention and consideration in view of the reasons for the judgment given by the Exchequer Court. What has taken place I do not know, but it seems to me that the Department of Justice should, in view of the incident of the Supreme Court, and in view of the reasons for judgment given by Mr. Justice Audette, revise these proceedings and give new instructions in order to prevent a scandalous claim from being paid. Here, you have the whole case in a nutshell. These beach lots cost the owner $18,000. They did not yield enough to pay the tax bills, the claim made was for $800,000 and because of the laches of the Crown, because of the absence of witnesses and experts on behalf of the Crown, the judge was compelled to award with reluctance, as he says in his judgment, a sum of $215,000 plus 10 per cent. The Crown, represented by its agent before the courts, and knowing more than anybody else the reasons given by the judge, yet accepts the judgment as to the amount of $215,000 and only contests for the smaller bit, a sum of $15,000. There is something strange, something mysterious, and I hope the minister will explain to the satisfaction of the House what happened in this case and what action he has taken since to prevent that scandalous amount from being taken away from the exchequer of the Dominion at the present time.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the hon. gentleman tell me whether or not either or both of these lots, or any portion of them, is now occupied by works constructed by the Department of Public Works on the St. Charles river?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am informed that the barrage, the damming, of the river is above those lots. I could quite understand the Crown expropriating lots above the dam but I am informed—and I speak subject to correction—that these lots are below the barrage and are therefore not seriously affected by the proposed works. I say the "proposed" works. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) declared the other day that he would stop these works. I do not know what his intentions are but this is an exorbitant amount that is being claimed under the present circumstances.

Mr. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) in his statement of the case, seems to have attached particular importance to emphasizing the part which the Crown took in the matter. There is not any doubt that the Crown was represented by counsel. The facts in regard to the direct action of the Crown are that the instructions were of the clearest possible kind that an appeal should be made from the entire award, and the appeal which was lodged under the immediate direction of the Deputy Minister of Justice, as the departmental records will certainly show, was an appeal from the entire award. But the hon. gentleman says that it was greatly to the surprise of the court when counsel charged with the case made the declaration. I may say it was as great a surprise to the Department of Justice, as great a surprise to the deputy minister who had given the instructions, as it seems to have been to the court. These instructions, I am informed by the deputy minister, were clear and distinct that the entire award was to be appealed from. What misapprehension the counsel seems to have laboured under it is quite impossible for me to explain. Certainly his action as I have said, was not in accordance with the instructions that he had received. The gentleman who had been retained and who was representing the Crown is, I do not think it will be disputed, a gentleman of repute and standing in his profession. I cannot undertake to explain how he came to misapprehend his instructions and to take the line of action that he did. I suppose it is to be assumed that for some reason

he was of the opinion, differing from the opinion expressed by the hon. member that the evidence for whose production he was responsible supported the judgment. If he entertained that view it was not shared by the department, and his instructions were such as I have stated. When the incident occurred, and when it was brought to the attention of the department, steps were at once taken to see that this erroneous representation was corrected and that the matter was put in such shape as to ensure that the case of the Crown attacking the award itself should be put in the most perfect manner possible before the court. Further, instructions, as I am informed, were given that, if upon a careful examination of the entire evidence, it should be deemed necessary, steps should be taken looking to a reference back to the court if there should be any deficiency in the evidence which it would be possible to supply. While the fact is undoubted that the learned counsel who was retained to carry on the case did take the view which the hon. member has stated, it is equally true that in taking that view he was not acting in accordance with the instructions which were given to him, and that that view was not shared by the Department of Justice. That the gentleman in question should have been retained I have not heard suggested as ground for complaint. I understand that Mr. Bernier has been the batonnier of the bar of his district, and enjoys a good reputation as a member of the profession. It is an incident most regrettable that he should have so misunderstood his instructions, but that is something, I suppose, that might happen with respect to the legal representative of any client. It might happen that the instructions of any client might be misunderstood or not fully grasped, and that is the regrettable thing that appears to have happened to the Government in this particular case. But the hon. gentleman and the House may rest assured that the appeal itself, as I have pointed out—which is a direct action on the part of the Crown taken under the direction of the department itself—was an appeal against the entire award, and, as I have said before, I am informed by the deputy minister that the instructions were precise that the entire award was to be appealed against. When it was brought to our knowledge that those instructions were not being acted upon, steps were taken at once such as I have already indicated, steps to see that the contentions of the Crown, as against the amount of the award itself, should be fully put before the court, and looking also—if that were deemed necessary or advantageous—to securing a sending of the reference back to the court below for the purpose of taking further evidence in the event of it being found both desirable and possible.

I do not know that I can add anything further. Those are the facts. Upon that set of facts I do not think that the department or the deputy minister, who is directly responsible insofar as the direction of these cases come under his hands, can be open to legitimate reproach. The most that can be said—and it is a most regrettable thing to have happened—is that the counsel that the Crown had retained to conduct the case—because it is quite clear it is not possible for the officers of the department to conduct all of the litigation which goes on on behalf of the Crown—apparently misconceived, or misunderstood the directions which he had received, or formed a judgment of the merits of the case, which was not in accord with the appreciation of the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no doubt whatever, from the explanation given by the Minister of Justice, that no blame can attach to the Crown, which was simply unfortunate in its selection of the counsel who conducted the case. I am glad to hear from my hon. friend that the instructions given to the new counsel are to have the case referred back to the Court of Appeal for the production of other evidence.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Were any explanations asked for, or received, from the counsel as to his conduct in the case?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say. I certainly have not taken the matter up, nor am I in a position to state at the present moment what communications have passed between the deputy minister and the counsel. There is room in this case for demanding an explanation, and that explanation will certainly be asked for.

Mr. VIEN: To whom has the case been entrusted for future action?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that Mr. Chrysler has been retained, and that the deputy minister is personally interesting himself in the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: As this matter relates to the Department of Public Works, I do not think I ought to allow the opportunity to pass without making a statement which possibly may have something to do

with the ultimate settlement of the case. Personally I never heard of it until last Friday morning, when I met a gentleman who told me what had taken 5 p.m. place at the Supreme Court, substantially as narrated by my hon. friend this afternoon. I immediately went to the Justice Department and there I saw the deputy minister, who explained to me the instructions which had been given to the counsel, just as the Minister of Justice has explained this afternoon, and who also assured me that the department would take immediate steps to apply to the court to have the case re-opened, and ask not only for a reduction of the award, but a new trial. As to that phase of the case, I have nothing further to say, because it does not rest with my department, but with the Department of Justice. Knowing, however, Mr. Justice Audette as well as I do, and realizing how carefully he weighs the evidence —and I speak now from personal experience and knowledge—I cannot read the judgment which he has given in this case without coming to the conclusion that he had a very strong opinion that something had been withheld from the court, and he was awarding more for the land than he was justly entitled to. I purposely asked my hon. friend this afternoon if these lands had been built over, or formed any part of the works on the St. Charles river. He says, in his judgment, he thinks not. From my standpoint, as Minister of Public Works, that is a very serious part of the case. I know generally where these works are, although I have never examined them carefully. I expect to go to Quebec within the next three weeks, when I shall to some extent act as my own engineer, and I want to assure this House that if these lands have not been built upon I know enough about the law of Canada to determine how to get round this thing a good deal simpler than going to the Supreme Court—I will simply abandon the whole proceedings. Because if we have not got the lands, from the description I have received of them I do not think we need them, and I know well enough how to get rid of them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to occupy the time of the House any longer than merely to say a few words further. I am satisfied with the explanation given by the Minister of Justice that he will see to it that decisive and direct instructions shall be given to Mr. Chrysler to look after this case. But in justice to Mr. Bernier, I wish to say, that I have learned since the incident which took place in the Supreme Court, and new instructions were sought from the Department of Justice, that the Crown Counsel was specifically asked by one of the judges on the bench whether his instructions were as stated in the factum. Mr. Bernier answered in the affirmative; that his instructions were to accept the award and to contest only over the ten per cent.

Mr. DOHERTY: Did Mr. Bernier state from whom these instructions were received?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He could receive those instructions only from the Department of Justice for whom he was the agent.

Mr. DOHERTY: Apparently then the question is which of these two gentlemen is correct in his statement, because so far as the deputy minister is concerned, I have his most direct assurance that the instructions were clear, that the entire award was to be appealed from.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is more probable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just one word of personal explanation. It is not, Mr. Chairman, an agreeable task for me to bring such a matter before the House, and some newspapers in my own province are blaming me for preventing the Government from giving this bounty to the city of Quebec. I have done nothing of the sort. If the works are needed, I have no objection to their being completed. But I do certainly object to bleeding the treasury even though these works should be a benefit to the city of Quebec. There is no reason why people should extort from the public treasury moneys which are not due them. I remember some years ago I lodged a protest against other expropriations on the frontage of the city of Quebec. Of course, the amount involved was not so large, but yet it was very much exaggerated in my judgment. And I am told—I beg to give this information to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice—that some of the riparian owners on the river St. Charles have filed claims which, to use a well-known phrase, would make reality stranger than fiction. I ask him to keep his eyes open as to these claims, and to protect the treasury, as he swore to protect it when he was made Minister of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY: So far as it depends on me, and in so far as I can vouch for the officers of the department, we quite realize what our duty is in the premises, and

we certainly shall endeavour to continue to perform that duty to the best of our ability, as we have endeavoured to do in the past to the full extent.

Department of the Secretary of State—Salaries, $80,025; Contingencies, $16,500.

Mr. VIEN: Have you called the item of salaries and contingencies for the Department of Militia, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. gentleman wish to revert to No. 5? It was passed long ago.

Mr. CARVELL: There will be another item for Militia and Defence in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like to mention to the Minister of Justice in connection with his department that the returning officers have not been paid in connection with the election, and members are receiving a great many letters from people who complain that their fees have not been settled. One of the troubles is this: The proclamation for the election was sent out, I believe, late in October, and the returning officers were instructed to post it. They posted it at many places, and about a week afterwards another notice was sent by Mr. Foley, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, accompanied by a letter in which the returning officers were told that if they had already posted the proclamation they must also post these notices, which might have gone out with the proclamation if they had been sent at the same time. The consequence was that in many cases, I am told, all over Canada, the returning officer had to go to the expense of sending men around the constituency to post these notices which left Ottawa on 6th November. The Auditor General takes the ground that he has no authority to pay, because he says that the notice should have been posted at the same time as the proclamation. For this condition of affairs it will require an Order in Council to authorize payment. There is no doubt at all about the justice of paying the bills because the letter from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery positively instructs the returning officer that if the proclamation was already sent out, the notice must also be posted beside the proclamation. If that had to be done, and expense incurred, it should be paid for. The sheriff in the constituency I represent writes me that he had posted the proclamation and that after having done so, he got this letter, dated 6th November, instructing him to post this other notice. He did what he was told, and the posting of the second notice cost him $104.74. The parties who did the work are claiming their money, and correspondence has come to the Auditor General and to the members regarding this matter, which is now several months old. I hope the minister will take the matter up and instruct the Auditor General by Order in Council to have it settled.

Mr. BURRELL: Apparently the Auditor General is not able under the Act to pass these special amounts. There are some of the accounts which have been sent in which can be paid, and some which will require to be looked into. These are being dealt with by competent men, one in the Finance Department and the other the General Returning Officer. After they are sifted out then they can be dealt with by the Governor in Council under a special clause.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Do not be too long.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask the Minister of Justice when he expects that the amounts due to members of the military tribunals will be paid? I have already sent to my hon. friend some accounts from tribunals in the county of Gaspé, and they have been bombarding me with letters and telegrams. I hope that my hon. friend will be able to settle them soon.

Mr. DOHERTY: The last information I had on the subject, which was within the last two or three days, was to the effect that all the claims that had been received had been passed for payment. They have to go from the Military Service Branch, to the accountant, and so on, but they have been passed for payment. I do not know that that means that all of them have been passed just as they were sent in, because there have been differences between the department and the tribunals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not as to the amount, but as to the fact of being paid if they are legal.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the last information I have. I think it is contained in an answer that was given the other day.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question regarding the Military Police.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. We have long since passed the Estimates of the Department of Justice, and we are considering item No. 6, Department of the Secretary of State. The discussion has been somewhat out of order since the beginning, with

the exception of the first item discussed by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) which I think was quite in order. But the other questions asked have been entirely out of order; and if it is the intention to finish up business to-night, the committee must certainly assist the chairman in keeping the discussion relevant.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Then I shall bring the matter up later.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Estimates of other ministers will be under consideration.

Post Office Department—salaries, $943,870; contingencies, $125,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is rather strange, living as we do under British institutions, that for the last three years we should have been deprived of a responsible head of the Post Office Department. But what is most extraordinary, indeed, is that the Postmaster General, having been defeated at the last election, should still be the incumbent, although he is not attending to the duties of his department. I know of only one similar instance in Canadian history At the very inception of responsible government, when the Governor was attempting to bar the way to its attainment, two gentlemen were sworn in as ministers in the Draper-Viger administration, under Sir Charles Metcalfe, if I mistake not. They went before the people and were defeated, yet they were retained in the Government. After some time, however, there was a reaction in public opinion, the Draper-Viger administration had to resign, the Lafontaine-Baldwin ministry succeeded, and Canada has since had an uninterrupted succession of cabinets possessing the confidence of the people. Since this case of Mr. Viger and Mr. Morrison, no gentleman sworn in as cabinet minister and afterwards overwhelmingly defeated by the electors has been maintained in office against the popular will. Aside from the constitutional revolution which such a precedent creates, what are its consequences? During last session and since the beginning of this session we have not once been able to discuss seriously the administration of the Post Office Department—and heaven knows that it needs investigation. The expenditure of the Post Office Department has more than doubled since 1911. If a responsible head of that department was in the House we could discuss these matters and certainly impugn its administration. What reason can the leader of the House give for such a nefarious precedent? Are there not gentlemen behind the Government who are able to occupy the position of Postmaster General? Is it fair for the Government to place the administration of the Post Office Department in the hands of a gentleman who does not belong to this House and is not appointed to the other? Hon. Mr. Blondin has not been elected by the people, and for him to draw his salary as minister of the Crown is rather surprising. I repeat that this is a dangerous precedent; it is on a par with the kind of government we have had since the beginning of the war. I need not say that my heart is in this war, but I regret that I ever gave my assent to the War Measures Act as it has been framed and applied. The country is being shorn of its liberties; Parliament of its constitutional rights. It is being shorn of its privileges and of its ancient usages. The constitution has become a by-word in Canada. The country is governed by Order in Council passed before, during and after sessions of Parliament, under the shallow pretense of winning the war. Mr. Chairman, we are fighting in Europe for the very liberties which are being denied to the Canadian people. I hope that the leader of the Government will give this Committee and the country the reasons why the Post Office Department has no responsible head, and whether this scandal is to continue during this fiscal year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know that in the Committee of the House is the proper place to make statements with reference to the matter brought up by my hon. friend. I do not think things are quite as blue as he has tried to make them appear. These are extraordinary times. The late Minister of the Post Office—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it the late minister?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —and the present Minister of the Post Office, not now representing a constituency, is doing more than speaking in favour of the war. He has actually put himself to the test of the war, and is to-day at the front doing his quota in sustaining the war effort. I think that it to be taken into account. I grant you that constitutionally the assent of the people to the possession of a constituency is the normal ground for the continuance of a departmental head in office, but there has not been a lack of instances, in our own or other countries constitutionally governed, where that general principle has been passed by under temporary or extraordinary circumstances. This certainly

is no ordinary circumstance; it is an extraordinary one, and I do not think that for a short period the people of this country will find any great fault with the action of the Government in reference to Mr. Blondin under the circumstances to which his absence from this country is due. He is doing where he is a service to the country equally as great as he could do here in Canada in administering a department of Government. The Post Office Department has not lacked for direction and Government during his absence. It has been under the care of a judicious and careful administrator. My hon. friend makes no point when he cites the fact that the expenses of the Post Office Department have increased during the last two or three years, and attempts to draw from that the conclusion that it is because of the absence of the departmental head. There are other reasons which account for the increase in the expenses of the Post Office Department and which will be amply explained by the administrator of that office when, in a few minutes, we come to his Estimates.

In reference to the more general subject as to Government of the country by Orders in Council under the War Measures Act, we are under experiences which are not different from those of all warring countries, and although we may talk academically with reference to loss of rights and privileges, there is not a single man of us who enjoys one iota less of his freedom, of his liberty, of his well-being, on account of the peculiar methods which do obtain in governments of countries in any period of great war and the stress which arises therefrom. If my hon. friend had been a member of a government during this war, he would have resorted to the very same measures. It is impossible not to do so. Let us take the case of the United States. The people of that country are, to a large extent, suffering a curtailment of the privileges of its legislative bodies such as in normal times they never would submit to for a single moment. They submit to it because the exigencies of war call for it, and it is impossible to have direct and strong action such as is necessary in war times, if you have to observe all the methods which obtain in normal times when everything has to pass through legislative channels. I do not think we are really very much hurt in the matter. As to the imputation of my hon. friend that he and the country have suffered from the Government which has been in power during the last three or four or five years, I am quite sure that the country had just as good an idea as my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) of what the Government had done and what they expected the new Government to do, when in 1917, they reposed an unbounded confidence in the present Government, although they may not have had as much practical acquaintance with governmental and administrative methods. When the war is all over, my hon. friend will not be the last to give his meed of commendation and praise for the way in which, and the methods by which, the present Government, and, I may say too, the past Government, have conducted the affairs of Canada in their objective of pursuing the war to a victorious conclusion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend has, as usual, very cleverly evaded the question, but he has done so through an expedient which is becoming stale. Whenever any reproach is brought against the Government, the answer which we have is "Win the war." Mr. Blondin is at the present time Postmaster General. That is against the law, but the answer which we have is: Mr. Blondin has enlisted. But if Mr. Blondin is to be Postmaster General he must, whether he has enlisted or not, be a member of this House. He tried his fortune in two constituencies, and he was defeated in both, and yet he is kept in office by the Government, with all the privileges attached to the office and none of the duties. We are at war, it is true, but the law must be observed. These privileges of responsible government have been won by long fights in the Motherland between the Crown and the people. Now it is a settled principle, which nobody denies, that a minister of the Crown must be in Parliament to administer the duties which are entrusted to him. Mr. Blondin tried to be a member of Parliament; he ran as a candidate; he was defeated; he is no longer in this Parliament, and therefore it is an abuse of the law of Parliament to keep him in office. We must have somebody in Parliament to discharge the duties of Postmaster General. If Mr. Blondin was a member of Parliament, it would be an excuse to say: He is not in attendance here because he is doing duty elsewhere. The only charge which we bring is this, that Mr. Blondin, not being a member of Parliament, cannot any longer be Postmaster General.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Without questioning what the leader of the House (Sir George Foster) has said, or what the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said,

may I point this out? This country is about to take over a great railway. We are to have a national railway, and with that railway goes a national telegraph system. Therefore, at a period like this, a Postmaster General ought to be in office so as to administer that national telegraph system, if the telegraphs are, as I imagine they are, to go under the administration of the Post Office Department. I should like to see not only a strong Minister of Railways, but a strong and active Postmaster General to administer the national telegraph system.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska) (translation): Mr. Chairman, I concur in the statements made a moment ago in reference to this matter by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). Under the circumstances, Mr. Blondin's absence is not only detrimental to the proper management of the Post Office Department, but it gives rise to a state of things which is contrary to public interest. As a matter of fact, the maintenance of Mr. Blondin at the head of that department, under the circumstances, is in defiance of public opinion, more especially of that of the people of the province which defeated the ex-minister at the last election, in two of the most important electoral districts of Quebec. French Canadians—and they constitute a most important section of the people of this country—are not represented in this Cabinet. We are not anxious to be represented in this Administration as now made up, and the remarks I have just made should not be construed as implying such a desire on our part. But let me say this: As long as the French Canadians have no representative in this Cabinet, at least let us dispense with that camouflage which is resorted to at present and in justification of which arguments quite as worthless are put forward.

Under the British system, it is contrary to every principle of constitutional government that a member of that Cabinet should be maintained in office and should continue to advise the Crown after ceasing to be a member either of the Senate or of the House of Commons. It makes no difference whether we are at war or not; I say to the Government that they violate every principle of responsible Government when they maintain in office a man who was defeated at the polls. As stated by my hon. friend the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), it seems as though, under the present régime, Parliament no longer exercises any rights in this country. Public affairs are settled by Orders in Council. We are left in ignorance of what is going on, the most important matters are disposed of without Parliament having any opportunity to interfere in any way. As an illustration, Mr. Chairman, take the question of prohibition; it is a most important matter. I, for one, would likely favour some measure of prohibition, especially during the war; but I am earnestly opposed to the settlement of the question through the Government, without Parliament being consulted, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) is a member of the Administration. A few days ago, a member of this House was elected by Order in Council. If the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) sits in Parliament to-day, he owes it to the fact that, on February 26, the Governor General in Council abusing the powers conferred on them by the War Measures Act, suspended the working of the electoral law in this country, so that a partisan might secure a seat in this House.

We had been told that this Union Government, as the offspring of the Parliament which was to be elected on December 17, would exert some influence over the future of this country, because political partisanship would disappear and we were, at last, to see independence prevail in Parliament. We have had instances of such independence here within the last two or three days, members who, though they had been elected under the Union flag, under the flag of independence, cast their votes in direct opposition to the views they had expressed, because the Prime Minister had said: "If you vote in favour of abolishing titles in Canada, or else if you wish to prevent me, as Prime Minister of this country, from giving titles to my friends, although I am in favour of winning the war and have been elected to win it, I shall give up the job, and shall tender my resignation to His Excellency." Mr. Chairman, that such conditions cannot be tolerated much longer is quite apparent, because they are objected to by all right thinking people, and I would ask the Government, as also the Acting Postmaster General to give us some assurance to the effect that the Post Office Department will be put under the management of one who is the choice of the majority of the electors in some constituency of the Dominion.

Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—Salaries, including solicitor at $4,000; Assistant Deputy Minister and Secretary at

$4,000; Director of Employment at $4,000; Accountant at $3,500, and Assistant Accountant at $2,500, $66,000; Contingencies, $25,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What are the names of the solicitor, the assistant deputy minister and secretary, the director of employment, the accountant and assistant accountant?

Mr. McCURDY: Mr. S. A. Armstrong, who was formerly in charge of the Ontario Government institutions, was appointed deputy minister shortly after the establishment of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The other offices have not been permanently filled.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are they all appointed under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will be appointed by the Commission.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does this department deal with the employment of returned soldiers?

Mr. McCURDY: The functions formerly performed by the Military Hospitals Commission have now been taken over by the Invalided Soldiers' Commission, or rather the name of the Commission has been changed to the Invalided Soldiers' Commission. Invalided soldiers who have been returned to Canada for active treatment remain under the Department of Militia and Defence until their discharge from military service; when they are no longer soldiers in uniform they come to the Invalided Soldiers' Commission which is under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The principal classes of invalids that will be taken care of by the Invalided Soldiers' Commission are the incurables, insane, and the tubercular cases; to that Commission will also return ex-soldiers who have a recurrence if illness due to service.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will this department find employment for a soldier who is well enough to work?

Mr. McCURDY: The Military Hospitals' Commission some three years ago called a conference of the provincial premiers. In each province is a Soldiers' Aid Commission, or similar body, though perhaps under different names. The premiers of the different provinces undertook the responsibility of finding work for returned soldiers through the medium of these provincial Soldiers' Aid Commissions. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment will aid in a supplementary way in securing employment for returned soldiers, but the primary responsibility rests with the provincial Soldiers' Aid Commissions. In the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, Mr. McCoy is the secretary of the commission, and is the person to whom applications for employment should be addressed.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): What is the policy of the department with regard to tubercular and insane cases and epileptics?

Mr. McCURDY: The policy that has been followed heretofore with regard to tubercular cases is to utilize the existing tubercular institutions. In many cases these institutions have been enlarged, and arrangements have been made with some of the institutions for the payment at so much per bed, the institutions taking complete charge of the cases. The large number of tubercular cases coming up for treatment have made it necessary for many of the tubercular institutions of the country to be enlarged; in many cases the accommodation has been doubled, but in each case a separate arrangement was made between the Military Hospitals Commission and the owners of the institution, or the provincial government operating the institution, as the case may be, on whatever might be mutually considered fair terms. With regard to insane cases, a uniform method of treatment is followed in all the provinces. At the conference of provincial premiers held in Ottawa, I think in November last, an arrangement was arrived at whereby all the incurably insane were to be cared for in provincial institutions, and the provincial governments were paid by the Military Hospitals' Commission a fixed sum per head per year.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Might I suggest that there may be great difficulty on account of these institutions being at the present time very much overcrowded? We cannot get half the accommodation we require in the province of Ontario for the treatment of civilian tubercular and insane cases. It strikes me the soldier end of this matter should be handled by the commission direct.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY (translation): To an inquiry which I caused to be inserted in the Orders of the Day, as to whether there was any foundation to the rumour that the Military Police had been substituted for the Dominion Police in the apprehension of conscripts, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) answered in part

by stating that as yet no Order in Council had been passed to that effect. However, despite the answer given by the hon. gentleman, I am informed that such is the practice for the time being; that is to say, that the Military Police have charge of apprenhendible that every considération should be Montreal.

It is useless for me to add that, toward ensuring the proper enforcement of the law, and especially the proper enforcement of the Military Service Act, it is indispensable that every considération should be given to the feelings of the people of the province of Quebec, as well as to those of the people of all other parts of the Dominion. Further, I may say that Mr. Bélanger, who is head of that department, has rendered valuable service, and it would be preferable, all things considered, to continue employing the Dominion Police, being careful at the same time to give them strict instructions to do their utmost not to provoke, or even hurt the feelings of the people, as was done in certain cases.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (translation): Today, as in the past, in the district of Montreal such work of apprehending, or rather locating—since apprehensions are not always in order—those who have been called or are bound to report under the Military Service Act, has been entrusted in part to the Dominion Police and in part to the Military Police. It is now proposed to establish a regulation whereby that whole locating service would be performed by a single body. I believe, and it is a view which I think will commend itself to all, that under such circumstances, as well as under any other, it is preferable that authority and responsibility be centralized. The question is just now being considered, and a rule will be laid down within a few days.

I thank the hon. gentleman for the kind advice he has thought fit to extend to the Government, but I do not think there was much occasion for it. Heretofore, we have endeavoured to impress on those who are entrusted with the carrying out and enforcement of the Military Service Act, that all are bound to faithfully fulfil the duties incumbent on them, but should invariably act in such a manner as to avoid antagonizing the people at large. In other words they should act toward people with whom they come in contact as officers of the law are expected to do that is to say, they should see to its enforcement, without, however, fully exerting the powers with which they are vested, except in cases of absolute necessity.

Mr. VIEN (translation): Before we leave this subject, the hon. Minister of Justice might inform us whether the two officers of the Dominion Police who had charge of the enforcement of the Military Service Act in the city of Quebec, and who, by their demeanour, brought about those riots, have been dismissed?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (translation): The evidence in the matter of the Quebec riots, is far from showing conclusively that the said rioting was the outcome of the demeanour of these two men of the Dominion Police. At any rate, I am not in a position to state whether these two men have been dismissed or not. I shall make inquiries.

Mr. McKENZIE: I saw a petition going around the House yesterday respecting the salary of a certain judge. I do not know whether it has reached the Minister of Justice yet or not. It has reference to our judge in the city of Sydney. The judge had his home in the town of Arichat, in Richmond county. He is a native of Arichat, and his district takes in Richmond, Victoria, and Cape Breton. He has come to reside in the city of Sydney. We have been battling with the Minister of Justice to try and get him a little more salary. He only gets $3,000 a year. He cannot live in the city of Sydney on $3,000 a year. He can live more cheaply in his own home in the town of Arichat. He has his home there, and a very comfortable one, too. He has told the Cape Breton Bar that he must, notwithstanding the great inconvenience that it would be to the Bar, go back to his own home. The Bar of Cape Breton are up in arms. I saw a petition yesterday that is to be presented to the Minister of Justice. If anything can be done to make it possible for the judge to live in the city of Sydney, it would be very much appreciated by the Cape Breton Bar. The minister might allow him a little more salary. The petition will reach the minister shortly.

Mr. DOHERTY: The determination of the place at which a judge should reside is a matter within the authority of the provincial legislature. As to legislation looking to an increase of a judge's salary, I am afraid I cannot say to the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) that it is possible in the present session to deal with that. He says that he has been battling on behalf of this judge. It may perhaps not be an in-

discretion for me to say that I have been doing considerable battling myself on this question of the inadequacy of remuneration of certain judges, but so far my battling has not been crowned with success.

Dominion Police—amount required, $146,765.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the Minister of Justice aware of the resignation of a Dominion Police officer by the name of Belanger?

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Belanger, a week or ten days ago, tendered his resignation. The resignation has not been accepted in view of a question concerning the enforcement of the law with respect to those who are being called out. The question is at the present moment engaging attention as to whether it is desirable that one force, one authority, should deal with this subject, and as to which of the two forces which in the past have been engaged in connection with the matter should be exclusively charged with it. Action in regard to Mr. Belanger will depend upon the decision reached in that regard, and that decision will be reached almost immediately.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am informed on the best authority that Mr. Belanger is an excellent and efficient officer, moderate in the exercise of his authority, and I hope that he will be retained in office and that the condition that he has brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman will be given consideration. We will have no trouble in so far as the city of Montreal, or the whole district of Montreal, is concerned with a gentleman of the judgment and of the poise of Mr. Belanger. I do not know Mr. Belanger personally, but I have had both from lay and clerical sources the highest praise with regard to him.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a very short statement. Tentative arrangements have been made for the Governor General to come to this House at ten o'clock to-night for prorogation. What we have to do in the meantime, if that arrangement is to be carried out, is to pass the remaining items of the Main Estimates, not so very many, and the Supplementary Estimates and the whole of Concurrence. That, as hon. gentlemen know, takes some time in the reading. Therefore I hope we shall be able to despatch that business in order to help towards that end. After consultation with my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) it is suggested that you take the Chair again to-night at seven o'clock instead of eight o'clock, and that members should practise so much self-denial as will enable them to be present at that time.

The CHAIRMAN: According to arrangement I now leave the Chair to take the same again at seven o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at seven o'clock, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Do any honourable gentlemen object to our proceeding without a quorum?

Militia and Defence, Gratuities, $5,541.42.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are these for the year mentioned?

Major-General MEWBURN: One of these gratuities is to the family of Professor J. M. Lanos. He is a Frenchman, who was for years a professor at the Royal Military College. He was ordered to France, and came back here and died, leaving a large family.

Legislation—Senate—Salaries and contingent expenses, $113,416.50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I saw the other day that the Senate was very severely criticised in the press for the purchase of some ladies' purses. I think the frills should be cut out, and the purses too.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree with my hon. friend. It should not have happened. I noticed a reference to this matter in the Journal of Commerce. I shall call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this matter. I quite agree that there should not be a single cent spent for such purposes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it true that the Senate claims that they have a right to make expenditures of this kind without authority from the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There may be something in that contention. However, if we decline to give them the money, that would prevent the expenditure.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: But they put up that claim, do they not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think they do.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the Government agree to that doctrine?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To this contention of the Senate?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: To accept the principle that the Senate can originate expenditures?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, we do not concur in that. I was informed that that contention was made quite recently. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Legislation—House of Commons, $457,537.50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is that vote?

The CHAIRMAN: It is the salaries of the whole staff of the House of Commons, expenses of committees, and so on. This item has been slightly changed. The salary of the Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms, $2,575, has been struck out, there being no Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms. Shall the item as amended carry?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I understand that His Honour the Speaker has entrusted somebody with the task of preparing a report on means to decrease the expenditure of the House of Commons. Has any report been prepared in that connection?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know whether the report has actually been prepared, but I know that Mr. Speaker has been engaged in the preparation of a report. I shall inquire before we close this evening, and if he has a report he might be requested to make an announcement.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was appointed a member of a committee to review the expenditures on the Journals and Votes and Proceedings to see if these could be combined, with a view to reduce expenditure. I was not convinced of the practicability of the scheme, and as the committee could not meet very conveniently during the session, although we had two or three meetings, a report was prepared recommending that the matter come up next session, when another committee will be appointed. Meanwhile, nothing has been done.

Library of Parliament, salaries, etc., $66,700.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It has been reported in the press that Mr. DeCelles, the General Librarian, is to be replaced by Mr. Sévigny. In reply to a question which I put to the leader of the Government, I was informed that he had no information on the subject. Mr. DeCelles is in perfect health, hale and hearty. He is an excellent officer and has been in the library for several years with Mr. Griffin, who is also an excellent officer. Surely the Government would not appoint as librarian a man who has not the necessary qualifications for the position. To be a librarian nowadays requires a great deal of experience. Besides being an expert librarian, Mr. DeCelles is a man of letters, and as such has a high reputation. I should like to have the assurance of the Government that they do not intend to superannuate him if he is willing to work for many years to come.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The rumour is entirely unofficial. I have not heard of it officially.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then I have the assurance that no change will be made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have absolutely no knowledge of the matter. I have not heard it stated officially by any of my colleagues that Mr. DeCelles is to retire. That is all I can say. If he is still capable of performing his work, I cannot see why he should be retired.

General—contingencies of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, including the employment of temporary help, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At the beginning of the session I received letters and telegrams from enumerators in the counties of Maisonneuve and Gaspé respecting the payments of their accounts. Have all these accounts been settled?

Mr. BURRELL: A great many claims have been submitted which, under the Act, the Auditor General could not pay. These have been placed in the hands of Mr. O'Connor, general returning officer, and of Mr. Stockton, of the Finance Department, for investigation with a view to their advising me what amounts should be allowed under the circumstances. They will then be dealt with by the Governor in Council.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There is no doubt about the authority of the Government, I suppose, to make payment legal by Order in Council?

Mr. BURRELL: The Act provides for that. Unquestionably many claims were sent in of an extravagant nature which, as presented, could not be allowed.

Pensions on account of the Fenian raid, 1866-70, $1,600.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I had inquiry a few days ago from a gentleman in California who said that he was entitled to pension on this account but that it was now too late for him to apply for it. Is it still open to him to apply for this pension?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My recollection of the Act is that it was passed for the purpose of excluding any further applications

after a certain date. This amount is probably voted to meet some cases that have been under review.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, $750,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that Colonel Labatt has resigned from the Board of Pension Commissioners?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And that his resignation has been accepted. Is the pension paid to Senator Bradbury to continue?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no information on the matter. I shall inquire into it and let my hon. friend know. Whether I can give the information to the House to-night or not, I do not know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my right hon. friend approve that pension?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not necessary for me to answer that.

Mr. CARVELL: The doctors say that Senator Bradbury is entitled to the pension.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The pension was not granted by the Government, but through the Pensions Board in the usual way and after the usual examinations and reports.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to enter my earnest protest against the payment of this pension to Senator Bradbury. I should think that his having been appointed a member of the Senate constitutes a life pension sufficiently remunerative to exempt him from receiving a pension from the Pension Board. If Senator Bradbury had been amongst the combatant forces—

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Would not his appointment to the Senate only prove that he was permanently incapacitated?

Mr. CARVELL: I am also reminded that all exemptions are now abolished.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to be unjust towards Senator Bradbury, but if he had been on the firing line and in the combatant forces, I would not object to his receiving a pension, although it seems that, after having received that life pension by his senatorship, he should not receive another pension. I protest against his pension. I think it is nothing less than a scandal.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understand that some few days ago the French Canadian section of the Great War Veterans' Association, at a meeting held in Montreal, passed a resolution requesting that Dr. Laviolette, who has been serving at the front for several years as surgeon and who holds the rank of major, be appointed to represent the French Canadians on the Pension Board. Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps regarding this request?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government will pay every attention to any request that is made to it with reference to the filling of that important office, and it will be the main effort of the Government to see that a perfectly qualified man is appointed. Whether that man is a French Canadian, or an English Canadian, or any other Canadian, will depend a good deal upon the merits as compared with the work which is to be undertaken, but all those requests as they come in will be given careful attention.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is a very large item—for salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, $750,000. Some explanation, however brief, ought to be given as to why it is necessary for us to vote such a large sum of money. How many members are on the board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not able to say how many, but my hon. friend will only have to think of the work which is before that Pension Board to understand how widely distributed it is and what an immensity of detail there is in connection with its work. There is a very large staff and that staff will increase in proportion as the number of the pensioners increases.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does this pay for the whole staff?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, it is not the salaries of the officers alone; it is for the whole staff. If my hon. friend had the leisure time and would look into the Pension office to understand its organization and the immensity of the work, he would be fully persuaded that the staff was not too large, and that it will probably, before the war is over, be larger instead of smaller.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We had submitted to the House this morning a report from the Committee on Pensions, and it does not look as though we would be able to deal with that report to-night.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the intention to go back to that report and have it discussed and passed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If there is to be an opportunity afforded for having a full discussion on that matter, I shall not take up the time of the House now, but this is a matter which I consider of as great, if not greater, importance than anything that has come before this House during this session.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall get back to it.

Distribution of Parliamentary documents and other Government publications, $45,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the saving made as regards this distribution of parliamentary documents?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: About $175,000 up to the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That does not appear here.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That saving is distributed over parliamentary and governmental documents as well. It represents a saving which took place under circumstances which were not favourable to the greatest saving, because the savings commenced later than they will another year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The system adopted by the Distribution office is an excellent one. I refer to the system of sending out to institutions cards containing a list of public documents that are available and leaving to the parties the selection of documents which they want. By this work I think a great saving can be accomplished.

Expenses under the Canada Temperance Act, $1,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Should this be expended, now that we have prohibition in Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The expenditure has been cut down to $1,000.

Special Allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said this afternoon that a statement would be made in regard to this item. I am not prepared to let it pass without further information being given.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did promise that a statement should be laid on the table of the House later in the day. That statement is at present in the hands of the Prime Minister, and I expect it before the House prorogues.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would ask that this item stand in the meantime.

Item stands.

Special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, $5,000.

Mr. EDWARDS: I hope I shall not be misunderstood in raising objection to this item. I do not want to be understood as being parsimonious in regard to the salaries that should be paid to the judges in this country. I should not object if the salary of the Chief Justice of the Dominion of Canada was doubled; I would not put my judgment of the worth of his services against the judgment of hon. gentlemen in this House who are of the legal fraternity and therefore better able to judge the value of those services than I am. But I do not like this roundabout way of adding to a man's salary, whether it be the Chief Justice of Canada or anybody else, and it does seem to me this is a roundabout way of adding to his salary. If the judgment of this House was that his salary should be $15,000 or $20,000, I should not object, but I say it is ridiculous, illogical, and unreasonable on the face of it, to say that $5,000 is necessary to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with the services of the Chief Justice while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General. The Chief Justice of Canada, I understand, comes down here once in a while to sign certain documents and act as the Deputy of the Governor General when His Excellency is away. If he is to be paid for that service, well and good, but to say that $5,000 is a fair remuneration for the work done is not in my opinion reasonable. Why does the item appear in that way? It must look to the general public as unreasonable, and that being so, it does not reflect credit on this House or upon hon. gentlemen. I agree that the position of our judges calls for such remuneration as will enable them to maintain the dignity of their position; I am quite in accord with that idea. But let us look at this thing reasonably and face the facts fair and square. Let us vote the Chief Justice of Canada a salary that is fair and reasonable according to his position, instead of voting him a salary which in the judgment of the members of this House is only half what he should get, and then making up the deficiency in some roundabout way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that

it is not exact to say that this is an addition to the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada. The history of this vote is this. At all times since we have had a Governor of Canada, there has always been an Administrator of Canada, or a substitute for the Governor, so that if the Governor was called away or was incapacitated for one reason or another from discharging the functions of his office, the executive head should not be wanting in Canada; there would always be some one to represent Royal authority. In the olden days the officer who discharged these functions when the Governor General was away was called the Administrator, since known as the Deputy to the Governor General. In the olden days the Administrator was the General Commander of the Forces who at that time was residing in Halifax. We had in those days garrisons at Halifax, Montreal, Kingston and Toronto, but the garrisons were moved from one place to another until at last we had only one garrison, and that was stationed at Halifax. The Commander of the Forces lived in Halifax and as it was inconvenient for him to come to Ottawa in some short absence of the Governor, it was thought advisable, and this dates back I think to the days of Sir John Macdonald's Government, to have the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada made the Administrator or Deputy Governor, and the salary was attached to the office at that time, if I remember correctly; I think I am right in that, but I speak subject to correction. It was thought advisable afterwards to give the salary as Administrator to the officer who happened to be the Chief Justice of Canada. That is the reason for this vote. Whether it is too high or not is another matter. I simply wanted to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that this is not an addition to the salary of the Chief Justice. We must have an officer for this purpose, and if it is not the Chief Justice it must be somebody else. I simply rose to correct the observation of my hon. friend, and to say that this sum is not an addition to the salary of the Chief Justice, because sometimes the duties of the Deputy Governor have been performed by a puisne judge of the court who has received the remuneration. This remuneration is attached to an office which I think ought to be remunerated.

Mr. EDWARDS: Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to express my thanks to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for the explanation which he has so fully and kindly given. I am very glad, indeed, to get it, because this is the first time I have heard a full explanation of the matter. Perhaps that is my fault. At all events I am glad to get the explanation now, and get it from one who has been connected with the affairs of this country for so long, and who can speak of his personal knowledge. I repeat, I have no desire whatever to be unjust or unfair to any man in this country, the Chief Justice or any one else, and I am very glad, indeed, to get this explanation, which I think was due to the members of this House, and which possibly it is not against the interests of the Chief Justice himself for the public generally to know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is true that the Deputy Governor General resides in Ottawa for six or seven months of the year, but I know that he resides at Murray Bay for a part of the year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have never raised the question, but I would like to learn, if possible, what the function of the Chief Justice is in attending as an associate member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that question is in order now that the item has been held over and will stand until some further information has been disclosed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May we return to the item providing for the special allowance?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved

That the committee revert to item 268.

Motion agreed to.

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to pay his travelling and other expenses while attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council goes back to the days when Sir Oliver Mowat was Minister of Justice. At that time the then Chief Justice, Sir Henry Strong, went to England to sit as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under an Act which had been passed by the Imperial Parliament inviting judges of colonial courts to sit with the members of the Judicial Committee. Their services were required especially for colonial cases. The Government of that day, at the instance

of Sir Oliver Mowat, placed an item in the Estimates of $2,500 to cover the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice. I do not remember the exact wording of the item, but it was to pay the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice while attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or some such wording as that. This item goes back to 1897. It was for travelling expenses. It appeared in the Estimates in that form until 1915 or 1916, when the item was changed from "travelling expenses" to "special allowance." Under this the Chief Justice received his travelling expenses to attend the court, when, in fact, he had not attended the court. Why this change was made from "travelling expenses" to "special allowance" I do not know. That was not in my time. It was in the time of the present Government. What the explanation of it is I do not know.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The late Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The present Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The late Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, not the late Government; the present Government. It may have a new complexion now but that is only a veneer; it is always the same old Government. They changed the words "travelling expenses" to "special allowance" and the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) made the statement lately that it was paid monthly. It so happened that in one or two years the Chief Justice was not called upon to attend the sitting of the Judicial Committee and on those years he had received the money. If the item had been left as it was before with the wording "travelling expenses" the money could only have been paid when there were travelling expenses, but it was changed to "special allowance" and there the matter stands to-day.

Mr. EDWARDS: As I have intimated once before in this House I often feel myself at a loss in discussing some of these questions when I have to pit my poor abilities against those of a lawyer who has had training along legal lines, knows the intricacies of the law and knowing also how to make a bad case out of a poor one.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I will leave it at that, because the case, although poor before, is worse now. The wording of the item was changed from "travelling expenses" under which, as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says the money could only be paid when he travelled, to "special allowance." What is the significance of the word "special"? If it was a special allowance I would imagine it would be granted for a special purpose and if it was for a special purpose, what was that purpose? Unquestionably it was to pay his expenses if he went overseas to attend the Privy Council. He did not go to attend the sittings for two years but he drew the $2,500 nevertheless. One might criticise paying a man $2,500 to cover travelling expenses even if he did go over, because, if you allow for a first-class passage on one of the best boats that cross the Atlantic and grant him a liberal remuneration during the six or seven weeks that he stays in Great Britain attending the Privy Council, his expenses will come far short of half of $2,500, let alone $2,500. I would not call in question the payment of the $2,500 if he had actually gone across to attend the sittings of the Privy Council. But it does seem to me that no amount of twisting—I do not use the word in a discourteous sense—no amount of camouflage can get around the fact that $2,500 was paid for a specific purpose which purpose was not carried out and he therefore was not entitled to that $2,500. There is only one thing that a member of Parliament can do and that is to insist that that money shall be handed back to the treasury of this country. If we have not some assurance along that line, there is only one thing I can do and that is to ask that this item be struck out. If you pay the Chief Justice $2,500 a year for a specific purpose which he does not carry out, then I shall certainly not give my consent to an item remaining in the Estimates to vote $2,500 to the same gentleman for a purpose which he will not carry out.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to call the attention of my hon. friend and of the members of the Committee to the wording of the vote. These Estimates are not got up by parliamentary lawyers, and it is quite open to ask why the word "special" should be there at all. The thing would explain itself if we made it read an allowance for a certain purpose. The word "special" does not qualify it in any sense good or bad.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How does it read?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The item reads as follows:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, to cover expenses when attending the sittings

of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Taking the wording itself, it means that this amount is to be paid if he is attending the meetings of the Privy Council. If it is considered well to have a special representative of Canada on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in view of all the different circumstances which may arise in reference to Canadian cases and Canadian law, if the country feels that that is a good thing to do—and I have no doubt about it whatever—then the country will have no objection to paying the expenses of the said representative when he does attend the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In case the judge named may not be able to go, under the wording of this item, no other judge could go. If it is proper that Canada should be represented there, why not word the provision so that it can be Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, or any other justice selected by the Government? While I am on my feet I would like to ask what duties this gentleman performs when in attendance as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? Does he make arrangements in advance as to how a case shall be tried, or give the judges data in advance, or arrange for the cases to be presented before the Judicial Committee?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He sits on the committee, of which he is a member.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does he make dispositions in advance, or anything of that kind?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Minister of Justice could better answer that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would ask the Minister of Justice if he can throw any light upon the question as to what duties this gentleman performs in connection with cases coming before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? It is rumoured that these gentlemen do sometimes assist in the preparation of the cases to be submitted, as well as of the judgments.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hold no brief for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but I may say that I attended the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council when I was Solicitor General. I remember perfectly well on that occasion seeing Chief Justice Taschereau, who was then sitting on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for the first time. The committee's sittings begin early in the summer months and last for three months at least. It is not only for the trip to England and meeting the other members of the Judicial Committee that this allowance is paid. The Chief Justice of Canada, sitting with the other members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, hears not only Canadian cases but cases from all the other Dominions. He takes the cases en delibere with the other judges, and the reports to His Majesty the King are made by that committee of whom he forms one. I can assure my hon. friend that the Chief Justice of Canada spends, when he is in London attending to his judicial duties, very much more than the amount he receives from Canada. Now let me say this: My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) will see in the Estimates of this House the salaries of the Supreme Court judges of the province of Ontario who are paid the same as are the Superior Court judges in the province of Quebec, namely, $7,000 a year. But the province of Ontario pays every year to each of its Supreme Court judges an additional $1,000, under an Act which was passed under Sir Oliver Mowat's premiership of that province, by reason of the fact that those judges perform additional work in connection with the hearing of election petitions. That was a pretext—but a good pretext I must say—to increase the salaries of the Ontario Superior Court judges. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that the Chief Justice of Canada, sitting as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should not get this small allowance of $2,500, when he is on a par with the other members of the committee in respect to hearing all the appeals that are inscribed, especially when it is borne in mind that lawyers like Mr. Lafleur, K.C., and Mr. Geoffrion, K.C., of Montreal, and Sir Allen Aylesworth, and Mr. Hellmuth, of Toronto, or any other prominent lawyers in Ontario, receive for one case at least twice that amount.

8 p.m.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend has the Estimates before him. Will he refer to item 268 and read it like this: "Special allowance to the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux to cover expenses for attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." Or suppose it read that it was to cover the expenses of the hon. gentleman attending the Imperial Conference. Would the hon. gentleman take that money if he had not gone to that Judicial Committee or to that Conference?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, well——

Mr. EDWARDS: That is a question that can be easily answered. If I were a lawyer and my hon. friend were a witness I would rap the desk firmly and say to him, "Answer the question, sir—yes, or no."

Mr. LEMIEUX: If it was understood between the Chief Justice and the Government that this allowance was voted to the former for the object of representing Canada at the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, I would certainly accept the amount under such circumstances.

Mr. EDWARDS: Whether you went or not?

Mr. LEMIEUX: But the other vote did not read in that way. My hon. friend knows that as the vote reads to-day, the Chief Justice would not draw the amount if he should not go to England? Does he not think so?

Mr. EDWARDS: Will my hon. friend say that the wording makes any difference whatever as to what that $2,500 was voted for? That is camouflage, and nothing else.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That is a good French word.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let me call my hon. friend's attention to a statement coming from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, which was made by the Prime Minister the other day. It is to be found at page 2044 of Hansard. He will find that in the year 1913-14 the vote was:

> Travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.
>
> Fiscal year 1914-15—travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.
>
> Fiscal year 1915-16—special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Why was the change made that year from "travelling expenses" to "special allowance"? That I do not know—my knowledge stops there. It is for the Government to explain why this vote was changed. Was the special allowance given to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick no matter whether he went once, twice, or three times to the Judicial Committee, or not at all? That is a question as to which I have no knowledge, but at any rate there is the law to-day.

Mr. EDWARDS: My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not argue that the Chief Justice of Canada took this $2,500 without any reference to the purpose for which it was voted. He cannot surely argue that. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that he believes as I do, that, notwithstanding the change in the wording of this vote, the purpose for which it was granted was precisely the same in the one year as it was in the other. My right hon. friend and the gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) who sits upon his right are trained barristers and can always find a loophole where apparently the argument against them is irrefutable. If I had a legal training I could perhaps make my contention more convincing still.

But I would like to get a straight answer from the right hon. gentleman, or anybody else, why there should be a different consideration made for the vote in one year than in another, because in the one year it says for "travelling expenses" and in the other "special allowance." What was the purpose of that vote in each of these years, whether it was for travelling expenses or for special allowance it was to meet his expenses when he went across the seas to attend the sittings of the Privy Council. If it was not for that purpose, what was it for? And the Chief Justice of Canada is no more entitled to get $2,500 out of this country for services he has not performed than anybody else is. What was that special allowance for? For his activities in connection with the Imperial Privy Council. It could not be for any other services that he rendered for the Privy Council on this side of the Atlantic. It must be for his services when he goes overseas. That is unquestionably what it was for. In two years, the vote was so worded that some persons thought—apparently the Chief Justice himself thought—he could take this money notwithstanding that he had not performed the services for which the money was specially voted. To put it mildly, I think the Chief Justice of Canada has made a very grievous mistake in taking the money in those two years; and if the majority of the members of this House think that he made a mistake, then the proper thing to do is to rectify the mistake, and that can only be done by paying back the five thousand dollars.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has asked me a question as to the interpretation of that vote. It is not to me that he should direct that question. The law was changed from "travelling ex-

penses" to "special allowance." It was done for a purpose. I ask my hon. friend to put that question to those who made the law.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it not true that we all made the law? My right hon. friend, because he sits as leader of the Opposition, cannot absolve himself from all responsibility in the matter. Neither can the members of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me. I make the laws here, but I absolve myself from many of the laws I have made. I accept only my own responsibility.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Was not the reason this: travelling expenses would not run up probably to the amount voted, and it was in order to cover travelling expenses and, in a sense, services at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I have asked several times what were the services for which this $2,500 was voted.

Mr. VIEN: Might I venture—

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I have an answer?

Mr. DOHERTY: As to their nature, they are precisely the services of a member of any court. When the Chief Justice of Canada goes over to sit in the Privy Council, as has been pointed out, he sits as a member, hardly of a court, but as a member of the Judicial Committee, which is the proper designation, which advises His Majesty as to the disposition which should be made of the cases.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does he prepare the cases?

Mr. DOHERTY: He sits as a judge sits, hears the cases, as one of the committee composed of a number of members. When they have heard the cases and studied the cases, they form their judgment, and he takes part in that judgment with the other members of the Judicial Committee. As I understand it, provision is made qualifying the Chief Justices, or the judges of certain courts in the Dominions, upon invitation of the Judicial Committee, to join with them in the hearing of cases. It is found, I think, particularly desirable in connection with colonial cases. Upon that invitation, when the Chief Justice acts upon and sits as a member of the Judicial tribunal, his duties as such are purely judicial, that is to say, to hear with the other members of the committee the cases and to make up his mind with the others as to what the proper judgment is to be rendered.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He does not have to do with hearing the evidence in advance or anything of that kind?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, he sits like any other member of the tribunal.

Mr. EDWARDS: I want to call attention to one other thing. In the year 1914-15 the vote was "travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500." This amount was paid, as Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attended sittings of the Privy Council in August, 1914. In 1915-16 the vote was "special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500." He drew it that year. Now, I have a right to ask, inasmuch as this is a vote to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, what expenses were incurred to warrant the payment of that amount? The wording is being changed this year to read as follows: "Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." That makes it, of course, that he cannot get it unless he attends. The only difference then in the wording in the two years is that the one year says "when attending." Now, if you say he is entitled to $2,500, whether he attends or not, to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, then it is up to this Government, or to those who think that the money should be voted, to show what those expenses were, or to show what trouble he was put to which would justify the paying of that amount to cover expenses. In the one case we have travelling expenses. When he travels, it is actual travelling expenses. We can understand that. In the other case, he does not travel, and gets the amount still to cover expenses. No travelling in that case: then what are the expenses? The idea unquestionably was to pay him $2,500 to cover his expenses in attending sittings over there. It is unreasonable to suppose otherwise. That being the case, when he did not attend, when he was not put to any expense for travelling, it seems to me self-evident that he has no business to draw the amount for services he did not perform.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no doubt about the wording of this vote. Is there

any doubt in the mind of the Committee that if we have a representative on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and we send him there, that we ought to pay him his travelling expenses, the expenses that he has incurred in doing that duty? The vote is so worded that it shows its intention explicitly. And I am quite willing to say that not a cent of that money will be paid unless the service is rendered. Under that, has my hon. friend from Frontenac any objection to the vote passing? I will also say that I will get the information and give it to him, I hope, before this session is over, with reference to the two preceding years.

Mr. EDWARDS: My right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) has asked me a question, and I will answer it. I am not prepared to let the vote go through. I am in the judgment of the House; I am only one. But the fact that, in my judgment, five thousand dollars of the money of Canada has been taken out of the Treasury by a man who happens to be Chief Justice of the Dominion of Canada, warrants me in saying that I will not consent to the passing of another item of $2,500 to that gentleman until I know that that money will be refunded.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think we must let this item stand until a later time, and come back to it again. When I have the information I will give it to the House, and then the House can make its own decision.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I suggest that instead of providing a specified sum for Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, we vote an amount for the duties performed and expenses incurred. Two thousand five hundred dollars would not be too much to grant for the duties performed.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That would be a great mistake. I do not see why the Chief Justice of this Dominion should not be in the same position as that occupied by the humblest civil servant in the country so far as this matter is concerned. Why should he not make a return to the Auditor General of the expenses which he incurs on this visit to England? Why vote him $2,500? It does not cost Sir Charles Fitzpatrick $2,500 to go to London. Let Sir Charles Fitzpatrick do as any other civil servant is required to do, that is, submit an account of his expenses, and we shall be glad to pay them.

Item stands.

Post Office—Outside Service, salaries, etc., $19,116,260.75.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that the country has lost the valuable services of the Postmaster at Toronto. The postmasterships of Toronto and Montreal are the most important in Canada; these are the largest offices, yield the largest revenue and incur the largest expenditure of any in Canada. The press of Toronto are unanimous in their desire that the late Mr. Rogers, the former postmaster in that city, be soon replaced. We have just passed a Bill which is supposed to bring about Civil Service reform. Will the leader of the House inform me, without giving names—I understand that he must be very discreet about such appointments—whether it is the intention of the Government to select by promotion from within the ranks and according to merit only, a successor to the late postmaster at Toronto?

Mr. DOHERTY: Under the Civil Service Act all appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission, who will doubtless proceed in accordance with the provisions of that Act. I understand that the question is presently engaging their attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Perhaps I am too exacting, but I am not satisfied with my hon. friend's answer. Various rumours are afloat and prominent names have been published in the press in connection with the vacancy in the Toronto post office. Will the Government fill this vacancy by appointing an officer from within the ranks on the principle of promotion and according to merit?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman does not seem to grasp what I pointed out: that the appointment is not in the hands of the Government; therefore, the Government cannot say who will be appointed. The Government will appoint nobody. The Civil Service Commission will make the appointment, and I have no doubt that they will give consideration to the point raised by my hon. friend. I do not speak positively, but I think that the principle of promotion such as my hon. friend suggests is laid down for the guidance of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. FIELDING: I must express my regret at the manner in which the public business of Canada has been handled during the last two or three days. I think I am right in saying that this is the first time that we have had before us any item which permitted the discussion of post office affairs.

Mr. DOHERTY: The post office estimates have not been up before to-day.

Mr. FIELDING: It is now half past eight o'clock, and I am informed that at ten o'clock His Excellency is to come down with the expectation of proroguing this Parliament. It is very desirable that we should do business expeditiously. But I want to say this: I shall not use the word "protest" because that is too strong a word, but I believe I voice the general opinion of the House when I say that this is not a fair way to do the business of the Dominion of Canada. I realize the necessity of the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues going away, but certainly that is no reason why the whole work of Parliament should be rushed through in the way in has been done during the last two or three days. We have had meetings of the committees at ten o'clock in the mornings; the House has met at eleven o'clock in the morning; it has met in the afternoon; it has met in the evening, continuing till all hours of the night; and now at this stage of the session we are, for the first time, within an hour and one-half of prorogation, taking up the Estimates of one of the greatest departments of the Government and we are in a few minutes going to vote $19,000,000 for that department. I want to say, in no spirit of fault-finding, that this is not a proper way of doing business, and I do not think the Government are justified in rushing business through in this way. While it may be quite necessary to provide for the absence of the Prime Minister, he has able and competent colleagues who could take charge of matters in his absence, and we should have been able to sit here for a few days longer and conduct the business of the House as it should have been conducted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to emphasize the remarks made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens. I shall not delay the proceedings of the House, but I shall simply give a few facts which will show how this whole business is badly managed.

Sir Sam HUGHES: Has it not always been the same?

Mr. FIELDING: No, it has not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that we are going to vote $19,000,000 without having had a single minute during a session of nearly three months to discuss the affairs of the Post Office Department. I said before dinner that the expenditure in that department had doubled since 1911.

[Mr. Fielding.]

I have the figures under my hand. In the public accounts I find that in 1910-11 the expenditure in that department amounted to $7,954,222. In 1911-12 it jumped to $9,172,035. In 1912-13, it was $10,882,804; in 1913-14, $12,822,058; in 1914-15, $15,961,191; in 1915-16, $16,009,138, and in 1916-17, $16,300,578.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: How much has the revenue increased in that time?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that the special war tax has increased the revenues of that department, but putting that tax aside, as it should be, the revenues have practically remained the same while the expenditure has been more than doubled. That is a very unhealthy state of affairs. I do not wish to delay the proceedings of this House, but I shall simply enter my protest. We have had no opportunity to discuss the postal administration, and yet we are face to face with this bald fact that, in 1910-11, the expenditure of that department was about $8,000,000, whilst for the last fiscal year it had reached the enormous figure of $16,300,000, with no more revenue than in 1911, with the exception of the war tax.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member has pointed out that, in the last seven years, there has been, as he states, no increase in the revenue, if you eliminate the special tax. I am assured by those who know the facts that in that he is quite mistaken, and he shuts his eye to the fact that there has been an immense expansion in the business to be carried on by the Post Office Department. We have had a great extension of the rural mail route deliveries. We have had an immense increase in the parcel post business which has necessarily entailed an additional cost of the service rendered to the public. Anything so unfair as taking the bald statement that more money is being spent in the year 1918 than was spent in the year 1911, and concluding that that necessarily implies improper expenditure, I think it would be difficult to suggest. As to our having such a very short time to deal with this matter, we have been in readiness, on different occasions, to lay these Estimates before the House, and the delays that have prevented us are not attributable to the Government. Yesterday we spent one whole day that might have been usefully employed in discussing in detail these very Estimates, in discussing a motion that prevented us from going into this matter. On other occasions attention has been given to matters that

are certainly less important than these Estimates, but whose is the responsibility? I do not think this is an exceptional instance which has never occurred before. I shall not dwell upon the reasons on account of which, in the judgment of those best qualified to speak for both sides of the House, it was not thought desirable that this session should be prolonged. Those reasons commended themselves to the general judgment of the House. Those reasons have brought about this situation, which I should be glad to have avoided, but the responsibility for which does not rest, at all events exclusively, upon the shoulders of this Government and this particular department.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like to have from the minister a statement as to the cancellation of mail contracts. There is a great deal of unrest amongst mail contractors throughout the country, many of them claiming they are losing money by carrying out their contracts. I understand that of late some contracts have been cancelled. Will the minister state briefly on what terms a mail contractor can obtain cancellation of his contract?

Mr. DOHERTY: A mail contractor has no right to cancellation of his contract. He tendered for that contract in competition with others, and got it because his tender was lower than the tenders of others. But as I mentioned some time ago, upon a resolution on this subject, taking into consideration the circumstances and conditions which justified the belief that, in many instances, it is, at all events, probable that unexpected increases in costs have so altered the situation of the contractor as to place him in a position where he is suffering substantial loss, we did adopt, as I explained at that time, the rule that, where a man had, under totally different conditions, entered into a contract which, for the reasons I gave a minute ago, might be entailing serious loss to him, we would in such cases consent to cancellation of the contract and call for tenders at the present time, putting that man in a position where he would be enabled to do the work at prices similar to those for which others would be willing to do it, giving him his fair chance with everybody else. As I explained, I could not convince myself that it was fair to those who had failed in obtaining contracts that the man who had got it because his tender was lower in the first place than the others should retain the contract at a higher price because he was losing money. Of course, it is not really a sound business principle to consent to cancel a contract at all, and if we were standing on our rights we would not cancel them. But I have felt, and I think the House will justify that view, that where it was perfectly clear that a man by reason of unforeseen and unusual circumstances was in a position where he was actually doing this work for the country at a substantial loss to himself, the country should not insist on holding him to his contract.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the old wagon days a certain mileage rate was allowed up to a certain sum. Possibly that has all been done away with, now that tenders are called for.

Mr. DOHERTY: The work is let by calling for tenders.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Under the system carried out by the minister one man may find that he has submitted too low a price, but he has to struggle on. Why not return to the old system and say the rate should not exceed so much per mile or per trip? Give the department a little option in the business. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but I could give half a dozen instances where men who have the mail contract are losing money. They find themselves cut out and then the man who takes their place in turn has the same experience. I think it is hardly fair to the men who are doing the contracting.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: There is a great deal of distress among the men carrying the rural mail in our part of the country, and they would like some advance. If the minister would allow the men who have the contracts a better rate I certainly think something of that kind ought to be done, because I get letters nearly every day from men who are actually losing money on their contracts. If the minister can possibly find a way of relieving the distress of these rural mail carriers it certainly ought to be done.

Mr. ARTHURS: I was desirous of bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I read with some interest the statement made by the minister some time ago respecting the possibility of cancelling these contracts. As a matter of fact, in only one of the cases that have come to my attention has the contract been cancelled, and that was the best paid one of the lot. An absolute refusal to cancel the contract was given in every other case.

The minister has stated that as a matter of right these contracts need not and should not be cancelled because these men entered into them in a perfectly open and legal way, and knew what they were doing. It is true tenders were called for, but in almost every case it has been the practice of the Government for many years past when the tender price was a little higher than they wanted to pay, to send an inspector or some one acting on his behalf around and peddle the contract between Tom, Dick and Harry, beating them down like a Jew would until they got a certain price and in most cases the price was ridiculously low. I know a case in one part of my riding where a man for many years has been carrying the mail for a dollar for a return trip of sixteen miles, and yet he has to go on in spite of the fact that the price of everything has gone up. This man has not had a new contract for years, I venture to say, but his old contract has been renewed, the department simply saying to him that he should not ask for anything more in these hard times. Rural mail delivery contracts have been let in the past on the basis of $30 per mile per year; in other words, a man who had a trip of twenty miles would receive about $2.12 or $2.15 per day and out of this magnificent sum he had to pay the expenses of keeping a horse or a team, and pay for his meals when away from home, and when you take into account the present price of hay and oats, that leaves him 62 cents a day. I was told by one official of this Government that the matter might be remedied by letting women do the driving, and letting the men go into other employment where they might earn perhaps $3 per day. I told my informant it might be quite true of the part of the country from which he came, but that it would be absolutely unfair to ask any woman in my part of the country to drive a team twenty miles a day through snow in winter and mud in summer for the magnificent sum of 62 cents a day. I would be ashamed to offer it to any woman in the province of Ontario. These men are suffering an actual hardship, and I think the members of this House have a right to demand that where these men ask for a cancellation of their contract it should be granted at once. If a man is making any money out of the contract he will not ask that it be cancelled, but will go on with it; it is only men who are losing money who will ask to be relieved from their contract.

[Mr. Arthurs.]

The minister said a few moments ago that we are getting an increased revenue and doing increased work on account of the parcel post system, but what about the poor fellows who carry the parcels twenty or forty miles away from the railroad, and sometimes require two teams of horses to draw the mail in? These men are carrying the mail for the contract price in force before the war, and before the parcel post system had reached anything like the proportions it has to-day. These men are not getting one cent extra in spite of this heavy additional work.

I want to say a word on behalf of the country postmaster. In a great many cases it is a woman who is doing this work for $50 a year. She has the trouble of looking after the post office every hour of every day, and I think something should be done for these people. No man, let alone a woman, should be asked to put himself to the inconvenience of handling the mail in one of our country post offices for the sum of $4 a month. I think something should be done for their relief now. We are told that the estimates are doubling themselves every five years, and I think some part of the increase should be given to this very deserving class of our people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In the early days of the session a resolution dealing with this question was before the House, and I believe the Prime Minister asked to have the debate adjourned with a view to resuming it later in the session after the Government had had an opportunity of considering the matter of an increase in salary to the rural mail carriers. A few days ago I asked a question in the House, and the leader of the Government informed me that an opportunity would be given when the post office estimates were up to discuss this question.

The rural mail carriers are undoubtedly rendering a splendid service to the country, a service which is invaluable under present conditions, and at this particular time, when we are taking care of practically every branch of the public service of this country except the rural mail carriers, I think some explanation is certainly due as to why some relief has not been afforded them. Two years ago when a number of these contracts were let conditions were altogether different from those of to-day. I have a case in mind which I took up with the department about six months ago, asking that the man be relieved from his contract or be given an increase. Yester-

day I had another letter from him almost begging to be relieved from his contract, as his family was sick and he had no means, and he also urged me to see that the last part of his salary was forwarded to him immediately.

He is in a position to get daily wages as an ordinary labourer that would be much greater than he gets with his team and outfit while carrying His Majesty's mail. That is surely a condition of affairs which should not exist. It is deplorable. You must realize that many of the rural mail carriers are at a time of life when they are very much below their ordinary earning power. Old, and often crippled, men who are unable to engage in ordinary labour render good service as carriers of the mail. When you stop to think of the torture that these people had to endure during the past winter you must realize the very great injustice that is being done. I do not think that I am asking too much when I ask that adequate salaries be paid to these people. I would give some official in the department, an inspector, a superintendent, the deputy minister, or some one else, the right to exercise a little discretion in the matter during the abnormal times through which we are passing. The department ought to see that a uniform remuneration is paid for this service and that nobody is carrying His Majesty's mails at a loss. If a mail carrier is performing his duty at a loss the department ought to make up the difference. In a case such as I have referred to, where a man has gone down and out in absolute poverty as a result of carrying the mail, I think some recompense should be made. It is humiliating for the people of Canada to have public service rendered when the people who are rendering that service are unable to support themselves and their families as a result of the increase not only in the cost of living but in the cost of feed for their horses. The Government increased the salaries of letter carriers, who have only themselves and their families to support, but the rural mail carrier has a double increase to attend to. He has not only himself and family to provide for but he has his steed. The feed for his horses has now doubled in price, its cost is four times greater than it was when he entered into the contract. I was a little surprised that some explanation has not been given in view of the request that the Prime Minister made when the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) moved his resolution dealing with the matter. We have been looking day after day to see if something was going to be done in this regard. It is a matter of keen disappointment to me to find that apparently no provision is going to be made to take care of the people who are performing this service.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I just want to add a few words to what has been said in regard to the rural mail carriers and postmasters. Cases similar to those which have been spoken of by my hon. friend (Mr Sutherland) have come to my notice in the past three or four months. When I have brought these to the attention of the department, I have had the same answer, that these men were under contract, that they had taken the contract at a specific price and they must carry it out. In one district in my constituency two rural mail routes became vacant. No contractor has come forward and expressed a willingness to accept the price that the department is ready to offer. In one case the department have suggested to me that if I could get some one to take a contract they would be willing to consider a compromise and make the rate a little higher. Therefore, the whole contention about mail contracts being carried out falls to the ground. If they would simply give the contract to the lowest tenderer, whether or not such a tender was higher than the limit they had fixed instead of sending some one out to try and beat the man down to the mileage basis which was arrived at a few years ago, satisfactory contracts would probably be obtained. The only fair way is to give the mail carriers an increase in proportion to the increase which every one else in the country is receiving. I desire to say a word in regard to rural postmasters. I have had this matter also up with the department. A group of members waited on the minister and I think we made it clear that on the new basis which was established in 1915 fixing the salaries of rural postmasters there was a discrimination against the man who is in a post office with a revenue of less than $10,000 a year. Under the basis in force prior to 1915 a revenue of $10,000 gave the postmaster $3,200 a year as income. Under the new regulation a postmaster in order to get $3,200 a year has had to increase his postal revenue by 23 per cent. A postmaster in an office with a revenue of $1,000, received $500 a year, but under the new regulation he has to increase the postal revenue 52 per cent in order to get the same salary that he got before. I have spent considerable time at the Post Office Department trying to get

to the bottom of this question, but I will admit that I could not convince the officers of the department that there was discrimination. I pointed out the case of a post office in my riding where the postmaster's salary had decreased in the past two years, that whereas he was getting $208 a month prior to the change in the basis rate—out of which he had to pay his rent, light, heat and assistant—the remuneration has been reduced to $159 per month or a reduction of $49 a month while the work has been very largely increased. I have in my pocket a statement from the Post Office Department in regard to another post office in the district I represent, where the total amount that the postmaster receives for carrying the mails and keeping the post office, with an allowance of $80 per year for night duty, is $416, including rent. When a group of members had this question up with the department we were given to understand that probably some relief might be given when the Supplementary Estimates came down. But in the Supplementary Estimates I find that there is an item put in to take care of increases to thirty postmasters where the revenue is more than $10,000, and where the salary will be $3,200, but there is not one single nickel for the rural postmaster. The condition has just got down to this, that it has become almost impossible to get a man who can be depended upon to take charge of the post office in an outlying part of the country. Certainly, I feel that the whole scheme of remuneration for the rural postmasters and rural mail carriers should be revised and that something like reasonable compensation should be given to them.

Mr. KEEFER: I would like to corroborate what the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has said. In many cases the rural postmasters are not paid what they ought to be. In some cases there are well founded complaints about the management of the post office, but nothing can be done, because when you speak to the postmaster you know he is not properly paid and you cannot find fault. The remuneration of these postmasters and mail carriers is not what it ought to be. A case came up recently in Port Arthur where a man who had served faithfully for twenty-five years died and no allowance whatever was made to those who were dependent upon him. The postmaster wrote to the department about the old and faithful servant, but nothing could be done. I think the postal department should revise their salaries and allowances.

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

Mr. BOYCE: I would like to endorse what has been said in regard to the rural mail carriers and postmasters, and to apply it especially to the postmasters in the county of Carleton. I know a postmaster within seven miles of the city who is carrying the mail seven miles backwards and forwards for the sum of $300. There is no better class in the community than the country postmasters. They have to keep their offices open from six o'clock in the morning until possibly ten o'clock at night, in return for which they receive the munificent sum of about fifteen cents a day. If the Government are not generous they should at least be just, and I think it is only right that these men should be paid fair wages. Take the rural mail carriers. They drive twenty-five miles a day generally and are paid $600 a year, which hardly suffices to feed their horses. If we expect the mails to be carried in a satisfactory manner, we ought at least to pay these men a fair wage. I hope the Government will take these representations into their earnest consideration. We do not urge an extravagant stipend, but it should at least be a just one. I do not think any man who is in charge of a post office, and keeps it clean and presentable, should be paid less $100 a year, while the mail drivers should receive at least $1,000 a year.

Mr. MORPHY: There is in my county a grave state of affairs with regard to the rural carriers. The people there feel that the postal department is probably the best run department in the Government service because it is administered so parsimoniously. The general public think it is a wonderful department, by reason of it being the most economical branch of the public service.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a pity the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is not one of the listeners.

Mr. MORPHY: I will be glad to study the situation a little and find out who is the mean man at the head of the department. I cannot say that it is my hon. friend from St. Ann, because he is only the acting minister. However, I have observed this: A man having a route of twenty-five or twenty-six miles paid for on the old standard at the rate of $30 per mile per year, refused his contract lately when it expired. New tenders were called for and only one was received, which was $200 higher than the former contractor was paid. The Government would not give the contract to the tenderer. I suppose if his tender had been $200 lower he would have

got it very quickly. The department, I presume, said to the inspector: "For God's sake, see if you cannot save that $200 and get somebody to take this work."

The inspector wrote to the former contractor and he refused to continue the work. The request virtually made was: "Please keep the contract and we will peddle around and see if we cannot get somebody to take it." That was the tenor of it, for I saw the letter. The man wrote back and said: "I will not be bothered with it." Is that a fair way to do business? If the Government are going to stand by the principle of calling for tenders they should take the offer that comes in, whether it is a little higher or a little lower. I do not think it is dignified for the Government to attempt to beat down men who have sent in a bona fide tender according to the regulations, and failing that, attempt to get the former contractor to help them out.

While on the subject of the parsimony of the department, I do not know whether the Post Office Department is blameable for this matter or not, but I know a post office janitor who has served for thirty years at the magnificent salary of $600 per year. Although he is married and has raised a family of three children, he has not had an advance of salary in all that time. That man is there yet, but is frightened of his life of being squeezed out if his health fails him and losing that miserable pittance.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that janitor is suffering from the parsimony of the Public Works Department.

Mr. MORPHY: He has charge of the public building which accommodates the Excise, Customs and Post Office Branches. But it shows the parsimony of the department that they would keep a man at a salary of $600 after thirty years of faithful service. Hon. gentlemen stand up in this House and talk on behalf of the under-dog and all we get is a nod of the head from the Acting Postmaster General. He does not rise and say he is going to see that grievances like this are remedied. I think that the situation in the country to-day calls, and calls loudly, for the Government to declare that the time has come when this loyal and efficient body of officials in the country districts should get some recognition and some consideration. Large increases can be easily got for the big men, but nothing is forthcoming for the little men. There is no doubt about that. Why is it? Hon. gentlemen sitting on the front benches do not go to the country. They do not know the country. They are ensconced in Ottawa mingling with the high fellows, the club fellows, and the top-notch fellows. They do not know the country fellows at all. It is about time they roused themselves and shook up the service. We have got a splendid body of officials, but the officials are frightened of the ministers.

9 p.m.

An hon. MEMBER: Are they?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes, absolutely frightened, and yet some of them are men of strong parts and large hearts, but they are so repressed by the ministers that they are in a state of perpetual fright. When it comes to Sir Thomas This, or Sir Thomas That, it is easy enough to get a thousand dollars, it goes through hidden in the Estimates so that you cannot find it. On behalf of the Outside Service, I want the Acting Postmaster General to give the pledge to-night that, so far as this department is concerned, he will shake things up in the interest of that deserving body of men, and the same with the rest of his colleagues, so that the country's needs will be properly taken care of and what we sometimes call the "under dogs" properly looked after. You cannot expect a man to keep a wife and family of three children on such a salary as $600:

Mr. LEMIEUX: That's a large family.

Mr. MORPHY: There are some men in the eastern provinces who probably have more than thirteen children. Well, for keeping the post office, furnishing fuel and light and shovelling the snow off the paths in the winter for the convenience of the public, country postmasters get the magnificent sum of $75 a year. Morning, noon, and night, these postmasters are at the behest of the public in an official capacity, subject at any time to dismissal and the loss of that munificent stipend, if somebody happens to complain that he did not receive a letter which he should have got. Services such as these are, to my mind, public services in the true sense of the term, and these men should not be treated in the meagre, miserable, measly way in which they are treated throughout the country. I ask the ministers to realize that the Government is not getting any credit from the people for the parsimony exercised and displayed towards what might be called the inferior service, but is nevertheless the superior service, rendered by these people in the country districts. I ask again for

the most favourable consideration for the claims of these people, and that they be given a fair show.

The CHAIRMAN: Before recognizing Mr. Euler, who caught my eye several moments ago, I wish to say that never in my experience have hon. gentlemen kept so well to the question before the Chair as they have during the last two hours, but I must also remind them—without in any way desiring to call them to order—that there is only one hour left in which to dispose of about one hundred items in the Estimates. I understand that His Excellency the Governor General is leaving for Toronto on the eleven o'clock train, but if hon. gentlemen think that prorogation should be delayed until to-morrow, why of course it will have to be. I understood, however, that it was the desire of every one that Parliament should be prorogued to-night, but I would be very glad to have the opinion of the committee. If it is the unanimous consent that we adjourn until to-morrow the chairman is quite willing.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Only hon. gentlemen on the other side have spoken so far.

The CHAIRMAN: At the present rate, it will be impossible to meet the wishes of the Committee.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we will be able to get through in fair time. If we cannot do it by ten o'clock, we can by a little after ten, and if not by then, then by a little after eleven. We can get our views out, and I think we can get ready for prorogation to-night. I would not have gone so far as to have suggested it to-night, but there have been many times when we have made the same general conventions. And I have consulted also with my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) will certainly acknowledge that there has been no obstacle placed by us. We have been endeavouring to further the business. But the business of the country must be done, at all events.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, yes.

Mr. EULER: I shall not keep the House more than a few moments. I thought it was absolutely in place that at least one member on this side of the House should support what has been said by seven or eight members on the other side. I absolutely agree with the argument advanced by those who have already spoken. I believe the people of this country will absolutely endorse anything in reason that the Government will do for the relief of these three classes in the postal service—the letter carriers, whose case, I believe, has been dealt with, I think, not altogether too liberally; the postmasters, whose remuneration, I think, is almost a disgrace to the people of Canada; and the rural mail carriers. I agree with what has been said, and I think that the Government should deal with this,not in the spirit of getting the services of these men for as little as possible but with some idea of remunerating them according to what they deserve. I think the people of this country should support them in that. I will also say that, before the House prorogues, hon. members would appreciate some sort of an expression of policy on the part of the Government with regard to this matter.

Mr. FIELDING: Might I have a single word, not by way of criticism, but rather with a desire to help the minister who is acting as Postmaster General? I sympathize very deeply with him and his associates in the position in which they are placed. It is easy for us to stand up here and advocate the claims of the rural mail carriers, the postmasters and so on, but the minister and his staff have to consider the general cost of the whole undertaking. And when my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is telling the department they are spending too much money, the minister might be disposed to hesitate about adding additional charges to the service. I am afraid with regard to the public service of Canada generally, that it is underpaid. There are exceptions. There are a few of these big men that my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) talks about; there may be a few getting more than they should, but the great mass are not being adequately paid having regard to the service they perform. And I believe the people of Canada are willing to do it. I would like to strengthen the hands of the minister in any effort he may make to do something for the rural postmasters, particularly the smaller ones. Might I add a suggestion, which I ventured to offer before? I know the difficulty about the rural mail contractor. He has made a bargain, and a bargain is a bargain. And the minister may say: "If you do not like your contract, give it up." That may be a just judgment, but it is rather a harsh judgment. I ventured to offer a suggestion. My suggestion was

with respect to the smaller class of mail carriers in the country, not the big ones—I suppose seven-eighths of the mail contracts, leaving out the railway and steamship contracts, do not exceed $800 a year. My suggestion in regard to this smaller class of contractors—the big fellows can look after themselves—is, where they made their contracts before this great advance in the cost of everything, would it not be fair, confining it to that period and to that class of contracts, to give them a moderate increase all round? I am not urging it. I know the minister's difficulty. I only renew the suggestion. If he is able to bring forward some proposal in some shape or form, and not be too much alarmed by what the hon. member for Maisonneuve has said, he will be gratified to find the whole House disposed to agree with him in doing something for this worthy class of public officials.

Mr. MARSHALL: I quite agree with all what has been said about the mail carriers, who are not paid well and who are complaining bitterly. As the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens has said, conditions have changed very much in the last four years. Some of these contracts were taken four years ago, when horse feed did not cost half what it costs now. I think there is only one way for the Government to remedy this, and that is to allow every man to cancel his contract. Of course, he has the privilege of tendering again. The minister might add a percentage, but it is just a question whether that would be satisfactory. I know of one case in my riding, where the contractor carrying the mail was very poor, and we had to buy a horse for him to carry on his work. That should not be. They are not paid at all well.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There was a certain amount of disappointment in this House at the answer the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Doherty) gave to the question of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Lemieux) as to the principle which should be adopted in filling the vacancy in the Toronto Post Office. The minister said, when asked if it would be filled by merit from some man already in the service, that the department had nothing whatever to do with it, that the office would be filled by the Civil Service Commission. We are all aware that the Civil Service Commission has a certain amount of control, but I find that the Act says that the Governor in Council may make such regulations as he deems necessary or convenient in carrying out the provisions of the Act. There is nothing to hinder the Governor in Council from making a regulation as to the making of appointments. I would like to know from the minister, in view of the fact that the Government have complete control over the commission whether the principle of promotion will be applied at Toronto or will the old patronage system be followed?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman comprehends in a manner I cannot follow the provisions of the Act that the Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the Act, while the Act says that the Civil Service Commission shall make the appointments. And the hon. member suggests that we should make a regulation to control the Civil Service Commission, which, under the Act is to control us.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Act says that the Governor in Council may make regulations to control the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DOHERTY: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of that Act.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Certainly.

Mr. DOHERTY: But not, as I understand it, to empower the Governor in Council to make regulations to tell the Civil Service Commission whom they shall appoint.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister will not say, I am sure, that the Government have not the power to make a regulation that the principle of promotion by merit shall apply.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I understand it, the Civil Service Commission are to determine as to how they will select the best man to fill the office. And if it were up to this Government, would the hon. gentleman suggest that we should make a rule that even if in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission the man next in position was entirely unqualified, that he should be nevertheless promoted? To do that would bind the Government in all cases to appoint to vacant positions the man who happens to be next in rank, and would tie absolutely the hands of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. PEDLOW: I wish to bring three matters to the attention of the Acting Postmaster General: First, the postage on parcels to soldiers overseas. This is a subject

that I have had in mind ever since I came to this House in April. During the campaign in December it was impressed on me very forcibly from many quarters that it would be desirable if the Government could see its way clear to forward free of charge parcels to the soldiers overseas. Poor women who have to work hard for their money and find it difficult to pay for the material contained in the parcels sent to their sons overseas, have to pay in addition excessive amounts by way of postage On a package of ordinary size the postage amounts to thirty-eight or forty cents, and this makes the cost of the whole parcel very high. I am sure that this suggestion will appeal to the sense of fair play of many members on the other side of the House. The next matter that I have in mind is that of postage on magazines to soldiers. In the magazines published in the United States there is a notice on the cover advising the reader that if after he finishes reading the magazine he places a one cent stamp over that notice and drops the magazine in the post office, it will be forwarded to some soldier in the army or the navy overseas. I think that this also is a matter for the serious consideration of the Post Office Department. Then, there is the suggestion that the revenue from the sale of postage stamps and inland revenue stamps be kept separate. It is impossible for the Post Office or Inland Revenue Departments to determine exactly the amount of revenue received by the respective departments in respect of these stamps if they are not kept separate. Moreover, the way they are dealt with now is not businesslike. I suggest that the ministers of these two departments take this subject into consideration. It should not be possible to use a postage stamp for inland revenue purposes, and vice versa.

Mr. ARGUE: If rural mail carriers resign their positions, will the Government release their bondsmen?

Mr. DOHERTY: These people are not employees. They do not receive salaries; they are contractors who undertook to do certain work at a certain price. I do not think it is possible for me to say that I will cancel the contract of any rural carrier who asks that his contract be cancelled, because the question whether he had made a bad bargain or a good one would then cease to receive consideration. I do not see why a rural mail contractor, who is receiving proper remuneration which he originally agreed to take, should be relieved of his contract merely, perhaps, because he can get a more paying position if he goes somewhere else. It can only be dealt with, so far as my judgment goes—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am asked by some to answer, and others interrupt by calling "carried."

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like the Postmaster General to give expression of opinion regarding the matters to which I have directed attention.

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I stated this morning that I would give the House an answer to the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), with regard to their inquiries concerning the allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in respect of his attendance at the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I will read the statement if my hon. friend wishes, but the substance of it is this: Sir Charles Fitzpatrick contends that he was entirely justified under the circumstances in accepting the allowance for the two years during which he visited London. That is entirely true. But with reference to the last two years, as it appears to be the wish of the House that these amounts should be returned, he says that he is quite willing to return them. I think that is the gist of the matter.

Dominion Police—further amount required, $11,000.

Mr. BUREAU: I see that there is a provisional allowance under this head in the Supplementary Estimates. Is this amount of $11,000 to give a supplementary allowance to the Dominion police, or it is just the ordinary increase to which they are entitled under the law?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand this further amount of $11,000, which is for the last fiscal year, is attributable to the fact that it has been found necessary to increase the number of the Dominion Police. Their work under existing conditions calls for additional help. That is the reason why we were $11,000 short.

Mr. BUREAU: It is for past services?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, for the last fiscal year.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it the intention of the minister to give the Dominion Police any supplementary allowance the same as is being done for the Outside Service on account of the increased cost of living?

Mr. DOHERTY: We expect to make to the different ranks a proportionate increase in their pay.

Mr. BUREAU: Plus an allowance?

Mr. DOHERTY: The increase in their pay will represent the allowance. Instead of proceeding by way of allowance, in view of the discrepancy between their pay and the pay of other police forces, what is going to be done is to give a reasonable increase of pay.

Mr. BUREAU: That will be an increase over and above the salaries they were getting last year, plus the allowance, to supplement the difference in the salaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Arts and Agriculture—For the purchase of seed grain and feed oats—Governor General's Warrant (Mar. 8, 1918), $700,000.

Mr. KAY: What was this used for?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The item explains itself. It is for the purchase of seed grain and feed oats. The purchases have been made and the amount is re-paid to the public treasury.

For the purchase of screenings, mill feed and corn, $300,000.

Mr. KAY: What was that purchased for?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That was purchased in the same way by the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of getting feed for the stock raisers, which was sold to them and for which they paid.

Adulteration of food, and the administration of the Act respecting fertilizers, fraudulent marking, and commercial feeding stuffs.—Further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. VIEN: It was understood with the leader of the House that there was a matter that would be introduced on the Supplementary Estimates of the Department of Militia and Defence. I understand that there are no Supplementary Estimates of that department.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There were Estimates of the Department of Militia and Defence in the Supplementary Estimates. They were passed just after the committee assembled at seven o'clock. My hon. friend was not in the House at the time.

Mr. VIEN: I was here when the Chairman took the Chair.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Item 342 is not yet passed.

Mr. VIEN: If all the items connected with the Department of Militia and Defence were passed after recess, I suppose the leader of the House will permit me, as promised, to introduce this matter on this item which is connected with the Department of Agriculture.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend sees exactly where we are. If he were here at seven o'clock when those Estimates came up, he should have spoken to those items. As it is now, this is not an item to which his remarks would be pertinent. At the same time it is quite true, as I said this morning, there would be items and he would have an opportunity of saying something.

Mr. VIEN: There is at my disposal another way of bringing before the House the matter I have in mind. I have a motion to adjourn the House in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VIEN: If the Chairman will allow me to put a question—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VIEN: I think the right hon. gentleman will allow me to explain.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. It is well known that the rule in Committee of Supply is that the discussion must be strictly relevant to the clause that is before the committee at the time. The Chairman, of course, has no knowledge of any agreement which may have been made between the hon. member and any hon. member who may have at the time been leading the House. The Supplementary Estimates of the Militia Department were passed at about ten minutes after seven o'clock this evening. The Minister of Militia was in his seat and asked that those items be called owning to the fact that he was obliged to go somewhere else, and the items were passed. The Chairman would suggest—it is merely a suggestion—that the items be allowed to go through as quickly as possible, and, if we have time left, the hon. gentleman may, with the unanimous consent of the committee, address the House on the subject, but, without unanimous consent, I certainly cannot allow him to do so.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The facts are as have been stated by you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Militia was in his seat, and the items were called and passed. My hon. friend (Mr. Vien) did not notice that and consequently lost his opportunity. At the same time, I would be very sorry to have him go away feeling that he had been disappointed in his purpose. Let us put through these estimates and put through concurrence. Then I am going back to motions, and, with the consent of the House, my hon. friend can then take his time.

Mr. BUREAU: We cannot rely on the unanimous consent of the House. Some hon. member might object.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: We will take it on concurrence.

Mr. VIEN: It will take longer on a motion to adjourn.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Canadian Government Railways, working expenses, further amount required, $8,500,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Before this item is carried I wish to have a parting word with the Minister of Railways on the question of patronage on the Intercolonial railway. I have brought this matter to his attention several times, but I have not yet had a clear and distinct statement from him as to the policy of the Government in this matter. We all know that the employees of the Government railways were excluded from the Civil Service Act which has just been passed. I want to tell the minister that in Eastern Canada the patronage system still exists on the Intercolonial railway notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister stated some months ago that it had been abolished. It has not been abolished. When I brought this matter up a few days ago the minister said that he had had a conversation with the superintendent of the road, and that he had told the superintendent he had a free hand with regard to the question of patronage. Now that is not sufficient to bring about the reform we desire. The general superintendent will be afraid to offend members of Parliament in that part of Canada by enforcing this reform unless he is backed up by the whole strength of the minister, and the minister so far has not taken the action that is to be desired. In Nova Scotia we have a committee which looks after securing employment for returned soldiers. The committee is very active and has done splendid work in the way of finding employment for the men who are coming back from the front. The secretary of the committee a few days ago wrote a letter to the master mechanic on the eastern division of the Intercolonial railway. It had occurred to this committee that some of these soldiers might be given positions as brakemen or cleaners on the railway, and this letter I have referred to was written for the purpose of eliciting from the master mechanic a statement that he would accept applications for employment of that kind from returned soldiers. Let me read the reply to that letter:

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.
Eastern Lines.

R. H. Martin,
Superintendent Dist. No. 4.
Stellarton, N.S., April 22, 1918.

Secretary, Returned Soldiers' Employment Committee,
65 Metropole Building,
Halifax, N.S.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 16th instant to hand, in regard to the employment of returned soldiers.

If you have two machinists, I could place them at Sydney. In regard to wipers and cleaners employed at the roundhouses, I would refer them to Mr. A. McGregor, M.P., New Glasgow, for a recommendation, as this has always been the practice when taking on employees in the railway.

Yours truly,
W. N. Ingram,
Master Mechanic.

Mr. Ingram has the duty of employing men on the eastern division of the Intercolonial, and in this letter he tells the secretary of the committee that if he wants to get a position on the road for a returned soldier as a wiper or cleaner, which is the meanest position on the Intercolonial, the applicant must get a recommendation from Mr. A. McGregor, M. P., for New Glasgow. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, a young soldier just back from Vimy Ridge who wants a position of this kind on the Intercolonial going to the door of one of the shops on the Intercolonial and with hat in hand asking for a job, being told that he must first get letter of recommendation from someone distributing patronage for the district! If this is done in the case of returned soldiers, what will be the chances of a young fellow who belongs to the opposite political party? What I want from the minister is a plain and clear-cut statement that he will apply the rule of no patronage on the Intercolonial railway; that he will have a notice nailed on the doors of all the shops to the effect that no recommendation will be required from any patronage committee in the case of any applicant seeking a position; that men will be given positions on

their merits, and will not be required to bring a certificate from Mr. McGregor or any body else. If the minister will make such a statement it will be quite satisfactory. I know he does not intend that the present conditions should prevail on the road, but the conditions I have described certainly do exist at the present time, and unless some positive action is taken by the minister they will continue to exist.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think I stated in the House a few days ago that I had informed the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, Mr. Hayes, that in operating the road he could employ any one he saw fit without regard to the political party to which the applicant belonged. I am sorry the party mentioned in that letter should take the stand he does as far as returned soldiers are concerned. The only recommendation any returned soldier wants to get a position on the Intercolonial railway or in any department of this Government is himself. The returned soldier will be given preference over everybody else. With reference to patronage outside of returned soldiers, I gave instructions to Mr. Hayes that he was to employ people on their merits, and those instructions, I suppose, he would circulate among all the officials serving under him who had authority to employ help. I gave him instructions by letter only to-day, for I have received a copy of the letter my hon. friend has read, and I will expect those instructions to be carried out. I do not think the hon. member for New Glasgow, the hon. member for Guysborough or any other member, wants to be bothered with patronage if he can get out of it; that is the way I feel about it, and I have not been bothered with patronage either on the railway or anywhere else since Civil Service reform was brought about. Neither Mr. McGregor nor any other member has recommended me to employ any person on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: He is certainly doing it, as this letter shows.

Mr. J. D. REID: He is assuming that responsibility himself. I do not think I could make my position any plainer than I have done. If the instructions I have given are not carried out we shall be having another session some months hence, and hon. gentlemen can come back and make any complaints they wish.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would it not be well to put that letter of instruction on Hansard?

Supplementary estimates, 1918-19, Department of Justice, including Penitentiary Branch —To provide for a clerkship in First Division, Subdivision A, $2,800.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the Minister of Justice inform me whether he has appointed the new inspectors for the penitentiaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: That has not as yet received its sanction, so that it would be a little difficult for me to have made any appointments under it. Moreover, these offices will, I understand, be like all others.

Department of Mines—Contingencies—for expenses of a representation of the Dominion of Canada on the advisory body of the Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, London, England, $2,000.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I understand that this bureau is established in accordance with a resolution adopted at the Imperial Conference of last year. I am glad the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is in his seat and that I may have an opportunity to say what I have to say previous to his departure for London to attend another conference with certain members of the Government. The main resolution which was adopted last year, and with which I thoroughly agree, concerning the political readjustment of the different parts of the Empire, reads as follows:

> The Imperial War Conference is of opinion that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be dealt with during the war, and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference to be summoned as soon as possibles after the cessation of hostilities.

But I submit that other resolutions adopted at the same conference are somewhat objectionable, though it may seem presumptuous on my part to criticise in any way the statesmen who took part in that conference. What I fear is that certain gentlemen, certain groups and certain organizations, are taking advantage of the war, and of the conditions created by the war, to try to create a situation or condition of accomplished facts in order to promote their ambitions, and that they propose a readjustment according to their own view. It is said that these commissions and bureaus are only created for the purposes of the war. That was said in answer to a question asked the other day of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). In this connection, I wish to read to the committee the following resolution which was

adopted at the conference last year in regard to the control of resources:

> The control of natural resources available within the Empire, especially those that are of an essential character for necessary national purposes, whether in peace or in war.

In regard to this Imperial Mineral Bureau, for which we are now asked to vote a sum of money, it is said:

> That it is desirable to establish in London an Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau upon which should be represented Great Britain, the Dominions, India, and other parts of the Empire.

So this control of what certain gentlemen call "Imperial resources" is advocated for times of peace as well as for times of war. What about this particular Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau? This Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau has been recommended by the Imperial War Conference of last year upon a suggestion by the Dominions Royal Commission, of which the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce was a member. I commend to the members of the committee these words which I find in the report of the commission:

> It is not difficult, however, to imagine conditions even in times of peace, in which it might become desirable to use the possession of these assets as an instrument of commercial negotiation. The practical monopoly of potash which Germany possesses has enabled her to exert pressure on other countries in the past, and the controversy between Germany and the United States in 1911 may be mentioned as an example of the influence which the possession of a raw material monopoly gives in commercial negotiations between two Powers. The possession of assets such as the Canadian asbestos and nickle supplies could be used by the British Empire as a powerful means of economic defence.

The commission, of which the right hon. gentleman was a member, recommended that the assets of Canada should be considered as belonging to the Empire as a whole and might be used to advantage by the united governments of all parts of the Empire in the negotiation of commercial treaties with foreign countries. I do not desire that this particular vote should be considered as a ratification of the resolutions, especially of the wording of the resolutions, which were adopted at the Imperial Conference of last year. The resources of Canada are national resources and should be so considered. Nothing should be done of such a nature or character as to prejudice, or interfere in any way with, the great task which will confront the statesmen of the Empire after the conclusion of the war.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had expected that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) would before his departure for the old country give us a precis of the objects of his visit to London to attend the next Imperial Conference. He had promised to make a statement to the House but he has not made it. He had also promised to give us the names of those who were to accompany him on his visit. I wish to emphasize the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). I do not object to the presence of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues at any Imperial Conference provided that at that conference nothing is decided upon without the free and unshackled consent of the people of Canada. Last year's conference was held in London and several important matters were discussed. First, the navy scheme was discussed and the Admiralty was requested to work out, immediately after the conclusion of the war, what it considered the most effective scheme for the naval defence of the Empire. I would not wish to enter upon a naval debate this evening, but while we do not object to our statesmen discussing with the Imperial authorities the actual needs of the war, the time is not ripe when they should proceed in advance and commit the credit of Canada and of the Dominions to any future naval schemes. Other questions were decided with regard to the military situation, standardization, military training, the question of Imperial resources which has been brought up by my hon. friend from Kamouraska, and preferential treatment, this last being a very dangerous subject to discuss at the present time, because when the war is over the policy of preferential treatment between the British Empire on the one hand and the rest of the world on the other will create a very complex situation.

The CHAIRMAN: I fear that the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am just about to conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and it is just as well to have from the right hon. leader of the House a word or two on the contemplated visit, because in the last dying hours of Parliament we have had no explanations whatever with respect to this important matter. I do not wish to detain the House at any length, and I will conclude my remarks if the Chairman will afford me the opportunity of merely stating this: We are all proud to belong to the British Empire, but we are all Canadians,

and at the forthcoming Imperial Conference we hope, as Canadians and as free British subjects, that the interests of Canada will not be jeopardized. I, in common with many other Canadians, view with alarm the constant agitation of these round table clubs and Imperial circles, and the reunion of those framers of Imperial constitutions. I remember that Mr. Chamberlain many years ago—

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but I will have to ask the hon. member to desist. He is absolutely out of order in discussing these questions on this item I have called a great many of the younger members to order, and I cannot do otherwise with the hon. member for Maisonneuve.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not be sorry, Mr. Chairman; I will bow gracefully to your decision, but before doing so I wish to conclude my remarks. Whilst at the Imperial Conference let the representatives of the Canadian Government work in conjunction and in harmony with the British authorities towards the winning of the war but let them not jeopardize the interests of Canada by wild Imperialistic schemes. The world is against imperialism just now.

Mr. MURPHY: Before the item is carried, we would like some information as to who is to be selected for this mission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will allow the business to go through so that we can get somewhere near the object that we have in view—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not obstruct.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —There will be a few moments in which I will make some remarks with reference to the mission and the persons who are going.

Mr. MURPHY: I will just ask the one question.

Mr. BURRELL: I will answer my hon. friend. The gentleman who has been selected to represent Canada on the Imperial Resources Board is Dr. Miller, of Toronto, Provincial Geologist of Ontario, whose salary they are paying. Dr. Miller is a very well known geologist, and this amount is intended to meet his expenses.

Mr. MURPHY: I simply want to have the assurance of my hon. friend that this gentleman is not a nominee of Lord Beaverbrook.

Mr. BURRELL: Not at all.

Mr. MURPHY: Because I have reason to know that Lord Beaverbrook is very much interested in imperializing the resources of Canada.

Mr. BURRELL: Dr. Miller was selected after a conference of various representatives of the provincal governments and mining men throughout the country, including the Mining institute.

High Commissioner's Office, London—To provide an additional amount for three clerks, $300.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I desire in connection with this vote to offer a suggestion, or present a request to the Government—perhaps I should say that I am only claiming a right. I was in London last year and I happened to go to the High Commissioner's office in company with two lawyers from the city of Quebec—Mr. J. E. Chapleau, K.C., and Mr. Simon Lapointe, K.C. One of my companions was curious to learn whether he could be understood in French in the High Commissioner's office. The first official to whom he spoke only shook his head. He then went into the various rooms in the building and tried to get the information he wanted, but nowhere in the High Commissioner's office in London could the French language be understood. Now, Mr. Chairman, the French language is spoken everywhere in London. In the large stores, in all the hotels, in all the public offices, and in the railway stations, notices are posted in both languages. In all the large churches, even of the Church of England—and there are very few Frenchmen who belong to that denomination—French is recognized. In St. Paul's Cathedral and the other churches you will observe notices posted in both French and English. In the city of London the French language occupies the position which it enjoys in all civilized countries and among all educated people. Sir, it is a pity, and I thought it was regrettable, that the only place where French could not be either spoken or understood was the office of the High Commissioner for Canada, a country in which the French language is official. I avail myself of this opportunity to ask that this grievance be redressed, and that at least one of the three clerks who are to be appointed as a result of this vote shall be a person able to understand the questions of gentlemen of French extraction who may go to London and who want to be heard and understood in their own language.

10 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is a little mistaken, but it is probably the wording of the item which has led to the error. The item does not mean that there are three additional clerks to be appointed to the High Commissioner's office, as my hon. friend will see when he notes that only $300 is being voted. What this means is that a statutory increase is asked for three clerks. However, that does not take away from the other portion of my hon. friend's remarks, and I shall have very great pleasure in giving the substance and the very words of his statement here to-night to the Prime Minister, under whom the High Commissioner's office is placed, and who will take the matter into consideration. I do not think that what my hon. friend has said is unreasonable.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Canadian Government Railways.

To provide for the purchase of the following Railways at amounts not exceeding those set out in each case:—

Elgin and Havelock Railway	$30,000 00
York and Carleton Railway	18,000 00
St. Martin's Railway	65,000 00
Salisbury and Albert Railway	75,000 00
Moncton and Buctouche Railway ..	70,000 00
Kent Northern Railway	60,000 00
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway ..	200,000 00
	$518,000 00

Mr. CAHILL: Judging by this item there seems to be quite a flock of lame ducks seeking shelter under the protecting wings of the Minister of Railways and Canals. And before he gets too far into the railway game in this country, into the business of acquiring all the railways in sight, he and the Government should take into their very serious consideration the question of the counties which are paying bonuses to railways. The county of Pontiac, which I have the honour to represent, voted a bonus of $200,000 a few years ago to get a railroad. Of that they still have to pay $100,000. They will also have to assume their proportion of the cost of the purchase of these and other railroads; they have to stand the burden of the increased freight rates and passenger fares as well. They understood they were to be benefited by this railway when they agreed to pay this bonus, but they have no railroad communication whatever, yet they are in a position of paying a bonus, and having to pay ferry charges every time they go across the lake at Pembroke, representing an increased expenditure there of five or six thousand dollars a year to get their produce to market. While the minister is spending money for railways in lavish amounts, I think something should be done to relieve these people of that bonus. I think other counties than Pontiac have probably paid bonuses to have railroads built. If it is the policy of the Dominion of Canada to take over these railroads, they will, I hope, not demand the payment of at least that proportion of the bonus not yet paid.

Mr. J. D. REID: The matter referred to by the hon. member is of course a very large question, and it is the first time I have had any suggestion of this kind. I should be glad if he would put in writing to me the suggestion he has just made in order that I may give it consideration during the recess. It is too large a question to discuss here at this late hour. With respect to the several small lines in the province of New Brunswick, covered by this item, they have been operating for years at a loss, and it is really now impossible for them to operate on account of the loss they are making. We are now taking them over, and not at a price that any one would feel is exorbitant For instance, in the case of the Elgin and Havelock railway, they have agreed to sell their lines for $30,000. The rails alone on that line, if we were to sell them for scrap, are worth about $80,000.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask my hon. friend who are the directors of that railway, or, at least, who is the president?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not say. There is a Mr. Pearson in Halifax, connected with it. All of these railways we are getting at about one-third the value of the rails. I have a word to say about the last two. For the Kent Northern, I have put in an amount of $60,000. They have not agreed to accept that amount. Neither have the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway agreed to accept the amount of $200,000. To those two lines we have made these offers, which are on about the same basis as the others mentioned before. If they do not accept, we will not pay any higher price, and these amounts will not be paid. But I am placing them in the Estimates to give them the opportunity, and to allow us to take over the lines, and thus close out the branch lines which are so unsatisfactory in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MURPHY: Out of deference to the wishes of hon. gentlemen to wind up the business of the session and get home, I do not at this stage intend to enter the protest against these purchases, which it

was my original intention to do. However, I desire my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals—who refers to a matter relating to the county represented by my hon. friend from Pontiac, involving, I think $100,000, as so large that he has not time to deal with it, but who is asking us to vote $518,000 as a comparatively small sum to these other railways—to submit to the House at the opening of the next session the full correspondence relating to the purchases of these roads, giving all details as to the ownership and directorates in each case.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall certainly be glad to do that.

Mr. TURGEON: I could not allow this item to pass without making some remarks. I have explained my position with regard to the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, and I do not intend to rehearse the argument I put before the minister at that time. However, my chief fear was that the company in possession of this railway would not accept the amount that was offered to them. In the early days of the session, I suggested to the Minister of Public Works that the best way to handle this matter would be to expropriate the road and arbitrate afterwards. We want to ensure a service equal, at least, to the necessities of the community in the county of Gloucester. I suggested at the time to the minister that, although I did not think the proposed amount of $200,000 would be accepted, he might put it in the Estimates. He refused at the time to put it in. On second thought, he has included the amount of $200,000, which is in the Estimates together with the corollary "not exceding those set out in each case." I am afraid these words will render an arrangement as impossible as it was last week when I spoke on this question. The Minister of Public Works especially knows the feeling existing to-day in the county of Gloucester with reference to transportation facilities, which are of vital moment for our important industries which cannot do without an efficient service. I had hoped before prorogation that I might possibly get either from the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Railways and Canals a statement that would dispel the disquiet now prevailing.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend wants a statement I will give it to him now. We have offered them $200,000 for the railway. They cannot make two hundred thousand cents out of it for the next ten years. We will not arbitrate. We will not pay any more. We think they will take it.

Branch lines—to bring Lines up to Canadian Government Railways Branch lines standard, $200,000.

Mr. MURPHY: I desire to ask my hon. friend if this amount is to be expended on the branch lines which were set out in the previous item.

Mr. J. D. REID: Exactly, if we get them all. But if we do not get the Caraquet and Gulf Shore or the Kent Northern, we will only need probably a third of the amount.

Railways generally—Contribution towards cost of construction of a railway bridge on the Canada Central Railway, over the Peace River, at or near Peace River Crossing, Alberta, $175,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is bearing the rest of that cost?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Alberta Government.

To acquire free and clear of all charges, encumbrances or claims, at any public sale, the Quebec and Saguenay railway, extending from its junction with the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway to Nairn Falls, Que., about 62.3 miles, at a price not exceeding $3,489,313.53, $3,489,313.53.

Mr. J. D. REID: I desire to add to the end of this item the words "exclusive of any sums paid out of amounts voted by Parliament in 1916 and 1917." That is so that there may be no misunderstanding.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is the total amount that has been paid out?

Mr. J. D. REID: About $1,500,000, in addition to this.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain this item a little more fully?

Mr. J. D. REID: Two years ago an Act was passed authorizing the purchase of this railway, with two others, the Quebec and Saguenay, and the Lotbiniere and Megantic. We are now taking only the Quebec and Saguenay. I have before me the judgment of Judge Cassels, in which the amount of the award is stated as $2,892,249.87. Then there are two years' payments during construction on monthly balances, $228,519.63, and interest from July 1, 1916, up to the present time, $373,854.84.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister is not increasinig the judgment of the Exchequer Court?

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. CAHILL: Is this to be a final payment? Shall we have title to the property when this payment is made?

Mr. J. D. REID: We cannot pay one dollar of this until they hand us the deeds and the title, free from all encumbrances.

Harbours and rivers—Quebec harbour—river St. Charles—improvements to navigation—further amount required—revote, $386,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood that the works on the river St. Charles had been dropped.

Mr. CARVELL: This is not for the continuation of that work. The work was stopped nearly a year and and the contractors are contending that because of the closing down of their works, a portion of their plant should be taken over and certain amounts paid them by way of damages. I do not admit for a moment that we are liable for those claims, but an adjustment is to take place. There is also the question of the amount that we thought might possibly be required in the adjustment of the case referred to by my hon. friend this afternoon.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is provision for that adjustment, then?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. This amount is to take care of every possible contingency. No work will go on at the river St. Charles until the financial condition of the country is different, and no money will be paid out of this vote until the matter is thoroughly investigated.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I see that there is an item here for St. John harbour. I saw a report in the press the other day that a contract in this connection had been let for $7,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not true.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is this expenditure in St. John harbour?

Mr. CARVELL: It is to carry on a contract that has been running for some years —the Norton, Griffiths contract.

Mr. MURPHY: Has it not expired?

Mr. CARVELL: No, the contract has been assigned to the St. John Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, a new company, which took over all the rights and works of the old contractors. They have filed their specifications for a dry dock of the first class, similar to the new dry dock at Lauzanne. They hope to be able to make arrangements to commence operations soon, and this is to carry out some necessary harbour works without which the dry dock could not be operated.

[Mr. Cahill.]

Mr. MURPHY: Who are the gentlemen connected with the new company?

Mr. CARVELL: I can only say this: it is really the Canadian Dredging Company of Collingwood, of which Mr. Playfair is president.

Mr. FIELDING: This dry dock comes under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: And is not included in this vote?

Mr. CARVELL: No. They have made application for a subsidy under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act.

Mr. MURPHY: How does this next item, Toronto harbour improvements, find its way into the Estimates?

Mr. CARVELL: This amount is necessary to finish up work that is now partly constructed. So far as we can see, this is the total amount that will be necessary until new financial arrangements are made.

Mr. MURPHY: The vote does not relate to new work?

Mr. CARVELL: No. Crib work has been built up to within two or three feet of the top of the water, and this is to put the top on the crib work and keep it from being lost. About $200,000 is invested in the cribs, and the engineers report that unless something is done it will all be lost.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the public utility of this work when it is finished?

Mr. CARVELL: Very little, in my judgment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister is very frank.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—generally —construction and repairs, $55,000.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: Has provision been made for repairs to Glace Bay harbour? Has the minister decided upon the policy of taking over that harbour and making it a public harbour? At present this harbour is owned by the Dominion Coal company and representations have been made that it should be taken over by the Government. I understand the minister has had the matter up. Has he come to any decision?

Mr. CARVELL: This amount of $55,000 has been asked for the carrying out of repairs generally in the province of Nova Scotia. I have received an enormous num-

ber of applications from the different engineers stating that wharves and breakwaters have been injured by ice and severe storms. In fact, the reports were so much alike in each case that I thought it was best to have a general appropriation and to make an investigation, and I propose to have a pretty thorough investigation before the money is expended. I never knew until a few days ago that the harbour of Glace Bay was not owned by the public. I understand it is, and has been for some years, owned by the Nova Scotia Steel Company. There have been some negotiations towards handing it over to the department. I am not in a position to say what the result will be, but I can only state that, in my judgment, the harbour of as important a town or city as Glace Bay should be public property, and, therefore, if proper arrangements can be made, it would not only be proper, but in the public interest of the commercial life of that district, that it should be made a public harbour. I cannot say that any amount of this $55,000 is intended for that purpose. The $55,000 is left in a general way, and will be used as we think best for the repairing of wharves and breakwaters in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MURPHY: After investigation?

Mr. CARVELL: After investigation.

Mr. FIELDING: The appropriation being a general one, we are disposed to ask what is contemplated by it. I accept, however, the assurance of the minister that he is going to make an investigation. That is satisfactory. I had occasion to bring to the notice of the minister some urgent matters of repair in my constituency, and if he will investigate them with the help of his engineers, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. McKENZIE: Hon. members from Nova Scotia who are supporting the Government are making a very poor job. New Brunswick is getting $678,000, and the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) an able representative—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Nova Scotia got the large plate mill.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is such a thing as I have read in the scriptures: "You must needs go through Samaria."

Mr. CARVELL: Twenty-five or thirty million dollars of public moneys are being spent in the province of Nova Scotia this year.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. McKENZIE: You are up against the wrong chicken if you think you are going to make me sit down. I shall be very brief if you will let me alone; if you are not, it will be daylight. I simply want to tell my hon. friends from Nova Scotia supporting the Government that they made a very poor job of this. They get a miserabe $55,000, and they are not going to get it in a particular place; it is put between Heaven and earth where it will not help anybody. The good little province of New Brunswick, however, with an active solid minister, gets $667,000. That is what I remind the supporters of the Government of, and I want to tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he is throwing the plate mill up to us, he had to go where the substance of the matter was and get it there.

Mr. BUTTS: Is it not true that this harbour of which the minister has spoken was given away from this country to the Dominion Coal Company without a cent of consideration?

Mr. BUREAU: By whom?

Mr. BUTTS: By the former Liberal Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: Glace Bay river was a small brook, and the late Hon. David MacKeen, who at one time had a seat in this House, owned the old Caledonia mines. That enterprising gentleman and his company dug out that little river and made a little bit of a harbour for themselves in connection with the mines. They claimed it was their own because they opened the mouth of the river. About twelve years ago an arrangement was made with this Government.

Mr. BUTTS: Not with this Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: With the Government at Ottawa. I was in the House at the time. I should have known that this Government would make no arrangement of any kind. There was made with the Government of the Dominion of Canada an arrangement by which some moneys were expended in the harbour of Glace Bay. The Minister of Public Works will find that contract in his office. The company gave away certain rights to the public for the consideration of some public moneys being spent there, and there is an agreement of that kind. We never owned that harbour; it is merely a little river which is opened up for the purpose of the mines. We know all about it down home. If my hon. friend (Mr. Butts) does not know about it, he is the

only man in that part of the world who does not.

Harbours and rivers—Prince Edward Island—Mink river, repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. McISAAC: I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works concerning two matters. One is the boat harbour at North Lake and the other the dredging of the boat harbour at Newfrage. As the minister understands, there is now at North Lake a boat harbour where the boats can come in and out at high water; but in consequence of the shifting of the sand, it is likely to become shallower and fill up. Further than that, the provincial Government finds it necessary to build a bridge across there, and it would be out of reason for them to do so unless something was done by the Federal Government to make the harbour substantial. This is a matter of extreme importance to a very large number of fishermen.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has brought this matter before me a number of times during the last three months. I have made inquiries, and I find a report from the engineer that it would require some $15,000 or $30,000 to do this work. I have information from a gentleman in whom I have the very greatest confidence that about $2,000 will do it. I am going to investigate the matter. There is a general vote for the Maritime Provinces, and if the work can be done for a reasonable sum of money, I may be able to arrange to do it out of the general fund. I shall, however, have the matter thoroughly investigated and do whatever is proper.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, further amount required, $70,000.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Has the Minister of Railways made arrangements to dredge the approaches to Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse.

Mr. J. D. REID: The chief engineer is looking after the matter now. I expect to be down in that locality within the next few weeks and I shall take the matter up.

Mines and Geological Survey—For experimental work relating to briquetting of lignite coal, $200,000.

Grant for investigation of conditions affecting smelting of lead-zinc ores, $3,000—$203,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is to carry on this experimental work in connection with lignite?

Mr. BURRELL: It is to be carried on by an advisory board of three, appointed under an arrangement between this Government and the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this one of the results of the investigations made by the Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Labour—Administration Employment Offices, Co-ordination Act, $15,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask the Minister of Labour what are the latest developments in connection with the Winnipeg strike. I see that Premier Norris of Manitoba is in Ottawa to-day. Has he had an interview with the minister in reference to the strike?

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not seen the Prime Minister of Manitoba in connection with this matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is here.

Mr. CROTHERS: Very well, but I have not seen him. I received two telegrams from Winnipeg this afternoon, the latter indicating that the whole thing will be adjusted inside of twenty-four hours.

Mr. KEEFER: Has the minister an officer in British Columbia who could investigate the question of wages paid to the fishermen to see whether they are reasonable? The situation is this. We are encouraging people to eat fish, and halibut come largely from the Pacific coast. In 1915 the men were all found in nets, food and everything else and the price was $1.25 per hundred pounds; in 1916 the price rose, in 1917 it rose to $2.12, and now it is $3. This cannot be due to the high cost of living or anything of that kind because the men, as I have said, are found in food and everything else. It is a matter that ought to be looked into because it affects the price of fish very much. I am told that a good many of these fishermen are of alien race and not in sympathy with the Food Administration and they are making things difficult in this way. I think it would be of great assistance if the minister would appoint an officer to look into this matter.

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend would send me a memo, setting forth the particulars of the complaint—

Mr. KEEFER: The complaint is that there has been an increase of 140 per cent in the price the men are getting for their fish.

Mr. CROTHERS: We all know that wages have been increasing in the last few years, as well as everything else. I am not prepared to state that wages have advanced as rapidly as some other things. However, if my hon. friend will send me a memo. I will have our agent on the Pacific coast look into the matter, but I do not expect to find that the fishermen are being paid too high wages.

Mr. HARRISON: Representations have been made by officials of the Trade Unions that a wrong impression has been created by the statement made by the hon. member for South Vancouver on April 22, to the effect that one-third of the membership of the unions are alien enemies or aliens of neutral countries. I have been informed on good authority that this is wrong, that not over ten per cent of the membership are alien enemies or aliens of neutral countries The unions pride themselves on their loyalty during this struggle, and resent the implication that any material fraction of membership could influence action inimical to the best interests of the Empire. They also claim that by reason of their association with aliens, enemy and otherwise, in the unions and at work, they are in a peculiarly fortunate position to detect any unfriendly disposition on the part of any of said aliens and to take such action in consequence as will ensure the greatest measure of safety to the Empire. The unions are anxious that nothing should be said that would lead to misunderstanding and consequent friction, and express the hope that the hon. member from South Vancouver had only the best interest of all concerned in mind when he made the statement, and was in not particular antagonistic to the unions which have aided so materially in the present crisis. With regard to the present difficulties at Winnipeg I must say it is deplorable that conditions of this kind should arise at the present time. I do not know whether every possible means have been tried by the men to effect a settlement, but if not I can assure the House that they are not working in accord with the principles of organized labour as I know it.

Miscellaneous — Provisional allowance (except in the case of light-house keepers') for married men and for widowers and widows, with children, in the Outside Service, who are employed permanently and are giving their entire time to the public service, such allowance to be made on the following basis:

(a) To each such person in receipt of a salary at the rate of $1,200 per annum or less, an allowance of $150 less any permanent increase in salary given to such person since January 1st, 1917, provided however the total salary and allowance shall not in any case exceed $1,300;

(b) To each such person in receipt of a salary at the rate of more than $1,200 but not more than $1,550 per annum, an allowance of $100, less any permanent increase in salary given to such person since January 1st, 1917, provided, however, the total salary and allowance shall not in any case exceed $1,600, $3,000,000.00.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I should like to know whether this expenditure is going to end here. This increase of $3,000,000, which I presume is one of the first results of the new Civil Service Act, is a considerable item to pass without discussion, representing an increase unparalleled in this House. We were discussing a little while ago the question of providing an increase for postmasters and rural mail carriers, who, if the comparison is permissible, are giving their time for one-half the amount these civil servants receive. I want to point out that this is one of the effects, during war time too, of the Bill that was passed at this session of the House, and without any very great demand, I consider, from the people of Ontario, at all events.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend is certainly mistaken in attributing this vote to the passing of the Civil Service Act, as there is no connection between the two. Very many representations have been made to the Government for a war bonus to the Outside Service, limited to those who were devoting their whole time to the public service and were in receipt of smaller salaries. I desire to amend the phraseology of the vote by inserting the following words in the first paragraph, after the word "Service," in the third line:

And also when deemed advisable by the Governor in Council for unmarried persons in the outside service with dependents and for married persons and unmarried persons with dependents of the inside service of the rank of messengers, packers and sorters, and also to strike out the words "January 1, 1917" and substitute the words "April 1, 1918" in sub clauses A and B.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. KEEFER: Are the Dominion police included in this item?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. KEEFER: Should they not be taken into consideration?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I explained in answer to a question when the Dominion Police Estimates were up, we are proposing to give the Dominion police an increase in their pay.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why are lighthouse keepers not included?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An increase was provided for them under item 409 of the Estimates we are now considering.

Amount to pay claims for clothing and articles lost in destruction by fire in the Parliament Buildings, $3,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the Government give the details of this item? I understand that last year we had a return tabled showing the extravagant claims made by some people. I would like to have full information from the Government on this subject.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is merely a vote to cover what we anticipate we will have to pay.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We want the details showing what you are going to do, because there were fictitious claims filed last year. The Government has refused for two years, through the Auditor General first and then through, I am glad to say, the very able and faithful official who preceded the present Serjeant-at-Arms, the late Lieut.-Col. Smith, who put his veto on these claims, to accede to the demands which were made and which were nothing less than scandalous. I would like to have all the details about this expenditure.

Mr. BUREAU: Does this item include any articles except those which were lost by employees at the time of the fire?

Mr. DOHERTY: Generally speaking, although I cannot say absolutely that no person who was not an employee may not possibly receive something. We received a large number of claims which my hon. friend properly enough has described as extravagant. I do not know that it was necessary to have the intervention of any officials of the Government to prevent their being paid. The matter has been looked into by a committee which was appointed for that purpose, and having arrived at the specified amount which people ought to receive, we determined to ask for this vote which, upon its face, is not extravagant, to meet a number of small claims. The great bulk of them were from employees in and around the buildings, people who could ill afford to suffer the loss that was serious, though the amounts in each case are not large. I do not recall at the moment any considerable sum that would be paid to any individual.

Resolution agreed to on division.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Railways and canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Canadian Government Railways—working expenses, $37,000,000.

Mr. MURPHY: What is that item for?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is for the operation of the Government railways. Last year we had an item of $25,000,000. We have just passed an item of $8,500,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, making between $33,000,000 and $34,000,000 that it cost last year to operate the Government railways. This year we estimate it will take about $37,000,000, but, of course, the earnings are deposited to the credit of the Receiver General and will offset that amount. This is merely a bookkeeping entry. Earlier in the session I introduced a Bill to take the place of this item, but I dropped the Bill later on.

Mr. MURPHY: Does this cover any actual or estimated loss on operation?

Mr. J. D. REID: I estimate there will probably be a loss of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 next year and that is included.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We have already voted $8,500,000 for this purpose.

Mr. J. D. REID: That was for last year.

POST OFFICE—OUTSIDE SERVICE.

To provide for the salaries of the Postmaster and staff of the following Post Offices, the salaries may be readjusted and appointments made notwithstanding anything in that portion of the Civil Service Act affecting the Outside Postal Service, or the Post Office Act—Sydney, Truro, Amherst, Moncton, St. Hyacinthe, Three Rivers, Cornwall, Brockville, Smith's Falls, Belleville, Lindsay, Niagara Falls, St. Catharines, Woodstock, St. Thomas, Chatham, Sarnia, Collingwood, Owen Sound, North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur, Fort William, Portage la Prairie, Prince Albert, Strathcona, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Nanaimo and Prince Rupert, $310,000.00.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain on what principle these selections were made?

Mr. DOHERTY: This item, while it figures here, does not imply our obtaining any additional money. It is inserted to effect the abolition of what were called semi-staff offices and to place them on a parity with the offices where we directly pay the salaries. Though in the semi-staff offices fixed salaries were paid, those salaries were paid out of the revenue of the post office. The object of this is that while we take a vote for $310,000, the entire revenue of these post offices will now come into the general office. This is really not adding a cent to the expenditure of the

Post Office Department, but it is abolishing a system which has given rise to a good deal of complaint and recrimination and has not proved of material advantage.

Mr. CARVELL: Is that Woodstock, Ont., or Woodstock, N.B.?

Mr. DOHERTY: It just depends on which one of them is a semi-staff office.

Hr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The officials in some towns are receiving an
11 p.m. increase and the officials in other towns are not receiving any. How did the minister select the towns mentioned in this list and leave out other towns?

Mr. DOHERTY: Nobody is being given an increase. But all these towns have semi-staff offices, that is to say, offices where the revenue of the office is taken and the salaries paid out of it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: All the towns that have semi-staff offices are included in this list?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, it is to get rid of the distinction between the regular offices and what are called the semi-staff offices.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend calculated whether the revenue of these semi-staff offices will make up for the amount voted?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am assured that they do. They necessarily must because the salaries paid in the past are not being increased, and those salaries were paid out of the revenue.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolution concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE SUPPLY BILL.

On motion of Mr. A. K. Maclean, the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved:

1. Resolved,—That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1919, the sum of $131,342,638.20 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved,—That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1919, the sum of $46,957,312.68 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

3. Resolved,—That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1918, the sum of $14,034,274.33 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 111, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1918, and the 31st March, 1919.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the Governor General's secretary, announcing that His Excellency would proceed to the Senate Chamber this evening at half past eleven o'clock for the purpose of proroguing the present session of Parliament.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Bruce North): moved:

That the recommendations contained in the third report of the Joint Committee on Printing, presented to the House this day, be concurred in.

He said: The House is asked to concur in two recommendations made by the committee. One is for the discontinuance of the monthly statement of Canadian exports and imports which have been published, I believe, for the last eighteen years. At this session we passed an Act to establish a bureau of statistics which will compile and publish the statement referred to, and we are endeavouring to avoid duplication and overlapping. The other recommendation is that the report of the editorial committee concerning a reduction in the grade and weight of paper used in Government publications be adopted. I may add that the editorial committee, of which Mr. Fred Cook is chairman, has done very valuable work and has saved the country thousands of dollars in the last year.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS.

MOTION THAT THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS BE COMMENDED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved:

That the recommendations contained in the third report of the Special Committee appointed on the 10th day of April, 1918 to consider and report upon the Pension Board, the pension regulations and the sufficiency or otherwise of the relief afforded thereunder, the pension lists in force in Canada for disabled and other soldiers and the dependents of those killed while on active service, and any other matters relating thereto or connected therewith, be commended to the consideration of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald) moved:

That 500 copies in English, and 250 copies in French, of the first and second reports of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be printed in pamphlet form forwith, and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

THE FARMERS' DELEGATION.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GOVERNOR GENERAL, THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have an understanding with the right hon. leader of the Government that I shall be given opportunity to direct the attention of the House for a few moments to a matter which I deem to be of considerable importance. I shall not take up much of the time of the House; I have not much time to take up, anyway. If an agreement had not been made for prorogation this evening, a much longer debate would have taken place on this matter. However, I do not wish to delay the business of the House, as our friends on this side do not desire to delay prorogation unduly beyond the time agreed upon.

On 14th May a delegation of farmers some 4,000 strong, came to Ottawa from all parts of Canada, representing, I might say, not only the districts from which they came, but the whole rural population of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. VIEN: At least, large sections of the rural population of Canada. Hon. gentlemen who say "No" may find that the population represented by these delegates is a larger one than they imagine. These delegates embodied in a report the conclusions of their deliberations, a copy of which they sent to the Prime Minister. They also addressed to you, Mr. Speaker, a communication which passed almost unnoticed. Subsequently a further communication was addressed to His Excellency the Governor General. I ask the leave of the House to lay this correspondence on the Table and to have it embodied in Hansard without my reading it.

Mr. SPEAKER: A great deal of this correspondence came to my hand. It attempts to put in the form of a letter what is, in effect, a petition which, in that form, would be precluded from presentation to the House.

Mr. VIEN: Then I shall read the documents. The following is the communication to the Governor General:

His Excellency,
The Duke of Devonshire,
Governor General of Canada,
Ottawa, Can.

Your Excellency:—

The undersigned, in exercising the immemorial privilege of British subjects, are confident that Your Excellency will honour the ancient practice of the highest authority in the realm of hearing sympathetically the representations of the citizens upon matters affecting the good government of Canada.

We are encouraged to transmit to you certain information by the knowledge that those who have preceded you as a representative of the Crown in the working of responsible Government in Canada, have been swift to regard any endeavours of departure from the constitutional usages by which the freedom of Parliament and of the individual citizen has been established.

Since Your Excellency's arrival among us, we have had every reason to be assured that Your Excellency is imbued with the conciliatory far-seeing and statesmanlike spirit which animated Lord Elgin, to whom Canada and the Empire will ever be indebted for a wise and courageous guidance within the powers confided to him.

We believe, therefore, that you will welcome this expression of our trust during the period of unprecedented difficulty through which the Dominion of Canada is passing.

It is in harmony with Lord Elgin's reply to an address from the County of Glengarry, dealing with the unrest at that time, regarding the administration of public affairs, that we submit for Your Excellency's consideration the attached correspondence with the Speaker of the House of Commons. Perhaps Your Excellency will allow us to repeat what Lord Elgin said to the men of Glengarry, in reply to their address; "I recognize in it evidence of that vigorous understanding which enables men of the stock to which you belong, to prize, as they ought to be prized, the blessings of well-ordered freedom, and of that keen sense of

principle which prompts them to recoil from no sacrifice which duty enjoins."

The letter goes on to make further representations to His Excellency, and attached to it is the correspondence which was subsequently transferred by His Excellency to the Prime Minister. I put a question to the Prime Minister with regard to this matter and was informed by him that he would later make a declaration to the House on the subject.

This announcement by the Prime Minister has not come as yet. I might now read the correspondence which was attached to this letter sent to His Excellency the Governor General:

Windsor Hotel, Ottawa,
May 15th, 1918.

Hon. E. N. Rhodes,
Speaker of the House of Commons.

Sir,—

The delegation of farmers from Ontario, Quebec and other provinces which held several conferences here yesterday charged us to transmit certain information to you with the respectful request that you will convey it to the House of Commons.

The conference yesterday afternoon composed of several thousand farmers decided unanimously to present itself at the House in the evening, with the request that two of its members be heard at the bar, in pursuance of the resolution duly adopted in the morning and forwarded to you. The Prime Minister, who was informed of this intention, referred us to the acting leader of the House, the Hon. Mr. Sifton. The request proffered while the delegation was in and about the precincts of Parliament was refused by the Hon. Mr. Sifton on behalf of the Government. The delegation therefore, in a most orderly manner, returned to its meeting place, where it unanimously endorsed the address which its representatives hal intended reading to the House, and directed us to forward it to you.

It is as follows:—

To the Honourable the Speaker,
and Members of the House of Commons,
of Canada, in Parliament assembled.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen
of the House of Commons:—

On behalf of thousands of Ontario farmers assembled in this city to-day, we warmly thank the House for the proof it has given that it desires to keep in sympathetic touch with the citizens from whom it derives its dignity and authority. We believe we express the sentiments of all thoughtful citizens when we say that this departure in Canadian Parliamentary practice, following so closely upon the speech to this House and the Senate, of the President of the American Federation of Labour, is an agreeable recognition of the new relationships which the war is producing, as between those who govern and those who are governed by consent.

That portion of Canadian labour which is so vital to the prosecution of the war, and which we represent, appreciates to the full the evidence of loyalty which the House of Commons gave in August, 1914, to the democracies of the Western Hemisphere in its instant support of the motherland in her hour of need. We trust that the spontaneous action then taken will be justified by a continuation of those habits of freedom which it has long been the peculiar privilege of Canadians to maintain. These privileges are all the more appreciated in view of the long struggle for responsible government which was undertaken against the opposition of those who exercised arbitrary authority, and who feared the free expression of opinion, in the press and by the spoken word.

We are sure the House will permit us to say also, that the citizens generally have observed with gratitude that the House has shown a larger independence of thought and speech than has been customary under the system of partisan Government. We should fail in the duty of being candid which is cast upon us by the readiness of the House to hear us, if we did not express our concern regarding another tendency that has been observed in the House where the public will is believed to be supreme.

The increasing frankness of discussion so noticeable here, has been accompanied by a tendency to silence on the part of members of the Cabinet, who in reality, are, as one of four distinguished members has said "only a committee of this House."

The unrest in the country which has brought about the unexampled spectacle of thousands of farmers leaving the important work of planting their crops, to come to the capital to remonstrate with the Government, is known to every member of the House of Commons. We beg leave to intimate that this unrest is not related merely to the special matter which was discussed with the Premier and members of his cabinet to-day. We cannot disguise from the House an apprehension that the liberties, of which the popularly elected branch of the Legislature is the bulwark, may be dangerously curtailed during the period that the House is not sitting. In proof that this dread is not illusory, we would venture to inform the House that, in common with our fellow citizens, here and throughout the country, we have observed certain innovations, the continuation of which we believe would be fraught with serious results to the confidence which the subjects of His Majesty have hitherto reposed in the working of that responsible government for whose unimpaired preservation forty thousand Canadian soldiers have laid down their lives.

Will the House permit us to speak more plainly what is in our minds? We have never believed that the conditions produced by the war demanded flagrant departures from the honoured processes of law enjoined by the constitution while Parliament is in session or is near assembling. We believe that reliance upon Parliament, instead of upon arbitrary authority, most effectively honours the guarantees of freedom which are embedded in the constitution. One considerable departure from sound practice may be accepted, but repetitions of it may be exceedingly dangerous, especially under such circumstances as now beset the State.

We, therefore, beg leave to remind the House of several instances in which, it seems to us, the liberties of the people and of their representatives have not been given sufficient consideration.

Twelve days before the meeting of Parliament in January, 1916, the authorized Canadian Army was doubled from 250,000 to 500,000 men. No British Army had ever been doubled without recourse to Parliament. That it was done in Canada caused students of British

history to enquire whether anything had occured to warrant such a disregard of Parliament. Though this House of Commons has inherited some of the consequences of such an innovation, we desire to confine our respectful remonstrances to more recent events.

During the session there were riots in the city of Quebec. The House desired to discuss the serious situation thus created, and was entitled to declare what measures might be taken to prevent a renewal of such unhappy occurrences. It did not escape the notice of the country that immediately before the House proceeded to discharge its duty, there was put upon the table a completed law, in the form of an Order in Council, which arbitrarily took out of its control the very question which the House of Commons was about to discuss.

Later there were other departures from the traditional practice of British law by equally astonishing proceedings. An Order in Council was given to the House as a matter of information providing for the registration of the human power of the country, and setting up an entirely new criminal code in connection therewith, by creating several methods of punishment hitherto unknown to Canadian civilization. Surely such departure should not have been attempted in such a manner. Punishments created without the assent of Parliament naturally tend to provoke hostility. We feel we are performing a national duty in respectfully calling attention to such conditions.

The Order in council endorsed by Both Houses on April 18th virtually sweeps away the Military Service Act. The resentment it has created is known to this House, members of which are known to regret that the elements of the constitution were ignored in this proceeding; and that the method of presenting a practically executed decree, while withholding disclosure of the facts on which it may be based, cannot easily be justified to the constituents of a newly elected Parliament.

The curtailment of the liberty of written and spoken speech contained in the Order in Council given to the public on April 16 has especial concern to all who are aware of the history of free discussion in Canada and other parts of the British Empire. We are sure we need not beg the House to examine its provisions in order to appreciate how a doctrine of the essential infallibility of the Government may be forced upon a free people on pain of a fine of five thousand dollars and five years' imprisonment. The House, to our extreme regret, has been faced with a notification of the intended curtailment of the privilege of a member of Parliament to declare his mind, and the right of his constituents to know what he has uttered. That this unique warning to a freely elected British assembly was halted for several weeks on the Order Paper, we venture respectfully to attribute to you, Mr. Speaker, as the appointed guardian of the liberties of the House and also of the people. It has been noted that the Prime Minister, in withdrawing the measure, viewed with so much apprehension from outside the House, announced that it is likely to be reintroduced next session.

Perhaps the House may not be offended to learn that cognizance has also been taken of a notice issued to it within the last week to the effect that it must curtail its discussion of vital national affairs, and withdraw from its precincts within a few days, or be summoned hither during the hottest and most inconvenient month of the year. That such a direction should be issued without apparent recourse to the judgment of the House causes reflective citizens to wonder what has happened to the freedom Canadian institutions have hitherto enjoyed.

Mr Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Commons, the disquiet of the country of which we are the humble and inadequate exponents and which demonstrates sadly the increasing dangers to our national unity, which, if we lose it, we shall have lost all indeed, cannot be allayed by a persistence in the courses we have so imperfectly sketched.

Will the House permit us, with much deference, but much earnestness to repeat the reminder of one of its members that the Government is a Committe of this House vested with the executive powers of Parliament. The responsibility of government, therefore, is ultimately upon this House. Nothing appears to have been done to make the position of members of Parliament, with regard to the carrying out of the war policy, correspond to the status which they enjoyed before the practice crept in of making them subservient to those whom they created and whom they might destroy.

In this prolonged crisis of the national fate the hour has arrived to re-establish the inherent freedom of the House of Commons. We are certain that in that restoration the people of Canada will sustain you, and that the sacrifices of war will ultimately be justified and honoured in the blessings and progress of peace.

May we inform you that we remain at the Windsor Hotel, where we shall be happy to receive whatever answer the House may return to this address.

We are, Mr. Speaker,

Yours very sincerely,

I beg to remind the Government, also, of the conclusions of the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture, which has just been adopted by the House. For three weeks the report of the committee lay on the table and no motion was made to have it concurred in by the House. The conclusions of that report are most important and read:

(a) That actual farmers who have been called up shall be given leave of absence and

(b) That no actual farmers be required to report until all others in the class affected by the Order in Council of 20th April, 1918 have been put in service; such leave of absence and delay in reporting to be conditional upon their actual employment in farming.

The other day, when the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were being discussed in committee, I inquired from the Minister of Agriculture what was the policy of the Government with regard to the exemption of farmers. The minister replied that I surely could not expect him to make a declaration of policy, but should put my question to the leader of the Government. I inquired from the Prime Minister as to the change of policy, if any, that was contemplated, and drew his attention to the fact that though the Minister of Militia and Defence had told the House that the

boys on the farm would not be called before the city boys and that instructions to that effect had been sent to the registrars for their guidance in sending out notices, those instructions were not being followed. The Prime Minister told me he would bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence. The boys on the farms are being called up as a matter of fact. Some time ago the Deputy Minister of Agriculture wired to Mr. J. J. Morrison, Secretary-Treasurer of the United Farmers of Ontario, Toronto, as follows:

> Your wire 18th to Minister re leave of absence for farmers. Communicated with Mr. Stonehouse, Agricultural representative Toronto, who replies officer commanding district states no leave being refused to farmers. Please see Stonehouse and furnish him with any specific cases you have. After seeing him, if still reason for complaint, kindly communicate with me.
>
> Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

I wish to bring the attention of this House to one fact of which I am myself a witness. There is a conflict of authority between the representative of the Minister of Agriculture on the Leave of Absence Boards and the officers who compose these boards. The boards are composed of three or four officers who sit in a committee, and the representative of the Minister of Agriculture is there simply in an advisory capacity. I have seen cases in Quebec where I have myself acted as counsel for the farmers who were claiming exemption under the Leave of Absence regulation, and on three or four different occasions Hon. Mr. Garneau, the representative of the Minister of Agriculture on the Leave of Absence Board has recommended that leave of absence be granted, but leave was not granted. I am told by Mr. Morrison, the secretary of the United Farmers of Ontario, that yesterday Mr. Stonehouse, the representative of the Minister of Agriculture in Toronto, advised him that he was powerless to obtain leave of absence for the farmers who were claiming it before the Leave of Absence Board. There is therefore a conflict of authority. Surely if the Government are in earnest when they state to this House and the country that the boys on the farm will not be called up until after the city boys have been called, means can be found of sending sufficiently plain instructions to the registrars to that effect. I have talked this matter over with some of the officials of the Department of Militia and Defence, and they inform me that the whole thing is in the hands of the Minister of Justice, who has charge of the administration of the law. Surely there should be some understanding between the Minister of Militia and Defence, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Justice, as to the instructions that shall be sent to the registrars and the steps which shall be taken to see that such instructions are carried out.

I have been given leave by the right hon. leader of the Government to ask him a question, and this is the question I am going to put: Has the Government adopted any policy to provide for cases of extreme hardship and for cases in which production would surely be diminished? For instance, the case of the farmer's son who is the only one left to work the farm, or where the son is the sole support of incapacitated parents. I see by to-night's Star that an announcement on this question was supposed to be made to the House. I would ask the acting leader of the Government to make a plain statement on this matter, which is causing a great deal of unrest in the country.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has given and is still giving the most careful and earnest consideration possible to cases of extreme hardship that may occur in the working out of the Military Service Act and the Order in Council which has been passed more recently. These cases of hardship will be considered not only as they affect farmers but others as well. There will be no distinction made as to classes in which similar cases, or equal cases, of extreme hardship occur. In reference to those cases, an Order in Council has been considered and has been passed, and will be issued to the public, accompanied by regulations which are now receiving the consideration of the Government. These will be framed and published simultaneously with the gist or essence or full text of the Order in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot say to my hon. friend the exact time, but no delay will occur beyond what is absolutely necessary to come to considered conclusions as to the regulations which are to be made public. Publicity will be given just as soon as these regulations are complete. I should think that within twenty-four hours or thereabouts these will be completed and issued. I do not know that my statement could go beyond the words which I have just now addressed to the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will it affect only farmers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have already said that cases of extreme hardship will not be restricted to any one class. Cases of extreme hardship will be considered, no matter under what class the person who claims, or suffers, the hardship may be included.

SECRET SESSION OF PARLIAMENT—ALLEGED DISCLOSURE OF PROCEEDINGS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The very applause which has greeted the declaration of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) must show him that the Government has taken the proper action in doing what it has just done. The more liberal the execution of this new order is the better it will be. In connection with this matter I want to call the attention of the House to a question which is one that affects its privileges. I am glad to see the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in his seat. Respecting the very subject that has just been dealt with, I find that the Evening Journal says:

> Mr. J. E. Armstrong, member for East Lambton, who was asked to resign, has issued a vigorous reply to the petitioners.
>
> Mr. Armstrong throws some new light on the secret session of Parliament and states that Mr. Lloyd George in an appeal to Canada asked for more men even if production suffered.

If it be true that the hon. member for East Lambton has given out a statement of what took place in the secret session, it is a breach of the privilege of Parliament. He had no right to do so. Nobody will dispute that. It was well understood that it was a secret session, and so far nothing has been said with regard to it. But if it be true that the hon. member for East Lambton has said what is here alleged, I repeat, it would be a breach of privilege. The paper further says:

> Mr. Armstrong says in part:
>
> In the secret session of Parliament held before deciding on the setting aside of exemptions, word was received direct from Lloyd George to send men and more men, even if production did suffer. This is only one of many urgent appeals received from the Government.

I think every man who heard the words spoken by the Prime Minister on that occasion—and he is the only man who spoke,—will agree with me when I say that I am sure the hon. member for East Lambton did not understand, or represent, what was said by the Prime Minister if he understood him to attribute to Lloyd George the words: "Even if production did suffer." There was not a word of that kind said, and I call upon the Government to take such action as they think should be taken in regard to such a matter. I do not press for any answer to-day, but I must protest and nobody will contradict my word, when I say that the hon. member for East Lambton had no right to repeat what was said in this House at a secret session.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The statement made in that letter in answer to the petition that was sent to me by my constituents, is a perfectly straight-forward and honest statement, and a statement that has been used freely throughout the country. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that it has been used freely throughout the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not the point.

Mr. MURPHY: It is evident that the secret session is going to be used in the same way as the soldiers—camouflage.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no excuse at all. However, I am not going to carry the matter further.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I wish to call the attention of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) to two other matters on which we should receive information. We were promised some days ago by the Prime Minister that we should be informed as to who the ministers were who were to accompany him to England and as to what was, in so far as it could be disclosed without infringing upon the secret correspondence, the object of the meeting.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I remember that, in answer to a question of my hon. friend the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) I promised to make a very short statement in reference to this matter. First, as to the object of the assembling of the war council and of the Imperial Council; my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and all the members of this House have, I have no doubt, taken cognizance of similar meetings which were held in pursuance of a similar call about a year ago or a little less. The purpose of these meetings was explained to the Parliament of that day and Parliament signified its agreement with the purpose for which those conferences were called. The propriety of having them attended by the representatives who are invited was also apparent. Since then, published reports have been made of what took place at those con-

ferences. Whilst everything that took place has not been made public the larger portion of the resolutions and the discussions upon them, is now public property. The summons for the meeting of these conferences this year has been made for the same purpose as before and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has been summoned to attend these as have the Prime Ministers of other overseas dominions and also a representative of India. In pursuance of that summons, and for similar purposes as were held in view a year ago, the Prime Minister proposes to proceed to London. The Prime Ministers of the other dominions are also over there or on their way thither. The Prime Minister has selected to accompany him, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), the Minister of Colonization and Immigration (Mr. Calder) and the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell).

Mr. BUREAU: Some choice!

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These gentlemen will in due time proceed to London, and will carry out the objects for which the meetings have been summoned. It is not known how long the conferences will take, but every effort has been made to make them as short as possible. It is not supposed that the Prime Minister will be absent from Canada for a very long period, and it is quite probable that the three ministers whom I have named will be a still shorter time in Great Britain. It may be, if circumstances require it, that when they return the Minister of Naval Affairs and the Minister of Militia as well may go to London to take up matters in connection with their several departments. That gives a general idea both of the purposes of the call and of the gentlemen who are to participate in the conferences. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that whilst the Prime Minister of each dominion may have such of his colleagues as he chooses, and as are felt necessary, to attend him, there is but one vote in these conferences and that is the vote that is given by the Prime Minister of each of the dominions. I do not know that there is necessity for any fuller statement on my part.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is quite sufficient. It is five minutes to twelve, and we are on the eve of being summoned to the other House; but perhaps we might use the time available before the summons reaches us to take up a matter to which I have already drawn the attention of my right hon. friend. Perhaps he will give us some information now as to the registration of man-power and woman-power which is to take place at an early date—that is to say, what is the object of such registration and if any policy has been decided upon by the Government in connection with it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It might, perhaps, meet the wishes of my right hon. friend and the House if I should lay on the table a memorandum which I have had prepared in order to answer the question which my right hon. friend intimated a few days ago he would put before the prorogation of Parliament. The memorandum is fairly full, and I may just simply add, in connection therewith, that the purpose, of course, is to register the man and woman power of this country within certain ages. The registration is to be carried out by a distribution of cards and the signature of the persons falling within those ages to those cards. A board, or commission, has been appointed, at the head of which is Senator Robertson, who have the arrangements in charge, and they are working in close conjunction with the Bureau of Statistics in my department in the collation and tabulation particularly of the information when it is gathered. It is not thought to be possible that that registration will take place before the middle of the month of June, or a little later. A great deal of the work—I might say the majority of it—is being undertaken by voluntary effort, and the response in all portions of the country to the call for voluntary effort has been very marked, and shows the sympathy and goodwill of the people in the purpose which is intended. At what time the tabulation can be finished we are not certain. Something will depend upon the day upon which registration takes place. After that, by a well co-ordinated system, the information will be sent as rapidly as possible to Ottawa, and there tabulated. Outside of that, it is meant that before the full results of the total registration are available, arrangements are being made by which the information as it comes in shall be made accessible as far as possible in order to get at sources of labour supply, with a view to using it for work during the coming season when agricultural labour will be very much required in our country. It is believed by the commission that it will be possible to reap very great benefit in that respect with regard to agricultural work in the autumn of this year from the informa-

tion received through the registration. The memorandum is a pretty full one and will give the modus operandi as well as the objects of the registration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Have the Government formulated any policy, and if so will the right hon. gentleman state what that policy is with regard to the use of the information thus collected?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has considered very carefully as to what measures can be taken to utilize to the very largest possible extent the information which will be available, and that is a matter for further consideration.

Mr. MURPHY: Did I understand my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) to say that the results of the registration will be used for agricultural or labour purposes, and not for military purposes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was speaking with reference to one of the uses which would be made of this information which is to be gathered, and that it was hoped to use a portion of that for agricultural purposes during the coming autumn.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just one word about the Imperial Conference. I said earlier in the evening that the people of this country viewed with alarm the agitation which is going on on both sides of the Atlantic—the agitation carried on by the Round Table Club. For the information of the gentlemen who will represent Canada in England at the coming Imperial Conference, I wish to quote advice given by the late Sir John A. Macdonald on the question of Imperial Federation:

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

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I may be allowed just one word in answer to my hon. friend's proffer of information. Whilst it is accepted gratefully, I hope my hon. friend will not consider that he is the only guardian of the rights, privileges and liberties of this country. I hope he will consider, and that, after considering, he will not be backward in expressing that the gentleman whom I have named and the party or the section that they represent, are not one whit less loyal to the interests of Canada than my hon. friend. I beg of him to disabuse himself of the idea that he is the only guardian of the rights and liberties of Canada, and I would ask him not to spoil his holidays by having any undue anxiety as to what may be done on the other side.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You will allow us the privilege of believing that our trust in our missionaries is not unlimited.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But it is always open for us to become more and more trustful.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is very slow to come.

Mr. BUREAU: In view of the discussion that took place this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member for Maisonneuve is doing right in giving warning to my hon. friend the leader of the House to-night. There may be a disposition to give away resources of this country, and if we are left without resources, I do not know what will become of us. Our trust may be diminishing after what has taken place in this House, after hearing the statements of the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) and the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), yet in spite of these, when the challenge is made to a member of the Privy Council to make good unfounded charges, we see him sit quiet in his seat. So we have reason to be suspicious when we see him a member of the delegation.

Mr. CAHILL: Did I understand the leader of the Government to refer to gentlemen who were representing the party and representing a section of the country? They are not going to the Imperial Conference to represent a party, I hope.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Don't worry.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Everybody will remember that a very important question was discussed in this House a few days ago, the question of titles. The House, or a majority of the members of the House, reached a conclusion—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Surely my hon. friend is not going to broach an utterly new question.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am going to ask the leader of the Government a question. The conclusion reached by the House, as everybody remembers, is that we would ask for the abolition of hereditary titles.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is my hon. friend disappointed?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: And we did not say what course we would take in regard to knighthoods. The Prime Minister informed us that this matter would be fully discussed at the Imperial Conference. It would be interesting if the leader of the House is in a position, or is free to tell us, what attitude the Government takes in regard to that matter, and whether they will hold to the resolution passed by the House, or whether they will go any further and ask for the whole matter to be considered at the Imperial Conference with a view to abolishing titles altogether.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The pleasures of anticipation are often very much greater than those of actual possession. I would not desire to spoil my hon. friend's pleasures of anticipation for the holiday season for the world.

Mr. BUREAU: We may anticipate anything.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I am not going to speak, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House for calling on me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: And I want to say on behalf of myself—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: —and the party to which I belong that I hope the hon. gentlemen who are going to represent us in the United Kingdom will not give away any of our rights and will not do anything to prejudice the interest of Canada until they come before this House, and receive instructions.

Mr. BUREAU: Let them keep away from booze over there—preach prohibition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And practice it.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

A message was delivered by Lieutenant-Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Senate Chamber.

In the Senate Chamber His Excellency, the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act to confirm an agreement between His Majesty the King and the Van Buren Bridge Company.

An Act to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.

An Act respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

An Act respecting The Canadian Society of Civil Engineers and to change its name to "The Engineering Institute of Canada."

An Act respecting a patent of O. G. C. L. J. Overbeck.

An Act respecting the Cosmos Cotton Company.

An Act to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

An Act to amend the Yukon Act.

An Act to amend The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.

An Act respecting the Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act, 1911.

An Act to provide Compensation where Employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties.

An Act to amend the Railway Belt Act.

An Act to amend the Public Works Act.

An Act to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.

An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for Military and Naval Defence.

An Act to amend The Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1913.

An Act to Aid and Encourage the Organization and Co-ordination of Employment Offices.

An Act to amend the Indian Act.

An Act to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914.

An Act to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act.

An Act respecting The Canadian Indemnity Company.

An Act to incorporate The Merchants Casualty Company.

An Act respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.

An Act respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.

An Act to enable The Western Power Company of Canada, Limited, to own and operate the Railway of The Western Canada Power Company, Limited.

An Act respecting Fraser Lumber Company, Limited, and Fraser Companies, Limited.

An Act to amend the Salaries Act and the Provisions for preserving the Independence of Parliament.

An Act to correct a clerical error in the French version of The Naturalization Act, 1914.

An Act to amend the Penitentiary Act.

An Act respecting United Grain Growers, Limited, formerly The Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.

An Act to Confer the Electoral Franchise upon Women.

An Act respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

An Act respecting Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.

An Act respecting The Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate The Canadian Niagara Bridge Company.

An Act respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Nipissing Central Railway Company.

An Act to confirm an Agreement between Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and Northern Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting certain patents of The Dynamic Balancing Machine Company.

An Act to amend The Dominion Lands Act.

An Act to amend The Companies Act.

An Act respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

An Act to incorporate the Gospel Workers Church in Canada.

An Act respecting The Fire Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act for the relief of Frederick Ernest Zang.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Bailey Wainwright.

An Act for the relief of William Leo Walpole.

An Act for the relief of Mary Claire Dawson Hislop.

An Act for the relief of Martin Hafner.

An Act for the relief of Ida Sophia Wardell.

An Act for the relief of Edward David Hill.

An Act for the relief of Francis Newman.

An Act for the relief of Henry Ernest Saxby.

An Act respecting The International Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act to incoporate Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Daylight Saving Act, 1918.

An Act respecting a patent of Jacob David Wolf.

An Act to incorporate L'Ordre des Dominicains ou frères prêcheurs au Canada.

An Act respecting The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Halifax Relief Commission.

An Act to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Hay and Straw Inspection).

An Act to amend the Act of the present Session intituled An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act.

An Act for the relief of David M. Sloss.

An Act for the relief of Lillie Mabel Billing.

An Act for the relief of Emily Kathleen Cockrane Lackey.

An Act for the relief of Alonzo Jesse Chapman.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Bell Charlesworth.

An Act for the relief of Alfred Frank Scott.

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act respecting The Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

An Act respecting The Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.

An Act to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915.

An Act to amend The Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914.

An Act respecting The Protective Association of Canada.

An Act to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Fruit, Fruit Marks and Potatoes).

An Act to amend The Companies Act in various particulars.

An Act to amend The Customs Tariff, 1907.

An Act to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.

An Act supplementary to Chapter Twenty-four of the Statutes of 1917, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway System.

An Act to incorporate the United Canadian Insurance Company.

An Act to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

An Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

An Act to amend the Bills of Exchange Act.

An Act to amend the Income War Tax, 1917.

An Act respecting the Election held in the Electoral District of Yukon.

An Act to amend Chapter Thirty-nine of the Statutes of 1917.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code.

An Act to provide for the payment of Bounties on zinc produced from zinc ores mined in Canada.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name, his Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency, the Governor General, as follows:

May it please your Excellency:

The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending respectively the 31st March, 1918 and the 31st March, 1919.

To which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the clerk of the Senate, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks His Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the First Session of the Thirteenth Parliament of the Dominion with the following speech:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In releasing you from further attendance at the present session, I am mindful of the diligence with which you have discharged the important duties devolving upon you in these critical days.

A new campaign in the war having opened since you entered upon your labours, the enemy, now freed from threatened attack in the East, has struck with the force of vastly augmented numbers on the Western front for the primary purpose of destroying the British armies and with the ultimate object of gaining a decision before reinforcements can arrive. In the face of tremendous odds the soldiers of our Empire gallantly supported by our Allies, have withstood this assault with a courage and tenacity which command our admiration and gratitude. It is

anticipated that the attack will be renewed in still greater force and intensity during the coming summer and autumn.

Portions of the Canadian forces, already engaged in meeting this attack, have rendered distinguished service.

The readjustments which you have authorized in the military service law will provide the reinforcements and reserves so urgently needed to support and maintain all arms of the service at full strength, without unduly interfering with the demands of essential production.

Meanwhile arrangements for a national registration are being advanced, in order that the human power of the Dominion, especially such as is ineligible for military service, may be more effectively organized to maintain the productive capacity of the country which is exceeded in importance only by our military needs. For the like purpose, action has been taken as a war measure to enjoin and enforce upon all persons the duty of active employment in useful work. The assistance you have rendered towards the encouragement and co-ordination of the Provincial Labour Bureaus will assist materially in solving the important problems of employment and distribution of labour.

Measures you have adopted for increasing the revenues by further and wider taxation will doubtless result in a more equitable distribution of financial burdens among the people.

You have given your assent to enactments respecting the Public Service which will unquestionably promote its efficiency both at the seat of government and throughout the Dominion.

In creating the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment, you have provided the means for coping effectively with vital problems which will inevitably arise during and after demobilization.

The extension of the franchise to women will notably broaden the basis and strengthen the stability of government; and we may justly anticipate that it will exercise an important and wholesome influence upon many vital social problems confronting the nation.

The Daylight Saving Act has already justified the expectations you entertained of its attendant benefits.

The trade of the country has maintained its already remarkable development, and my advisers anticipate that necessary financial arrangements to facilitate the continued exportation of surplus products will be consummated at an early date.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you in His Majesty's name for the liberal provision you have made for the needs of the Public Service and for the prosecution of the war.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The sinister purpose of the enemy has been still more clearly revealed by recent events and especially by the military domination which he has founded upon his success in the Eastern Theatre. The unmistakable menace to our national liberties and safety, thus disclosed and emphasized, cannot fail to strengthen the resolution of our people, who abide the issue with unshaken faith in their high cause consecrated by the sacrifice of those who have died that freedom, faith and justice may endure. I pray that their strength may be sustained by Almighty God.

The Speaker of the Senate then said

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure that this Parliament be prorogued until Thursday, the 4th day of July next, to be here holden, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Thursday the 4th day of July next.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1918

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ques.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abitibi, railway facilities, 558

Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 5, 13

Adjournment moved to discuss matter of urgent public importance
Mr. Currie, Quebec disturbances, 239, 336, 380, 463

Adulteration of food. *See* Food.

Advances to provinces, ques. 208, ques. 741. *See also* Finance

Advertising. *See* Government advertising

Advisory Arts Council, 1195

Aeroplanes. *See* Army, Royal Flying Corps
Presentation of to British Government, ques. 740

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code amendment

Agriculture. *See also* Food; Animal Contagious Diseases; Inspection and Sale
Animals
Breeding, 2301
Distribution of, 151
Sherbrooke, at, ques. 870
Shipments of in Quebec, ques. 869
Cattle, British embargo on, ques. 565
Contagious diseases among, 800, 850
Horses, remounts, ques. 869, 904
Live stock industry, 2379
Sheep, protection of, 1055
Apples. *See under this head,* Fruit
Butter. *See under this head,* Dairying
Canning and packing houses, 1056
Dairying, 2298. *See also* Inspection and Sale; Oleomargarine
Butter, packing of, 1214
Cheese and condensed milk, prices, 1129
Exports, 307
Generally, 2298
Milk, ques. 872, 1129, 1214
Product in Canada in 1917, 290
Department of
Estimates, staff and salaries, 151, 2375
Expenditure, 1917-18, 573
Destructive insects and pests, 2298
Eggs. *See also* Inspection and Sale.

Agriculture—*Con.*
Inspection and grading of, ques. 1201, 1205, 1209
Exhibitions, 2376, 2380
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 280
Experimental farms and demonstration stations, 2290
Lennoxville, ques. 743
Spirit Lake, ques. 744, 2293
Flax, 1231, 2381
Food production campaign, 903
Memorandum of Minister of Agriculture, 25-27
Fruit and Fruit Marks, 2245. *See* Inspection and Sale
Apples, ques. 287
Distribution of, ques. 287
Grain, milling value of, ques. 2399
Hay. *See* Inspection and Sale
Inspection and grading, 1078
Levis county, purchase of, in, ques. 740
Implements
Duties and drawbacks, ques. 50, ques. 465, ques. 872, ques. 1203, ques. 1204, 1274, 1277
Tractors, ques. 467
Admission of, duty free, 54, ques. 467
Purchase of by Government, 1693, 2388
Indians, amongst. *See* Indians
Labour for. *See* Labour
Leave-of-absence boards, agricultural representative, Mr. Tucker, appointment of, ques. 331, ques. 873
Meats. *See* Meat and Canned Foods
Cold storage, in, ques. 1302
Mill feeds, ques. 206, 2298, 2300, 2304
Oleomargarine, 288
Licenses to manufacture, ques. 286, ques. 1201
Seed, 2381, 2537
Vegetables. *See* Inspection and Sale
Distribution of, ques. 287
Duties on, 1339

Agriculture and Colonization. Committee on, 106, 1175, 2308, 2382, 2550

Aiken, Mr. G. O., ques. 2238

Air Service. *See* Army, Royal Flying Corps

Aliens, 1694
Asiatics in British Columbia, 973-1026
Enemy, conscription of for labour, 974
Treatment of, 1007
Galicians, 980
Interned
Austrians, 1020
Mindheim, Siefreid H., ques. 207
Position of in Canada: Discussion of motions by Messrs. Clements, W. F. Maclean, and G. B. Nicholson, 973
Taxation of, 1001
Toronto, number of, in, 1000
Trades unions amongst, 2547
Treatment of in England, 1022

Allies
Military force arrangements with, 1071, 2194. *See also* War, Military Service

Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 890, 896

Alpine Club of Canada, 2227

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Montreal, St. Antoine)
Brazeau Collieries Bill, 1691
Budget, 1282
Domestic loans, 1286
Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1950
Patriotic Fund, 1292
Port Hood dredging, 1158
War expenditure and taxation, 1283, 1287, 1291, 1683-1688

Amherst drill hall, 1137

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Winnipeg Centre)
Canadian War Record, 913
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1878

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amendment Bill. Res. 800. 1r., 803. 2r., com., 3r., 850

Anse aux Beaufils, 1162

Anse aux Gascons, 1162

Anti-loafer law, 377, 2387.

Anti-Unionist candidates, ques. 2237

Apples. *See* Agriculture, Fruit; Inspection and Sale

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 18 (for 1918-19, $26,282,144.31). Res. 84, 1r., 85. 2r., com., 3r., 85
2. Bill No. 38 (for 1918-19, $500,000,000). Res. 463. 1r., 464. 2r., 571. Com., 571, 879, 1027. 3r., 1076
3. Bill No. 111 (for 1918-19, $131,342,638.20; for 1918-19, $46,957,312.68; for 1917-18, $14,034,274.33). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 2549

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Ammunition inspection, ques. 465
Budget, 1627

Archambault, Mr. Jos.—*Con.*
Chambly-Vercheres election, 972, 1304, 1618
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1883
Deniger, Mr. J. A., ques. 1982
Diamonds and precious stones, ques. 631
Engineers training depot officers, ques. 740
Flake graphite, ques. 631
Flour milling profits, 2128
Hamilton, Mrs., ques. 1481
Hunt, Donald, ques. 1480
Imperial Conference, 1982, ques. 2239
Income tax, 1627
Johnson, Mr. Main, ques. 570, ques. 1303, 2279
Laval military hospital, ques. 631
Military service, 2128
Farmers' exemption, 1632
Habeas Corpus writs, Montreal district, ques. 739
Local tribunals, ques. 740
Munitions, danger of explosion, 1099
Organized labour, conference with, ques. 875
President of the Council, special trains for, ques. 875
Private secretaries, appointments, 2285
Production, 1629
Quebec disturbances, 450
Rean, Mr. W. C., ques. 631, ques. 875
Saucier, Capt., ques. 740
Soldiers' votes, 2447, 2473
Toronto, Secretarial fund, ques. 875
Victory loan, 1628
War Council, ques. 2239
Women's Conference, ques. 875
Yukon election, 2339

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Daylight saving, 249
Soldiers' homesteads, 253

Argyll House employees, 56

Arichat, judge at, salary of, 2517

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Fruit packing, 2246, 2251
Fuel, 744
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., resignation of, 633
Oleomargarine, 288, 314
Railway Act mendment (Vessel rates) 330
Secret session of Parliament, 2554

Army. *See also* Military Service; Militia and Defence; War
Aeroplanes, presentation of to British Government, ques. 740
Allowances
Assigned pay, 888, 2387
Separation, 63, 888, 2387
Zwingle, Mrs., case of, 70
Argyll House employees, 56

Army—*Con.*
Battalions
25th Nova Scotia, ques. 1304
159th and 227th, ques. 2398
249th, ques. 466
Canadian Army Corps, 1305
Canadian War Records Office, 2127, ques. 2241
Civil servants in, pay and allowances to, 864, 1729, 1749, 2315, 2385, 2388
Conscription. *See* Military Service
Demobilization of, 31, 629
Dental corps, ques. 1202, ques. 2398
Deserters, 467
Draftees, and, alleged band of, 632
Reward for arrest of, ques. 467
Engineers training depot officers, ques. 740
Enlistments
British born and Canadian born, ques. 1127
June, 1917, prior to, 942
Labour, from, 978
Military Service Act, 1917, under, ques. 464
Overseas service, for, ques. 109
Voluntary system, under, ques. 1127
Fifth division, 879, 1306
First contingent, leave for members, 883-891
Forestry battalion, officers, 1175, 1305, ques. 2399
French Canadians, in, 1194, 1927
Units of, 927, 953
General statement by Minister of Militia, 578
Medical service, 1175, 1305, ques. 2238
Dr. Bruce, 1368
Military police, 2387, 2516
Mounted police, in, 2285
N.CO.'s., promotion of, 865
Officers
Fifth division, commanding, 1306
Montreal base depot, of, ques. 332
Quebec, ques. 288, 743
Headquarters staff, at, 862
Return of, to Canada, ques. 115
Returned, employment of, ques. 333
For individual officers see their names
Overseas forces
Casualties in, 34, 576, 936, ques. 1842, ques. 2102
Command of, 927
Strength of, 34, 901, 935
Victoria crosses won by, 288
Professional men, utilization of services of, 1539
Recruiting. *See also under this head,* Enlistments
Civil service, from. *See, under this head,* Civil Servants
Army—*Con.*
Military Service Act, prior to, 942
Numbers, 942
Property, leasing of for, ques. 465
Regiment, Amherst at, during election, ques 335
Remounts, purchase of in Canada, ques. 869, 904
Royal Flying Corps, 931, 1368
Enlistments in, at Quebec, 1367
Religious services, for, ques. 1365, 1617
Transfers to C.E.F., ques. 1842
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, in, 2285
Soldiers
Candidates for Parliament, 884
Civil pay of. *See under this head* Civil Servants
Mail matter for, postage on, 2535
Pensions, for. *See also* Pensions
Report of Committee on, 2480
Recruiting, advances for, ques. 1839
Return of
Canada, to, ques. 112
Front, to, ques. 332
Returned
Arrest for loafing, 2387
Employment, for, 1183
Government positions for, 1182, 1736
Imprisonment, alleged, of, 1367
Settlement. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amendment; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment; Soldiers' Settlement
Sickness of, while on leave, ques. 971
Smallpox among, 1131
Treatment of on transports, 73
Votes, 23, 909. *See also* Yukon election; War-time elections
In last election, 2256, 2400-2475
Motion (Mr. Copp) for investigation into, 2434
For individual soldiers see their names
Transfers from Royal Flying Corps to C.E.F., ques. 1842
Units recruited in Canada and their officers on reaching England, 596
Women's Auxiliary Army Corps, 952
Women's Royal Naval Service, 952
Art
Parliament buildings, new, decoration of, 1104
Canadian War Memorial, pictures for, 1195
Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Alien labour, 986
Annual reports in French and English, ques. 971
Dager, Mr. Herman J., ques. 2242
Government railway rates for troops, 2168
Immigration agents, clergymen as, ques. 1203

Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Indians in Ontario, 1056
Mail contracts, 2529
Pensions, 2489
Quebec disturbances, 438

Asiatics in Canada, 1002, 1005

Auditor General
Expenditure of, overseas, ques. 1481
Office, appointments in and salaries, 136, 1200
Relatives, appointment of, 1731, 1753

Austrians, interned, in Canada, 1020

Automobiles
"Joy riding" *See* Criminal Code Amendment
Tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Australia and New Zealand steamship service, 2211

Aviation. *See* Army, Royal Flying Corps

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Budget, 1357
Public expenditure, 1357
Ross rifle factory, ques. 1072, 1360

Ball, Mr. Robert J. (Southeast Grey)
Fruit containers, 2252
Printing Bureau appointments, ques. 1978

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Army
French Canadian units, 928
Officers of units recruited in Canada, 596
Defence of Canada Order, 1917, amendments, 932
Fisheries
Advisory board, 270
Bounties, 283
Commission, 275
Exhibit at Toronto, 280
Guardians and overseers, 270
Lobster hatcheries, 282
Protection service, 354
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, 868, 967
Halifax Relief Commission, 2197
Life-saving stations, 357
Light-keepers' salaries, 372
Magdalen Islands steamship service, 70
Marine and Fisheries Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 152, 270
Military service, 2384
Missisquoi Bay, seine-fishing, 275
Montreal Harbour Advances Act Amendment, 80, 132
Naval Discipline Act Amendment, 723
Naval Service Department, estimates and salaries, 148, 363, 366
Orders in Council and Reports, 12
Pilots, 373, 1306

Ballantyne. Hon. C.—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 362
Riviere Ouelle-Murray Bay service, 361
Royal Naval college, 357
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 367
Shipbuilding, 345-354
Simcoe, steamer, 366, 376
Sorel shipyard, 368
Steamers and ice-breakers, 358-360
Wharves, repairs to, 375
Wireless telegraphy, 355
Wrecking plants, 364

Banking and Commerce, Committee on, 106

Bankruptcy, Bill respecting, 1r., 205. 2r., 563. Special Com., 563, 735, 867. Rep. of, 1691

Banks. *See also* Finance.
Business hours of, 2383
Central gold reserve, deposit with, ques. 741
Deposits in, use of for war purposes, ques. 741
Excess circulation, 738
Government deposits in, ques. 742
Subscription to war loans, ques. 741
Victory loan, payments to, ques. 2240

Barre, Colonel, letter to Sir Edward Kemp, 1928

Barrington's Cove wharf, 1154

Bate, McMahon & Co., payments to, ques. 1479

Battalions. *See* Army

Beaufort, Mr. E., ques. 1364, ques. 1840

Beaverbrook, Lord, ques. 50

Béland, Hon. H. S. (Beauce), release from German prison, 7, 1910

Belanger, Mr., (St. Charles River works), 1567, 2375, 2507

Belanger, Mr. F. J., ques. 1841

Belanger, Mr. J. A., ques. 630

Belford, Major J. F., ques. 870

Bellechasse, steamer, ques. 112, 360

Benmore, Government barge, ques. 1617

Bernasconi, Mr., engineer, 1156

Berthier
Exemptions in, ques. 1843
Public works, ques. 467

Berthierville
Excise officers, ques. 113
Post office, ques. 466

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1768
Daylight saving, 189

Beverages. *See* Customs

Bills of Exchange Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2383. 2r., Com., 2477. 3r., 2478

Bird life, protection of, 2223

Blair, Mr. William J. (Battle River)
Immigration agents, clergymen, as, ques. 1203

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Alien labour, 1013
Budget, 1313
Hay, inspection, 1093, 1095
Prison reform, 1190
Taxation, 1315, 1366

Blanchard, Mr. H. Percy, ques. 2237

Blondin, Hon. P. E., Postmaster-General, 2513

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bola Pasha, ques. 1071

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 20; formation of union government, 21; returns under Military Voters' Act, 21; summoning of parliament, 22; conduct of election, 23; voting of soldiers, 23; Military Service Act, 24; food production and control, 25; shipbuilding, 28; prohibition, 30; excessive profits, 30; civil service reform, 30; demobilization of troops, 31; Canadian war organizations, 32; Halifax disaster, 32; railway equipment, 32; fuel control, 32; Military Service convention with United States, 33; trade and finance, 33; woman suffrage, 33; Canadian overseas forces, 25, 34; Russia, 34; progress of the war, 35.
Aliens, 1694
Allied forces, replacement by Americans, 2194
Army Medical Service, 1368
Bankruptcy Bill, 563
Banks, excess circulation, 738
Beaverbrook, Lord, 50
Béland, Hon. Dr. H. S., M.P., release of from German prison, 1910
Canadian cattle, British embargo on, 565
Canadian Daily Record, 898
Canadian Northern Railway, indebtedness, 1424
Canadian Northern Railway Company Bill, 1927, 1994
Censorship of debates, 1767
Censorship regulations, 1837
Civil servants overseas, 2315
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1808, 2132
Civil Service reform, 30
Customs Act Amdt. (control), 81
De Celles, Mr. A. D., 1767

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Demobilization, 31, 629
Deputy Speaker, appointment, 73
Desjardins, "Ti-noir," 1027
Director of Public Information, 899
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 82
Election, last general, 23
Employment offices, 842
Excessive profits, 30
Farmers' delegation, 1837, 1937, 2196
Fisheries Report, 1692
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 1976
Flour milling, 2237
Flying Corps, Canadian, proposed, 1368
Food production and control, 28
Fuel control, 32
Government appointments and parliamentary constituencies, 1305, 1481, 2101
Government employees, compensation for injuries to, 679
Halifax Relief Commission, 32, 2064, 2196
Hanna, late Dr. A. E., M.P., 3
House of Commons
Business of the, 2374, 1420
Adjournment instead of prorogation, 2314
Ascension day adjournment, 1618
Economy in, proposal of Mr. Speaker, 563
Monday sittings, 877, 1026
Morning sittings, 1419
Saturday sittings, 1419
Immigration and Colonization Bill, 103
Imperial Conference, 2239
Independence of Parliament, 683, 845, 878
Labatt, Colonel, 1693
Letter from young patriot, 1125
McMartin, late John, M.P., 932
Military Service, 24
Classes, 938
Deserter, presumed, arrest of, 1076
Deserters and draftees, alleged band of, 633
Exemptions, 1366, 1539, 1843
Fishermen, conscription of, 2315
Hardships under, 2128
Leave of absence, 1076
Quebec disturbances, 236, 284-286, 336, 396, 680
Order in Council concerning, 378
Regulations, ages, 20-22, 878, 933
Rural drafts, 2315
United States, convention with, 33, 54
National Service Commission, 903
Naval Discipline Bill, 725
Navigable Waters Protection, 730
Newspapers, payments to, 2128
Orders in Council laid on the table, 12
Summoning Parliament, 11, 21

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Pension Commissioners for Canada, 51
Pensions, Special Committee, 563
Private Bills, suspension of rules relating to, 1766, 1845
Privilege, question of, order in, 315
Public service, re-arrangement of duties of departments, 50, 76, 83
Railways and Canals Act Amdt. (Railway equipment), 32, 548
Railway situation in Canada, 1994
Remounts, purchase in Canada, 904
Royal Flying Corps, 1368
Religious services for, 1617
Rural mail carriers, 63
Russia, 34
Salaries Act Amdt., 683, 845, 878
Secret session of Parliament, 735
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 126
Sevigny, Hon. Mr., resignation, 155
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 610, 625
Soldiers' voting, 23
Speaker, election of, 1
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 524
Titles, 473, 489, 517, 2237, 2342, 2363-2364
Union Government, 21, 25
War
Argyll House employees, 56
Canadian War Memorial Fund, 1195
Canadian War Records office, 2127
Consultation with Imperial Government before outbreak of, 928
Expenditure and Estimates, 571-610, 879-881, 930-932
Accounting and auditing between Great Britain and Canada, 901-905
Forces, Canadian, engaged in, 34, 576
Army corps, 1305
Casualties, 34, 936
Command of, 927
French Canadian brigade, 1195, 1933
Numbers and nationalities, 935, 936
Human energy of Canada, use of, 25, 377
Nurses, Canadian, heroism of, 157
Official news, arrangements for, 1976
Organizations, 32
Progress of, 35, 933
German offensive, 83, 107
Red Cross rules, violation of by enemy, 157
Vote, $500,000,000, 571
War Mission at Washington, 905
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 1475
White, Sir Thomas, statement as to absence of, 50, 55, 736
Winnipeg strike, 2236
Woman suffrage, 33, 88-103, 364, 676
Yukon election, 1835, 2080, 2099, 2338

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Halifax disaster
Claims, ques. 2397
Reconstruction, ques. 1362
Hay, purchase of in Lévis, ques. 740
Lauzon dock, J. B. Paquet, ques. 2238
Military Service
Judges, fees of, ques. 1839
Lévis, officials, ques. 570
Quebec, dredges and steamers at, ques. 868
St. Lambert, liquor stored at, ques. 1127
St. Nicholas quarry, ques. 868
Victoria, B.C., employment at, ques. 1479, ques. 1978

Bowie, Major Henry William, appointed Sergeant-at-Arms, 3

Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Agricultural exhibitions, 2378
Animal contagious diseases, 802
Connaught rifle range, ques. 1981, 2195
Daylight saving, 166, 244
Hay, inspection and grading, 1088

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Animal contagious diseases, 803
Oleomargarine, 292
Rigaud-St. Redempteur mail, ques. 742
Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital, ques. 1303

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1941
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 534

Bradbury, Hon. Senator, services and pension of, ques. 1128, ques. 2397, 2520

Bran, exportation of, ques. 206, 2128, 2301, 2304

Brault, Romeo, ques. 111, 1075

Bremner, Major F. W. D., ques. 1843

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Budget, 1434
Trade and farming conditions in Canada, 1435-1437
War taxation, 1438

British Canadian Insurance Company. *See* United Canadian

Brockville appeal tribunal, ques. 2238

Brouillard, Mr. J. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Dental corps, ques. 2398
Fallon, Bishop of London, ques. 1304, ques. 2238
Fowler, Mr. Robert, ques. 2241
Furois, Mr. Philippe, ques. 1981
Labatt, Colonel, ques. 1981
Military district No. 4, advances, ques. 1839
Military Service
Central appeal judge, ques. 1840
Duff, Mr. Justice, and Round Table Club, ques. 1841

Brouillard, Mr. J. Ovide—*Con.*
Exemption tribunals, fees, ques. 1073
Kingston deputy registrar, staff of, ques. 2238
Sevigny, Hon. Albert, ques. 1618
Welland canal paymaster, ques. 2397

Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Lethbridge)
Canadian Northern Railway, 2113
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1752
Fuel, 327, 767
Titles, 2370

Buctouche, public building, 1138

Budget Debate, 1253, 1306, 1368, 1429, 1454, 1482, 1541, 1620

Bull, Mr. Harry Cecil, ques. 1842

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Auditor General's office, 136
Auditor General's report, printing of in French, 135
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1838
Bureau of Statistics, 337
Canadian Daily Record, 915
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 691
Canadian Northern Railway, 1919, 1926
Censoring of debates, 1767
Children, moral protection of, 1705
Chinese immigration, 2272
Civil servants
Conduct of, 2281
Enlisted, civil pay of, 2386, 2388
Civil Service Act Amdt., 721, 1774, 1782, 1813, 1817, 1826, 1847, 1860, 1875, 1891, 1906
Amdt. proposed, 2129
Conservation, Commission of, 2287
Departments, creation of, 844
Director of Public Information, 704
Dominion lands, homesteading, 250, 257
Dominion Police, 2536
Eggs, sale by weight, 1210
Elevators, 2264
Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1950
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amdt., 966
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 678, 817, 834
Imperial Conference, 2556
Industrial disputes, 835
Inland Revenue and Customs departments, suggested amalgamation, 149
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt., 1209
Portland cement, 1226, 1230
Interior Department, estimates, 2225
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2280
Judges, exemption from taxation, 1687
Labour Department, staff and salaries, 197, 830

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt., 789
Military Service
Medical examinations, 1694
Medically unfit men, 1076, 1130
Militia Department
Auditors, 138
Estimates and salaries, 561, 850, 853
Organization, 598
Mounted Police, 2285
Navigable Waters, constructions on, 562, 731, 734
Orders in Council, concurrence in, 2480
Parliament buildings, new, Speaker's quarters, 1108
Penitentiaries, 1178, 1184
Portland cement, 1226, 1230
Privy Council Department, private secretary to president, 2274
Railway Act (consolidation), 1909
Railways and Canals, estimates, 1969, 1971
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 835
Railway equipment, 552, 725
Shawinigan Falls bridge, 731
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 610, 625
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 525
Taxation
Automobiles and jewellery, 2121
Tea, 2126
Tobacco, 1984
Three Rivers
Ordnance lands, 2227
Public building, 1149
Public works employees, 141
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1198
Trade and Commerce Department, estimates, 344, 2263
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2388
Vice (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1705
Victory loan expenditure, 920
War expenditure, 598, 609, 879
Account of Canada with Great Britain, 901
Auditing of accounts, 905
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 2495; amdt., 2496
Water powers, 2267
Woman suffrage, 98, 365, 675
Yukon election, 2086, 2504

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Dominion Bureau

Burnham, Mr. John H. (West Peterborough)
Adjournment instead of prorogation, advisability of, 2313, 2254
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1879
Civil Service law, administration of, ques. 2242
Government appointments, 1305, ques. 1481
Not by examinations, ques. 2101

Burnham, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Labour clearing-houses, 1035
National rivalries and trade, 775
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1129
Rural mail carriers' contracts, 58
Separation allowance, 63
Titles, 502, 2344
Trent Canal construction, 1964
Woman suffrage, 651

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Secretary of State)
Companies Act Amdt., 2256
Demonstration farms, 2292
Fuel, 760
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 760 2541
Meat and Canned Foods, 790
Payment of returning officers, 2512
Soldiers' vote, 2435
Titles, 2367
Zinc bounties, 2501, 2503

Bury, Que., drill hall, ques. 743

Business Profits War Tax, revenue from, 1261

Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. Res., 1264, 1682. 1r., 1691, 2r., 2142. Com., 2142-2161. 3r., 2245

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Budget, 1640
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1881
Fuel, 327, 780
Glace Bay harbour, 1170
Halifax disaster, 858
Labour policy, 1037
Military Service Act, 1642
Pilots, 375
Political situation, 1640
Soldiers' vote, 2457
Tariff reductions, 1641
Titles, 2372

Cables. *See* Telegraphs

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Banking hours, 2478
Canada Food Board, 226
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2542
Revenues, 685
Canadian Northern Railway, 1196, 1423, 1717, 1913, 2121, 2190
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1862
Dominion Canners, drawbacks, ques. 287
Dominion lands, close settlement, 2221
Employment offices, 1038
Farmers' delegation, 1837
Government advertising, ques. 115
Indian lands, 1049, 1051
Live stock distribution, 2380
Railway equipment, 540, 550, 555
Railway situation in Canada, 2017

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229, 2231
Sweet, Major Edmund, ques. 2399
Thompson, Lieut. Col. A. T., ques. 2399
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1478
Woman suffrage, 98, 669
Zinc bounties, 2500

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Immigration and Colonization Department
Agents, 2270
Bill relating to, 103
Estimates, 205, 2269
Labour, and, 1040
Policy of, 2272
Labour bureaus, control of, 1043
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2391

Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1937, 1959

Camp Hughes, employment of Hon. Senator Schaffner at, ques. 2240

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 1541
Copper mining, 1546
Farm implements, free, 1541
Northern Manitoba, 1544
Soldiers and homesteading, 255
Titles, 2364
War taxation, 1541
Yukon election, 2076
Amendment, 2097

Canada and the War, 1951. *See* War

Canada Food Board. *See* Food

Canada Grain Act, estimates, 2263. *See* Grain

Canada Registration Board, 25, 903, ques. 1979
Regulations, 998

Canada Temperance Act, expenses, 2521

Canadian Associated Press, ques. 631

Canadian Aviation Fund, ques. 1481. *See* Army

Canadian Daily Record, 891, 915, 920

Canadian Explosives Company, ques. 465, ques. 1099

Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2542
Coal for, ques. 871
Employees, ques. 206. *See* Civil Service
Equipment, 1918, 2166. *See* Railway equipment
Estimates, 2538
Halifax disaster, 2166
Hudson Bay Railway, 2167
Ice contract, Mulgrave, ques. 876
Minister's summary, 2161
Rates for carriage of troops, 2168
Suspense account proposed, 683

Canadian Government Railways—*Con.*
For individual government railways, see their titles
Canadian Northern Railway
Finances
Assets, ques. 570, 2002
Claims against, ques. 970
General statement by acting Minister of Finance, 1711
Shares, acquisition of, ques. 971
Government policy concerning statement by Prime Minister, 1994
Mount Royal city, ques. 1480
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company. *See that title*
Canadian Northern Railway Company Bill (Indebtedness). Res., 1421. 1r., 1694. 2r., 1913. Com., 1913, 1994, 2102. 3r., 2142
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company Bill. 1r., 377. 2r., 464. Com., and 3r., 969
Canadian Nurses, heroism of, 157
Canadian Patriotic Fund
Statement by Sir Herbert Ames, Hon. Secretary, 1292
Zwingle, Mrs., case of, 70
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2064. 2r., Com., 2199. 3r., 2209
Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, work of, 2006
Canadian War Memorial Fund, 1195
Canadian War Mission, 31, 54, 905
Canadian War Record. *See* Canadian Daily Record
Canadian War Records Office, 2127, ques. 2241
Canals, 1963, 1970, 2167
Inland deep waterway, 2219
Tolls, abolition of, 1964
For individual canals see their titles
Canning and packing houses. *See* Agriculture; Meat and Canned Foods Act
Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Breeding animals, distribution of, 151
Chasse, Mr. Noel, ques. 111
Civil Service Act Amendment, 722
Dorchester
Mail contracts, ques. 115
Postmasters in, ques. 113
Telephone lines, 1172
External affairs, 847
Income tax, 2151
Inland Revenue
Employees, ques. 114
Estimates, 151
Labour Department, report by Mr. O'Connor, 204
Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Nichols, Mr., Director of Public Information, 922
Overseas forces, 923
Patronage, Naval Service Department, 148
Pilots, 373
Prohibition, Dominion-wide, ques. 1362
Quebec disturbances, 431
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, affidavit of, 434
Quebec
Mail service, ques. 2397
Post office, ques. 113
Public buildings, 1142
Re-arrangement of departments, 77
Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay service, 360
Royal Naval College, 358
St. Lawrence dredging, 369
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 128
Sevigny, Hon. Mr., ques. 206
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 626
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 111
War expenditure, 921-926
Yukon election, 2092
Cape Island district, smallpox in, 1131
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 2173, 2177, 2542
Carillon-Grenville canal, 1967
Carter, Mr. Samuel, M.P.P., ques. 1362
Carvell, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Belanger vs. The King, 2508
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 2543
Electric power, 1069
Georgian Bay Canal, 1836
Intercolonial Railway, 2031
Fire caused by locomotive, 2187
Military Service
Farmers, exemption of, 958
Regulations, 956
Navigable Waters protection, 464, 562, 730, 2476
Parliament buildings, new
Construction, 737, 1100, 1109
Decoration, 1104
Fire protection, 1110
Heating, 1102
Tower, 1101
Public Works
Architects, Horwood and Ewart, 142
Department, estimates and salaries, 141, 1110, 1138
Dredging, 1169
Dry docks, 1116
Engineers, 144
Lake Erie ports, 1167
Ottawa
O'Connor street building, proposed, 1110

Carvell, Hon. F. B.—*Con.*
Rental of buildings at, 1112, 1147
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 146
St. Charles River works, 146, 1119, 2508, 2544
St. John harbour, 1115, 2544
Telephones, 1153, 1171
Toronto harbour, 1123
Public Works Act Amdt., 464, 733
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 2493-2496
Water powers, development of, 1069

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Abitibi railway facilities, 558
After-war conditions, 1612
Aiken, Mr. G. O., ques. 2238
Anti-Unionist candidates, ques. 2237
Brault and Swan, conviction and release of, ques. 111, 1075
Budget, 1603
Coal, royalties on, ques. 570
Desjardins, Charles ("Ti-noir") ques. 112, 1027, 1075, 1607
Director of Public Information, ques. 1302
Lauzon dry dock, ques. 112
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 1073
Military Service
Brockville appeal tribunal, ques. 2238
Medical examiners, ques. 112
Quebec officials, ques. 569
Schaffner, Hon. Senator, ques. 2240
Schuster, Capt. W. E., ques. 1074, ques. 1128
Self-inflicted wounds by men in Toronto district, ques. 111
Newsprint inquiry, ques. 1364
Orders in Council, 1611
Prohibition, ques. 1073
Quebec, attitude of, 1604
Railway freight cars, detention of in United States, ques. 569
Royal Flying Corps, ques. 1365
St. Charles River works, ques. 112, ques. 1479
Soldiers, return of to Canada, ques. 112
Steamers, Champlain and Bellechasse, ques. 112, 360
"The Parasites," circulation forbidden, ques. 1203
War, 608
Taxation, 1605

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Portland cement, 1223, 1228

Casualties. *See* Army

Cauchon, Mr. Noulan, memorandum on deep waterway, 2219

Cement. *See* Inspection and Sale

Censorship
Beaufort, Mr. E., employment of, ques. 1364, ques. 1840
Censors and decoders, ques. 874
Press, ques. 1842
Regulations, 969, 1837
Mr. Speaker on question raised by Mr. Currie, 1910

Census and Statistics, estimates, 2264

Central Appeal Judge. *See* Military Service

Chabot, Mr. John L. (Ottawa)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 7; Imprisonment of Dr. Béland, 7; Halifax disaster, 7; Patriotic fund, 9; War loans, 9; Civil Service reform, 9; Woman suffrage, 10; Casualties among Canadians at front, 11; Patriotism of Canadian women, 11.
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1774, 1776, 1791

Chair, rulings of. *See* Speaker; Deputy Speaker

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Challies, Mr. J. B., allowance to, 2375

Chambly canal, 1966

Chambly-Vercheres election, 972, 1304, 1618

Champlain, steamer, ques. 112, 360

Chasse, Mr. Noel, ques. 111, 150

Cheese. *See* Agriculture, dairying

Chevassu, Mr. J. P. A., 1766, 2128

Chicory, tax on. *See* Customs

Children, moral protection of. *See* Criminal Code

China and Japan steamship service, 2211

Chinese, 787. *See also* Alien labour
British Columbia, in, 1002, 1005
Immigration, 2272
Number entering Canada, ques. 115

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Margaree harbour, 1156
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp steamship service, 2215
Port Hastings, customs collector, 1063
Press censorship, ques. 1842
Telephones, Government, 1170

Civil Engineers. *See* Canadian Society

Civil Service
Appointments, 1759
Circular from Federation, 1768
Civil pay of members in overseas forces, 864, 1729, 1749, 2315, 2385, 2388
Deputy Ministers, salaries, 1757
Law, ques. 2242
Patronage. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Reform, 30

Civil Service—*Con.*
Retirement (superannuation), 2312
For departments, see their titles

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 694, 701, 703. 1r., 723. 2r., Com., 1721, 1732, 1768, 1809, 1847. 3r., 2141.
Amendments proposed:
(1) Mr. Bureau, 2129; lost on div., 2130
(2) Mr. E. Lapointe (Mr. Parent), 2134, lost on div., 2137
(3) Mr. Currie, 2138; ruled out, 2139
Senate amdts., 2477

Civil Service Federation of Canada, circular from, 1768

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for External Affairs)
Printing Committee Report, 2478, 2549

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Budget, 1573
Canada Food Board, 229
Canadian Northern Railway, 2107
Civil Service Act Amendment, 712, 1860, 1862
Daylight saving, 175
Direct taxation, 1575
Experimental farms, 2294
Fuel, 772
Government railways, revenues, 692
Income tax, 1580
Tariff, 1574
Union Government, 1573, 1576
Yukon election, 2095

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Military service, 1602

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Alberni)
Alien labour, 973
Fish canning, 797
French Canadians, conscription of for labour, 976

Clergymen as immigration agents, ques 1203

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, estimates, 2519

Coal. *See* Fuel; Mines

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Budget, 1408
Canada Food Board, 234
Canadian Northern Railway, 1410, 1721
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1725, 1821, 1824, 1827, 1863, 1866
Farm implements, 1416
Fruit classification, 2248
General election, list of candidates sent to soldiers, 898-899, 906
Hay, 1085
Housing to protect morals (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1708
Moving picture films, duty on, 1681
Pensions, 2485

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway situation in Canada, 2051
Shipping facilities, 2260
Soldiers, assigned pay, etc., 888
Tariff issue, 1413
Taxation, 1408
Income, on, 1686, 2148
Tea and coffee, duty on, 1681
Woman suffrage, 101

Coffee, tax on. *See* Customs

Cold storage, meats in, ques. 1302

Committees. *See* House of Commons *and individual titles*

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
(1) No. 65 (Mortgages and Hypothecs), 1r., 968. 2r., Com., 1076. 3r., 1176.
Senate amdts., 1695
(2) (Various particulars), 1r., 2128. 2r., Com., 2256. 3r., 2374

Compensation for Injuries to Government Employees Bill. Res., 677. 1r., 679. 2r., Com., 810. 3r., 834

Concurrence, 2549

Conference of Provincial Premiers, ques. 287

Connaught rifle range, ques. 1981, 2195

Conscription. *See* Military Service
Labour, of. *See* Labour; Alien Labour in Canada
French Canadians, of, 976
Shipyards, employees of, 1118

Conservation, Commission of, estimates, 2287

Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company. *See* Zinc

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Alien labour, 977
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1734
Labour, enlistments from, 978

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland)
Budget, 1510
Civil Service Act Amendment, 2139
Daylight saving, 168
Experimental farms, 2293
Farm implements, 1515
Fish hatcheries, 282
Fisheries, 377
Overseers and guardians, 271
Fuel, 786
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 811, 821, 828
Government railways
Intercolonial
Branch lines, 2183
Patronage on, 2140
Provident fund, 2169
Lobster hatcheries, 282
Military service, 1515
Militia
Cadets, 853

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Patronage in department, 857
Parliament buildings, new, 1104
Reconstruction committee, ques. 335
Penitentiaries, 1188
Privy Council
Private secretary to President, 2281
Salaries, 2273
Quebec disturbances, 680
Shipbuilding, 1516
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 624
Soldiers' vote, taking of in last election, 2256, 2400
Motion for investigation, 2434
Steamer Simcoe, 376
Tax on tobacco, 1986
Union Government, 1511
Van Buren Bridge Company, 341
War finance, 594, 1513
Woman suffrage, 675

Cordwood. *See* Fuel; Inspection and Sale

Couillard, Capt., ques. 1841

Courcelette, steamer, ques. 286

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1784, 1812, 1884
Daylight saving, 167
Fuel, 752
Income tax, 2144
Indians
Commissioner Graham, 1050
Lands, leasing of, 1050
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1701

Crerar, Hon. T. A. (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture
Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 151
Animal contagious diseases, 800, 850
Bran and shorts, 2299, 2300, 2305
Exportation, 2128
Prices, 2309
Canada Food Board, 221
Destructive insects and pests, 2298
Exhibitions, 2376
Experimental farms and demonstration stations, 2290, 2293
Farmers, delegation of, 1837
Farm tractors, Government purchase of, 1693, 2388
Flax, 1245
Fruit, fruit marks and potatoes, 2209, 2245
Furois, Mr. Philippe, 2376
Live stock distribution, 2379
Meat and canned foods, 788, 1056
Millfeeds. *See under this head,* Bran and shorts
Oleomargarine, 307

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
(1) Seduction; Age of Consent; Moral protection of children; Gaming-houses; Theft of motor cars, (No. 69, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 1193. 2r., Com., 1695. 3r., 1767.
Senate amendments, 2491
(2) Punishments (No. 71, Mr. Doherty). 1r., 1419

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Budget, 1306
Bureau of Statistics, 808
Business profits tax, 1309
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 1729
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1819
Domestic loans, 1308
Income tax, 2147
Parliament buildings, new, 1106
Titles, 514
War finance, 1307

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (Minister of Labour)
Budget, 1507
Fair wages, maintenance of in munitions contracts, 832
Fishermen, wages of, 2547
Flour milling profits, 2128, 2314
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 823
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt., 564, 835
Labour bureaus and exchanges, 841, 1028-1046
Labour department, administration of, 198, 1508
Estimates, 197, 829
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., duties and resignation of, 199, 633, 800
Marine trades strike in Montreal, 2314, 2385
Organization and Co-ordination of Employment Offices, 841, 1028
Winnipeg strike, 2385, 2546

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company, payments to, ques. 1128

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1822
Fuel, 778
Wood, sale of, 1218
Harbours, expenditures on, ques. 970, ques. 1126
Income tax, insurance companies, 2148
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2395

Cruise, Mr. Robert (Dauphin)
The Pas and Dauphin customs revenue, ques. 111

Currie, Sir Arthur, address to Canadian troops, 946

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Aliens and alien labour, 1006, 1020, 1694
Budget, 1643
Canada Food Board, ques. 1361
Canadian Northern Railway, 2102
Indebtedness, 1425
Canadian Press report of speech, 1693
Censorship regulations, 1837
Civil servants overseas, civil pay of, 864
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1734, 1768, 1777, 1786, 1792, 1799, 1803, 1811, 1825, 1833, 1855, 1893, 1951
Amendment proposed, 2138; ruled out, 2139
Deputy Speaker, 75
Food, 1660
Foreign trade, 1658
Free agricultural implements, 1648
Fruit containers, 2249, 2252
Gouin, Lieut., 862
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 810
Great War Veterans Association, 915
Habeas Corpus, resolution regarding suspension of, 2385
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt.
Portland cement, 1230
Standard weights, 1227
International Bridge and Terminal Company, 1732
Journals and Votes and Proceedings, consolidation, 2313
Manufacturing industry, 1648
Meat and canned foods, 790
Military Service
Farmers, representations from, 2388
Quebec, in,
Appeals to Central Appeal Judge, 1978
Exemptions, 1252
Overbeck, patent of, 739
Oxford, election, 914
Permanent corps, 863
Printing of public documents, ques. 972
Printing, Joint Committee on, report of, 1691
Quebec disturbances, 239
Notice of motion for adjournment of House, 380
Withdrawn temporarily, 336; withdrawn, 463, 863
Railway equipment, 553
Railway situation in Canada, 1653, 2047
Returned soldiers, Government positions for, 1736
Soldiers
First division, on leave, 891
Parliamentary candidates, 886
Sickness of on leave, ques. 971
Votes of, 2404

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Tax on automobiles, 2122
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1196, 1198, 1477
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2392, 2394

Currie, Miss M., ques. 1302

Customs
Agricultural machinery, duties and drawbacks on, ques. 872, ques. 1203
Department
Dager, Herman J., ques. 2242
Estimates, 1065
Staff and salaries, 148, 1059
Farm machinery, collections on, ques. 465
Farm tractors, collections on, 54, ques. 467
Helena, motor-boat, ques. 2101, ques. 2241
Inquiry in Norfolk county, ques. 287
Port Hastings, collector, 1063
Preventive service, salaries, 1065, 1066
Revenue cruisers, 1066
River Port, N.S., officer at, ques. 1200
The Pas and Dauphin, revenue of, ques. 111

Customs Act Amdt. Bills
(1) Temporary control of imports and exports, (No. 16, Sir Robert Borden). Res. 81. 1r., 82. Bill withdrawn, 1767
(2) Revenue (No. 81 Mr. A. K. Maclean). Res. 1262, 1675. 1r., 1690. 2r., Com., 2142. 3r., 2245

Dager, Herman J., ques. 2242

Dairying. *See* Agriculture

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph E. S. E. (Rimouski)
Bradbury, Hon. Senator, ques. 1128, ques. 2397
Budget, 1537
Grand Mere post office, ques. 1481
Quebec disturbances, 452
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 2398
Woman suffrage, 660

Davidson, Mr. A. L. (Digby and Annapolis)
Soldiers' vote, 2420
Yukon election, 2095, 2327

Davis, Mr. Fred L. (Neepawa)
Alien labour, 991
Budget, 1596
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1796, 1803
Daylight saving, 169
Indian lands, 1052
Trade and financial conditions, 1596
War taxation, 1597

Daylight Saving Bill. 1r., 50. 2r., 157-197. Com., 244. 3r., 337
Amendment Bill. 1r., 1692. 2r., Com., 3r., 1913

Debates Committee, 106

Debentures, provincial and municipal, sale of, 115, ques. 287

De Celles, Mr. A. D., 1767, 2519

Déchène, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Bate, McMahon & Co., ques. 1479
Budget, 1548
Crow's Nest Pass Coal, ques. 1128
Experimental farms, 2292, 2296
Food containers, 2255
Grand Mere dam, ques. 2240
Grosse Isle quarantine, 1145
International banking, 2262
Labour
Bureaus, 1043
Shortage of, 1549
Post Office Department, leases in Ottawa, ques. 874
Production, encouragement of, 1549
Railway equipment, 551
Tea, tax on, 2126
White pine blister, 2298
Woman suffrage, 676

Defence of Canada Order, 1917, amendments, 932

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Military service, registrars' offices, ques. 1073

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. Johns and Iberville)
Granby post office, ques. 870
Missisquoi Bay, net fishing, ques. 109, 276
Oil deposits, ques. 1479
Voluntary enlistments, ques. 109
Woman suffrage, 651

Deniger, Mr. J. A., ques. 1982

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 1582
Financial conditions, 1583
French Canadians, social and political condition, 1586
Hay, 1088, 1093-1098, 1132-1135
Military service, 1585
Penitentiary inspectors, 1187
Quebec and the war, 1584
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 527
Titles, 2354
Woman suffrage, 641

Departments, annual reports of, publication in French and English, 135, ques. 971

Departments, re-arrangement of. *See* Salaries Act Amdt.; Re-arrangement; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Department of Railways and Canals Act Amendment Bills
(1) No. 42, (Railway equipment), Mr. J. D. Reid. Res. 537. 1r., 559. 2r., Com., 725. 3r., 730

Department of Railways and Canals Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
(2) No. 52, (Stores account), Mr. J. D. Reid. Res. 679. 1r., 680. 2r., Com., 829. 3r., 829

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Appointment of, 73
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Appropriations involved, increasable only by Message, 1898
Motion to report, not debatable, 1991
Principle of, not discussable in Committee, 1182
Private, suspension of rules, 1950
Committee
Motion that Committee rise, not debatable, 1099
Imputation of motives, 2281
Interruptions, 2425
Irrelevancy, 924
Business facilitated by members keeping to question, 2534
Discussion anticipatory of clause of Bill, 1084
Judiciary not to be reflected upon, 1896
Previous debate, reference to not permissible, 2502
Public officials, conduct of out of office hours, propriety of answer by Minister, 2276-2280
Quorum, proceeding without, 2518
Supply—discussion confined to clause before Committee, 2512, 2537
Unanimous consent, 2537

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Budget, 1535
Food, economy in, 1536
Ste. Anne de la Perade, purchase of land at, ques. 744
War
Insurance premiums, ques. 1361
Prosecution of, 1535
Webster, Mr. W. V., ques. 467

Desjardins, Charles, ("Ti-noir") ques. 112, 1027, 1075, 1607

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Budget, 1613
Food, 1616
Letter-carriers' salaries, ques. 1302
Munitions on ships, ques. 1128
Political situation, 1614
War, Canada's part in, 1615
Woman suffrage, 669

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Auditor General, 139

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B.—*Con.*
Beaverbrook, Lord, ques. 50
Budget, 1500
Civil Service Act Amdt., 710, 717, 1780, 1798, 1876, 1889, 1900
Director of Public Information, ques. 57
Economy in Government, 140
Employment offices, 1030
Food
Canada Food Board, 217
Production, 1501
Waste, 200
Imperial Munitions Board, 58
Labour Department, staff, 1031
Military service, exemption of farmers, 1502
Pension Commissioners, ques. 51
Privy Council Department, staff, ques. 466
Railway equipment, 549
Registration, 1507
Returns of last general election, 1366
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1697, 1701
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 530
War expenditure, 560
Woman suffrage, 94, 101
Yukon election, 2069
Amendment proposed, 2321

De Wolf, Mr. Harry C., ques. 1071

Diamonds, importation of, ques. 631

Dickson, Mr. W. H., appointment, 1835, 2127

Dillon, Capt. Gerald, ques. 568, 889, 1897

Dimock, Lieut. Bertram, ques. 1842

Director of Public Information, ques. 57, 699, 706, 719, 891, 896, 1302

Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts in, 2065

Dogs (sheep protection), 1055

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code
Alien labour, 1017
Anti-loafing, 2387
Arichat, Judge at, salary of, 2517
Austrians, interned, 1020
Belanger vs. The King, 2509
Bills of Exchange, 2383, 2477
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1945
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act Amdt., 2064, 2199, 2202, 2206
Children, moral protection of. *See* Criminal Code
Civil Service, appointments, 2527
Companies Act Amdt., 968, 1076
Criminal Code Amdt., 1193, 1696, 2492
Dominion Police, 2536
Belanger, resignation of, 2518
Drunkenness, habitual. *See* Criminal Code
Election, documents in, 972, 1304

Doherty, Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, 2526
Gaming-houses. *See* Criminal Code
Judges Act Amdt., 1836
Mail contracts, 2529
Rural mail carriers, 58
Military Service
Detention, alleged unlawful, 1176, 1367
Draftees, leave of absence, 1175
Enforcement, 1131
Exemption papers, confiscation of, 1367
Military police, 2387, 2517
Tribunals, 2512
Ministers' visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Motor cars, theft of. *See* Criminal Code
Naturalization Act Amendment, 968, 1077
Parliament buildings, fire claims, 2548
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 129, 1176-1191
Post Office
Department
Estimates, 2528, 2548
Vacancies, 2535
Mail contracts, 58, 2529
Quebec disturbances
Dominion police, action of, 2517
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 737
St. Charles river works, 2509
Seduction. *See* Criminal Code
Soldiers, returned, 1182
Soldiers' votes, 2459
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 240, 520, 537, 2198
Yukon election, 2083, 2085

Dominion astronomical observatory, 2218

Dominion Bureau of Statistics Bill. Res. 337. 1r., 339. 2r., 803. Com., 808. 3r., 834. Senate amdts., 1695

Dominion Canners' drawbacks, ques. 287

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1193

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1r., 82. 2r., Com., 85. 3r., 241, 336

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 55. 2r., 249. Com., 250, 257, 343. 3r., 520. Senate amdts., 1695

Dominion Lands and Parks, 2221

Dominion notes in circulation, ques. 334

Dominion Police, estimates, 2536
Belanger, resignation of, 2518
Inspector Military district No. 4, ques. 630

Dominions Royal Commission, 1074, 2265, 2540

Dorchester county
Mail contracts, ques. 115
Postmasters in, ques. 113
Telephone lines, 1172

Double standard of morals. *See* Criminal Code

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Homesteads, abandoned, tax on, 252
Indian lands, 1048

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Bernasconi, Mr., engineer, 1159
Fuel, 768
Glace Bay harbour, 2544

Doukhobors, ques. 1072, 1950

Drunkenness, habitual. *See* Criminal Code

Dry docks, 1116

Dublin Shore, postmaster at, ques. 876

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Bait, cold storage for, 280
Barge Benmore, ques. 1617
Budget, 1468
Canada Registration Board, ques. 1979
Customs, overmanning of department, 1059
Dublin Shore, postmaster, ques. 876
Feltzen South, breakwater, 1155
Financial conditions, 1468
Fishing industry, 1471
Guardians, 272
Indian Point, postmaster, 876
Loans, domestic, 1470
Mosher's Bay breakwater, 1158
Patriotic Fund, 2204
Privilege, statements in Journal-Press, 314
River Port, customs officer, ques. 1200
25th Nova Scotia battalion, ques. 1304

Duff, Mr. Justice, and the Round Table, ques. 841

Dupuis, Mr. J. A., ques. 109

DuTremblay, Mr. Pamphile R. (Laurier-Outremont)
Batiscan river bridge, 1166
Bremner, Major F. W. D., ques. 1843
Budget, 1330
Canadian Northern Railway, 1917, 2118
Cigars, tax on, 1678
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1828
Daylight saving, 178
Dimock, Lieut. Bertram, ques. 1842
Exchange rates, Canada and United States, ques. 465
French Canadians in army, 927, 1194, 1927
Hants county, revising barrister, ques. 2237
High cost of living, 1331
Indian lands, 1052
Industrial disputes, 837
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2284
Labour, employment offices, 1036
Laprairie-St. Lambert dyke, ques. 465, 1163
Military service
Medical examinations, 1693

DuTremblay, Mr. Pamphile R.—*Con.*
Military service—*Con.*
Police, 2516, 2387
Militia Department, patronage in, 857
Outremont public building, 1147
Pensions, Board of, Representation of Veterans—Dr. Laviolette, 2520
Railway equipment, 551
St. Lawrence channel, dredging, 1169
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 529
Taxation, 1332
Cigars, on, 1678
Income, 2145
Tobacco, 1988
Woman suffrage, 636

East Cacouna, wharf, ques. 970

East Peterborough, registration, ques. 1480, ques. 2100

Economic and Development Commission, 2225

Editorial Committee. *See* Printing

Edmonton, pavement, Jasper avenue, 1151

Edmundston, post office, 1138

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Budget, 1518
Civil Service Act Amendment, 708, 713, 1894, 2135, 2138
Customs, alleged overmanning of service, 1060
Daylight saving, 173
Dillon, Capt., 889, 1897
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance to, 2521. *See under this head,* Taxation, judges
Fuel, 777
Hay, 1083
Military service
Exemptions, 1538
Leave of absence for seeding, 1365
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1303
Oleomargarine, 299
Parliament buildings, new, Speaker's residence, 1107
Penitentiaries
Annual report of, ques. 2240
Inspectors, 1179-1184
Prisoners
Employment of, furniture making for Government offices, 1181
Young, treatment of, 1181
Pensions, 2482
Privilege—statement in Ottawa Citizen, 1982
Quebec disturbances, 428
Rural mail contracts, 60
Separation allowances, 888
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 621
Tariff reductions, 1520
Taxation, 1519
Income, 1518, 2152
Judges, of, 2157, 2160

Eggs. *See* Inspection and Sale; Agriculture

Elaine, steamship, 2213

Elections. *See also* Army; Soldiers' Votes; Dominion Elections Act; War-time Elections
Anti-Unionist candidates, ques. 2237
Chambly-Vercheres, documents, 972, 1304, 1618
De Wolf, Harry C., employment, ques. 1071
L'Assomption-Montcalm returning officer, ques. 1302, ques. 1482, ques. 2238
Oxford, 914
Renfrew, South, 884
Returns, general election, 1366
Returning officers, payments of, 2512
Soldiers' votes, sending of candidates' names to England, 906
Yukon. *See* Yukon election

Electrical Development Company. *See* Toronto, Niagara and Western

Electricity, export to United States, 1069. *See* Water powers

Elevators, terminal, 2263

Elgin and Havelock railway, 2542

Elkin, Mr. Stanley E. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Fuel, 323
Hay, 78
Temporary control of imports and exports, 81
Zinc bounties, 2500

Employment offices. *See* Labour

Estimates. *See titles of departments, and subjects*

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Military service
Deserters and draftees, alleged band of, 632
Exemption of farmers, 1252
Net public debt, ques. 1364
Tobacco culture, 2297

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 1622
Daylight saving, 179
Excise, collection of, 1068
Farm tractors, ques. 467
Fuel, 1166
Immigration agents, 2270
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 2241
Meat, inspection of, 797
Parliament buildings, new, 1109
Port Dover harbour, 1166
Pringle, Mr. R. A., K.C., ques. 868
Production, 1626
Rural mail contracts, 2534

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
War expenditure and taxation, 1624
Woman suffrage, 98
Zinc bounties, 2502

Excise. *See also* Inland Revenue; Taxation
Berthierville, officers at, ques. 113
Collection, 1068
Duties, changes (Budget), 1261
Liquor, seizure at St. Lambert, ques. 1127
Officers' salaries, 1066

Exhibitions. *See* Agriculture

Explosives 1099, ques. 1128, 2197

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Agriculture, appropriations for, 1601
Budget, 1598
Forestry battalion officers, ques. 2399
Military service
Farmers, exemption of, 1600
Quebec, attitude of, 1601
Production, 1598
Railway equipment, 558
Spirit Lake experimental form and detention camp, ques. 744, 2293

Fallon, Bishop, ques. 1304
Visit to front, ques. 2238

Farm labour. *See* Labour; Military Service

Farm machinery. *See* Agriculture

Farmers' delegation. *See* Military Service

Farran's Point, canal employees, ques. 568

Feltzen South, breakwater, 1155

Fenian Raid pensions, 2519

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Shelburne and Queen's)
Auditor General, 137
Business of the House, lack of opportunity for discussion, 2527
Camp Borden, land purchases, 1948
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 683
Cape Island, Nova Scotia, smallpox in, 1131
Civil Service Act Amdt., 706, 712, 1860, 1866, 1903, 2136
Customs duties on Government imports, 1062
Daylight saving, 190
Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts, 2066
Employment offices, 842, 1029, 1042
Fish in cans, weight of contents, 1212
Fisheries Commission, 274
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 816
Government railways
Provident fund, 2170
Revenues, 683, 686
Harbours, obstruction of by ice, 359
Judges and income tax, 1686, 2161

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Lobsters taken in extra-territorial waters, 967
Marine wrecking plants, 364
Ministers, need of election, 849
Moving-picture films, censoring, 1676
Parliament buildings, Speaker's quarters, 1106
Penitentiaries, regulations, 1189
Post Office estimates, lack of time for consideration, 2527
Public works, urgently needed repairs, 145, 1160
Railway equipment, 543
Rural mail contracts, 62, 2534
Shipbuilding, 350
Superannuation, 2312
Titles, 511, 516, 2349
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2391
War Mission at Washington, 905
War revenue, excise, 1680
Yukon election, 2076, 2098, 2326

Film service to advertise Canada, 2267

Finance
Advances to provinces, ques. 208, ques. 741
Banks. *See that title*
Department, salaries, 133
Dominion notes in circulation, ques. 334
Exchange between Canada and the United States, ques. 465
Federal advances to provinces
Applications for, ques. 741
Ontario, ques. 742
Saskatchewan, ques. 742
Gold reserve, ques. 334
Loans, ques. 334
Due dates of, ques. 741
Prevention of depreciation, ques. 335
Minister and Acting Minister of, visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Net public debt, ques. 1364
Prohibition, effect on Dominion revenues, ques. 335
Silver money in circulation, ques. 334
Specie, amount of, ques. 741
Treasury bonds, ques. 741
Victory loan. *See that title*
War bonds, purchase of by public servants, ques. 742
War expenditure, ques. 335

Firewood. *See* Fuel; Inspection and Sale

Fir Grove-Frampton mail contract, ques. 2397

Fir Grove-St. Odilion mail contract, ques. 2397

Fish and Fisheries
Advisory board, 270
Bait, 279
Bounties to fishermen, 283

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Commission, 274
Conservation, 2375
Department, estimates, 270, 354
Exhibit at Toronto, 280
Fishermen
Conscription of, 1296, 2314
Wages of, 2546
Guardians and overseers, 270
Inspection of pickled fish, 281
Lobster hatcheries and industry, 282, ques. 630, 967
Maritime provinces, value of fishing vessels, in, 1471
Missisquoi Bay, net fishing in, ques. 109, 275
Oysters, 271, 274
Prices, 2375
Protection service, 354
Report, 1692
Salmon fishing, motor boats for, ques. 970
Traps, St. Lawrence river, ques. 330
Transportation, 278
Treaty, 55

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 868. 2r., Com., 3r., 967

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, ques. 330, 1976, 1984, 2155, ques. 2478, 2521, 2536

Flake graphite, ques. 631

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1390

Flax, increased production, 1231, 2381

Flour milling companies' profits, 2128, 2237, 2314

Foisy, Dr. Louis Azarie, ques. 1302, ques. 1482, ques. 2238

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph E. (Hull)
Budget, 1440
Canada Food Board, 228
Military service
Arrangements with allied nations, ques. 1071
Deserter, presumed, arrest of, 1075
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 146
Taxation, 1441

Food. *See also* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale; Meat and Canned Foods
Adulteration of, 2537
Campaign for greater production, 25-27, 903, 1272, 1501
Canada Food Board
Establishment of, ques. 1361
Expenses of, ques. 971
Furois, Mr. Philippe, ques. 2243, 2375
Legal adviser to, ques. 466
Order in Council creating, 208
Salaries, ques. 335
Containers, marking of, 1211

Food—*Con.*
Controller, office of, 28, 52
Eggs, regulation governing sale of, 77
Sale of by weight, 1206
Fish. *See that title*
Inspection of exports and imports, 1057
Prices, fixing of. 1331
Quebec, production in, 1550
Vegetables, sale of, regulations, 77
Waste, 200

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers, Committee on, 107

Forestry corps and medical service. *See* Army

Forrest, Mr. T. M., ques. 1977

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 1462
Firewood, sale of, 1220
Military service
Administration of, 2384
Conscription of labour, 1464
Exemptions, 1253 ,
Leave of absence for seeding, 1475
Production, encouragement of, 1462
War expenditure, 900
Woman suffrage, 634

Fort William harbour, 1125

Foster, Rt Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Bounties, lead and crude petroleum, 2263
Burchard, Dr., report of, 2399
Bureau of Statistics, 337, 803, 1695
Canada Food Board, 212
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1865
Daylight saving, 157, 193, 244, 1692
Eggs, sale, regulations, 1210
Farmers, delegation of, 1912
Film service to advertise Canada, 2267
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, 2523, 2536
Food containers, 1211, 2254
Fuel, 782
Controller's office, 12
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amdt., 634, 966
Grain, milling values of, 2399
Hay, inspection, 78, 1078, 1132, 2198
High Commissioner's office, 2542
Imperial Conference, 1982, 2554
Insurance Act Amdt., 1205
Military service
Administration of Act, 2384
Bank clerks, leave of absence, 2383
Farmers, exemption of, 1912, 2388, 2553
Milk, sale, regulations, 1214
Orders in Council, concurrence in, 2382, 2479
Pensions Commissioners, 2520
Pensions, 2520, 2550

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
Pictou-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 68
Portland cement, 1221, 1231
Post Office Department, administration of, 2513
Railway Act (consolidation), 2493
Registration, 2555
Salt, shortage of, 1983
Soldiers' vote, 2256, 2471
Steamship services. *See that title*
Terminal elevators, 2263
Titles, 2352
Trade
Development of, 2260, 2262, 2267
France, with, 2257
Russia and Japan, with, 2258
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners, 2257
Department, estimates, 343, 2210
Water powers, Canadian, film exhibitions, 2268

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Alien labour, 1000
Camp Borden, 1962
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1732, 1762, 1797
Daylight saving, 248
Meat and Canned Foods, 792
Portland cement, 1222
Toronto harbour, 1120
Woman suffrage, 658

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1825
Patent Medicine stamp tax, ques. 871, 1992
Quebec disturbances, 454
Woman suffrage, 637

Fowler, Mr. Robert, Post Office Department, 1983, ques. 2241

France, trade with, 2257

Franchise. *See* War-time Elections Act; Military Voters' Act; Woman Suffrage

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Daylight saving, 168
Fruit containers, 2252
Woman suffrage, 650

Fraserville public building, rental ques. 1202

Freight cars. *See* Railways

French Canadian Brigade, 1194, 1927. *See* Army

French Canadian Ministers, appointment of, ques. 207

French Canadians, conscription of for labour, 976

French religious and the war, 43

French river dam, 1166

French treaty, ques. 1481

Fripp, Mr. A. E. (Ottawa)
Militia records branch, employees, ques. 113

Fruit. *See* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale

Fuel
Coal. *See also* Mines
Canadian resources, development of
Armstrong, Mr. J. E., motion, 744
Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company, payments to, ques. 1128
Lake Erie, transportation of, on, 1167
Lignite, briquetting, 2546
Quebec, rate from Maritime provinces, 1973
Royalties on, ques. 570
Control, 32, 321
Firewood, 77, ques. 113, 1218. *See* Inspection and Sale
Shortage, motion, Mr. Lemieux, 316

Fulton, Mr. Frederick J. (Cariboo)
Highland Valley, mineral claims, 243
Timber berths on Dominion lands, 262

Furois, Mr. Philippe, ques. 1981, ques. 2243, 2375

Gabard, Mr. Marcel, appointment of, 2313, 2383

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Admendment

Gaspe
Harbours, 359, 1162
Railways, 2185

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Budget, 1429
Fruit and vegetables, distribution of, ques. 287
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 812
Military service, 1431
Production, encouragement of, 1433
Railway equipment, 544
War taxation, 1430

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Témiscouata)
East Cacouna wharf, ques. 970
Fishing traps, St. Lawrence river, ques. 330
Fraserville, rental of building, ques. 1202
Intercolonial branch lines, 2182
Lebel, Mr. Nazaire, ques. 877
Light-keepers' salaries, 372
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1481
Pilots, 1306
Rivière du Loup steamship service, 2214

Geodetic survey, 2218

Georgian Bay Canal, 1836, 2219

German goods. *See* Identification

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Berthier public works, ques. 467

Gervais, Mr. Theodore—*Con.*
Berthierville
Excise officers, ques. 113
Post office, ques. 466
Hay, 1091, 1093, 1136
Mattawin river dredging, ques. 568
Military service, exemptions in Berthier, ques. 1843
St. Barthelemi road, protection dyke, ques. 569
Steamers, Montcalm and Lady Grey, ques. 466
Woman suffrage, 638

Gillespie, Lieut. Col. George, ques. 2239

Glace Bay harbour, 1170, 2544

Gladu, Mr. J. E. O. (Yamaska)
Budget, 1634
Canada's financial position, 1638
Coal situation, 1639
French Canadians, attitude of, 1635
War-time Elections Act, 1636

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Agricultural exhibitions, 2377
Agriculture, publicity for, 2378
Cheese and condensed milk, 1129
Dairying, feeds for, 311
Eggs, sale, regulations, 1208
Flax, production, 1231, 2381
Military service, leave of absence board, ques. 56
Separation allowances, 608
Woman suffrage, 665

Glengarry and Stormont, vacancy, 1071

Gobeil, Mr. Antoine, ques. 1978

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 1r., 634. 2r., Com., 966. 3r., 1028

Gold reserve, ques. 334
Central, banks, deposit with, ques. 741

Gordon, Rev. C. W., ques. 2240

Gouin, Lieut., 862

Government advertising, ques. 115, ques. 1072
Film service, 2267
Prince Rupert Journal, in, ques. 1360
See also Victory Loan

Government appointments, relations of representatives of constituencies to, ques. 1305, ques. 1481, ques. 2101

Government employees, compensation for injuries. *See* Compensation

Government railways. *See* Canadian Government Railways

Graham. *See* Sioux Lookout

Graham, Mr. W. M., Indian Commissioner, 27. *See* Indians

Grain. *See also* Agriculture
Canada Grain Act, 2263

Grain—*Con.*
Canadian, and Canadian routes, ques. 1362
Milling values, 2399

Granby post office, ques. 870

Grand Mere
Dam, ques. 2240
Post office, site at, 1481

Grand Trunk Railway
Government acquisition of, ques. 2242
Sir Clifford Sifton, and, ques. 2242

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Acquisition of, statement by Prime Minister, 2004
Aid granted to, 1996

Graphite, flake, ques. 631

Great Britain, steamship service, 2210

Great War Veterans Association. *See also* Army
Alleged election activities, 909, 915
Petition of, aliens, 977, 982
Representation, on Pensions Board, 2520

Green, Mr. Robert F. (West Kootenay)
Alien labour, 996
Zinc bounties, 2498

Grenier, Capt., ques. 1841

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 1145

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1691
Yukon election, 1835, 2209, 2315, 2321, 2505
Motion for adoption of report, 2315

Habeas Corpus writs. *See* Military Service
Resolutions regarding suspension of, 2385

Habitual Drunkenness. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Halifax
Harbour, cost of, ques. 1126
Quarantine station, 1138

Halifax, Canso and Guysborough steamship service, 2211

Halifax disaster, 32, 858
Claims, 2397
Reconstruction, ques. 1362
Relief Commission. *See* Halifax Relief

Halifax Relief Commission Bill. 1r., 2064. 2r., Com., 2196. 3r., 2198

Halladay, Mr. Howard H. (Bow River)
Daylight saving, 245
Fuel, 771
Post offices as labour bureaus, 1029

Hamilton, Mrs., ques. 1481

Hanna, late Dr. A. E., 3

Hants county, revising barrister, ques. 2237

Harbours. *See* Public Works

Harman, Mr. Charles, ques. 208

Harrison, Mr. C. R. (Nipissing)
Trades unions and aliens, 2547

Hay. *See* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Alien labour, 1014
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2137
Daylight saving, 163
Railway equipment, 550
Woman suffrage, 644

Helena, motor-boat, ques. 2101, ques. 2241

Henders, Mr. Richard C. (Macdonald)
Budget, 1591
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1855
Farm labour, supply of, 2382
Food containers, 1214
Fruit, inspection and sale, 2249, 2252
Indian lands, 1051
Portland cement, 1224
Tariff reduction, 1593
Union Government, 1592

High Commissioner for Canada, office, ques. 971, 2541

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Alien labour, 994
Budget, 1553
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1738, 1806, 1834, 1853, 1859
Daylight saving, 166
French Canadian Ministers, appointment, ques. 207
Fuel, 756
Judges' salaries, tax on, 2158, 2160
Orange Order in Canada, 1553
Post Office Department—Mr. Fowler, 1983
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1198

Horses. *See* Agriculture, animals

Hospitals. *See* Military Hospitals Commission

House of Commons. *See also* Speaker; Deputy Speaker; Parliamentary Procedure
Business of the
Adjournment instead of prorogation, advisability of, 2254, 2313
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 1618, 1691
Easter, 83, 157
Mondays for Government orders, 877, 1026
Morning sittings, 1419
Order of, 1026, 2310, 2374
Prorogation, date of, 2382
Saturday sittings, 1419
Wednesdays and Thursdays for Government orders, 156
Wednesday evening sittings, 156

House of Commons—*Con.*
Censoring of debates, notice of motion withdrawn, 1767
Chamber, acoustic properties of, 84, 2479
Committees, select standing, 3, 12, 104, 329, 1071, 1175
For individual committees see their titles
Decorum—at adjournment members to keep their places until Mr. Speaker has left the Chair, 518
Deputy Speaker. *See that title*
Discussion, lack of opportunity for, 2527
Elections. *See that title*
Employees, yearly increase in salary, 329
Estimates, 2519
Internal Economy Committee, 11
Members
Deceased, tributes to, 3, 932
New, introduction of, 1475
Return of, 236
Yukon, for, 236, 2382
Officials
Appointments
Debates Reporters and Translators. *See* Dickson, Gabard, Chevassu
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3, 329
Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Secret Session. *See* Parliament
Speaker. *See that title*
Speaker's quarters in new buildings, 1105
Vacancies, 562, 1071
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, consolidation of, 2313, 2388, 2519

Housing, protection of morals. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Hudson Bay Railway, 2167

Hughes, Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 890, 896
Alpine Club of Canada, 2228
Army corps, 1305
Auditor General, 136, 600-601
Expenditure of, overseas, 1916, ques. 1481
Relatives of in Government service, ques. 1200
Son of, position of, 1731
Budget, 1482
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1943
Canadian Daily Record, 918
Civil servants, civil pay of enlisted, 864, 2386
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1739, 1777, 1863, 1868, 2136
Colonization, 147, 614
Democracy vs. autocracy, 1482
Director of Public Information, 896
Domestic and foreign loans, 1489
Egg imports, 791
Farmers, delegation of, 1912
Financial conditions, 1485

Hughes, Sir Sam—*Con.*
Flooded lands in the West, 259
Flying Corps, Canadian, proposed, 1368
French Canadian brigade, 1934
Fruit containers, 2251, 2253
Hay, fraudulent sale of, 1081
Highways alongside railways, 82, 85
House of Commons, Chamber, acoustics of, 84, 2479
Imperial Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 1619
Imperial War Graves Commission, ques. 331
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2282
Judges, retirement of, 240
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 863, 895
Mail contracts, 2529
Medical service—Dr. Bruce, 1368
Military service
Administration of Act, 2384
Exemption of only son, 1366
Ministers and re-election, 77
Moving-picture films, purchases, 1676
Munitions, 1486
Officers, salutes to, 621
Ordnance land at Three Rivers, 2227
Overseas Militia Department, 1488
Overseas service
Army corps and divisions, recommendations as to, 879
Canadian officers, replacement of, 596
Canadian troops, authority over in England, 600
Soldiers, pay of, 601
Uniforms, 602, 603
Pensions, 2481
Private secretary to President of Council, 2279
Quebec disturbances, 407
Registration board, 1487
Returned soldiers, employment of, 1183
Royal Flying Corps, 1368
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 30, 614
Titles, 510
Trent canal, 1966
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2389, 2391
War
Men, raising and saving of, for, 1492
Progress of German offensive, 107
Water-powers, development of, 1070
Woman suffrage, 97
Zinc bounties, 2501

Hunt, Mr. A. B. (Compton)
Budget, 1620
Bury, Que., drill hall, ques. 743
Daylight saving, 190
Farmers, conscription of, 1622
Lennoxville experimental farm, ques. 743

Hunt, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Production, encouragement of, 1620
Sherbrooke, breeding animals at, ques. 870

Hunt, Donald, ques. 1480, 2275

Hydro-Electric Commission, 1199, 1355

Icebreakers, 358

Identification of traders in German goods, Bill. 1r., 1836

Idleness, Order in Council prohibiting, 377.

Immigration and Colonization
Agents, 2270
Clergymen as, ques. 1203
Belgium, 2272
Chinese, 2272
Department
Estimates, 2269
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 869, ques. 2241
Private secretary, 2273
Staff and salaries, 204
Labour, and, 1040

Immigration and Colonization Bill. 1r., 56. 2r., Com., 103. 3r., 129

Imperial Conference and Imperial War Cabinet, ques. 2239, 2244, 2539
Attendance by Canadian Prime Minister, 1619, 2554
British embargo on Canadian cattle, ques. 565
Motion for correspondence, 1982

Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 760, 2539

Imperial Munitions Board
Ammunition inspection, ques. 465
Construction of ships by, 346, 350
Lists of soldiers' dependents, copying of, ques. 58, ques. 1201
Munitions at Beloeil, 1099

Imperial War Graves Commission, ques. 331

Income War Tax Amendment Bill. Res., 1684. 1r., 1691. 2r., 2143. Com., 2143-2161. 3r., 2245.
Senate amendments, 2492

Income War tax, ques. 467

Incubators, purchase of, ques. 1301

Independence of Parliament. *See* Salaries Act

Indians. *See also* Indian Act Amendment
Agents
Crooked Lake, 2232
Commissioner W. M. Graham, 27, 1050
Department of Indian Affairs, estimates, 2232
Dogs, taxation of, 1055
Enfranchisement of, 90
Illegal celebrations of, 1056

Indians—*Con.*
Property devised by will, 1046
Witness, as to, 1047
Provinces, in
Nova Scotia, 2235
Ontario, 1056, 2235
Quebec, 2235
Northwest provinces and territories, 2236
Purchase of live stock for, 27
Reserves
Caughnawaga, 2235
Cultivation of, 1048, 1053
Crooked Lake, 2232
Increased production on, 27
Sarcee reserves, 1054

Indian Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 932. 2r., 1046. Com., 1046-1056. 3r., 1076

Indian Point, postmaster at, ques. 876

Industrial disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 564. 2r., 835. Com., 835-841. 3r., 878

Industrial Reconstruction Association, 1034

Industries, non-essential, 992

Inland Deep Waterway, memorandum *re* economic route, 2219

Inland Revenue. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Excise
Department
Chassé, Mr. Noel, ques. 111
Employees, ques. 114
Estimates, 149
Taxation, patent medicine stamp tax, ques. 871, 1991
War stamps, cost in connection with, 1067
Weights and measures, 1068

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Res., 1263, 1677. 1r., 1690. 2r., 1984. Com., 1984-1991. 3r., 1991

Insolvency. *See* Bankruptcy

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bills
(1) Vegetables, eggs, food containers, firewood and cement. (No. 19, Sir George Foster). Res., 77. 1r., 88. 2r., 1205. Com., 1205-1231, 2254-2256. 3r., 2256
(2) Hay and Straw (No. 20, Sir George Foster). Res., 78. 1r., 88. 2r., 1078. Com., 1078-1099; Com., 1132-1137. 3r., 1176.
Senate amendments, 2198
(3) Fruit, fruit marks and potatoes (No. 108, Mr. Crerar). Res., 2209. 1r., 2210. 2r., 2245. Com., 2245-2254. 3r., 2254

Insurance
Department, estimates, 134
War, premiums, ques. 1361

Insurance Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 867. 2r., Com., 1205. Ref. to Banking and Commerce Committee, 1421. Bill withdrawn, 1976, 2476

Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, acquisition of in New Brunswick, 2178, 2182, 2542
Patronage, abolition of on, 2140, 2538
Paradis, Mr., claim of, 2186

Interior, Department of the. *See also* Dominion Forest; Dominion Lands
Estimates, 2216, 2218

Internal Economy Commission, 11

Internment. *See* Aliens

Intoxicating liquors
Storage of at St. Lambert, ques. 1127
Illicit, 1989
See also Prohibition

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Bankruptcy, 205
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1944
Customs brokers, payments to, 1061
Daylight saving, 173
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 824, 826
Income tax, 1688
Industrial disputes, 840
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 869
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2282
Ministers of the Crown, their number and responsibility, 604-606
Montreal, land for public buildings, 1148
Trent canal, 1965

Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 869, ques. 2241

Jamesville, breakwater, 1155

Jewellery, tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Johnson, Mr. Main, ques. 570, 912, 2236, 2274, ques. 1303. *See* Privy Council

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred. (Last Mountain)
Shipbuilding, 354
Woman suffrage, 672

Joy-riding. *See* Criminal Code

Judges. *See* Justice Department; Military Service, Tribunals; Supreme Court Act

Judges' Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1836.

Justice
Administration of, 2507
Department
Desjardins, bail for, 1027
Dillon, Captain Gerald, ques. 568, 889, 1897
Dominion Police, salaries, 2518, 2536
Estimates, 2539
Exchequer Court
Belanger vs. The King, 2507

Justice—*Con.*
Judges
Arichat, N.S., 2517
Central Appeal Judge, staff of, 331. *See* Military Service
Salaries, and income tax, 1685, 2155

Kay, Mr. W. Fred. (Missisquoi)
Agricultural exhibtions, 2377, 2380
Bran, exportation of, 2128, 2304
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 280
Food containers, 2256
Lennoxville experimental station, 2295
Meats in cold storage, ques. 1302
Military service
Medical boards, 1306
Tribunals, ques. 111
Milk, bottling of, 1214
Mill feed, bran and shorts, ques. 206, 2301, 2305
Missisquoi Bay, seine fishing in, 275
Mount Royal City, 1480
Public buildings at Ottawa, 1114

Keefer, Mr. F. H. (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1889
Daylight saving, 164
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., railway men's votes, 1193
Fishermen, wages of, 2546
Government employees, compensation for injuries to, 813, 819
Oleomargarine, 297
Rural mail contracts, 2532
Sioux Lookout, 2175

Kemp, Sir Edward (Overseas Minister of Militia)
War, cablegrams from, as to, 157, 238

Kennedy, Mr. William C. (North Essex)
Banking system, 1404
Budget, 1402
Business profits war tax, 1403
Casualty reports, ques. 2102
Customs officials, overtime pay for, 1067
Domestic loans, 1406
Farmers and military service, 1406
Government railways, purchase of coal in United States for, ques. 871
Ships' plates, purchase of in United States, ques. 744
War taxes, 1403

Kent House, use of as military hospital, ques. 1843, ques. 2102

Kent Northern railway, 2542

Killen, Robert Cleland, ques. 1842

Kingston, deputy registrar, ques. 2238

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural fairs, 2380
Budget, 1534
Copper and gold deposits, 1534

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Saskatchewan
Grain production, 1534
Indian reserves, 2236

Labatt, Colonel, ques. 51
Pension, ques. 1201, ques. 1981
Pension Board, appointment to, ques. 1201
Connection with Major-General Mewburn, 1692
Resignation of, 2520
See also Pensions

Labour. *See also* Alien
After-war conditions, 1033
Agricultural, shortage of, 1549. *See* Military Service, farmers
Bureaus
Canada, in, 1030
Control of, 1043
Duplication of, 1033. *See also, under this head,* Employment; Exchanges
Capital, relations with, 1037
Chinese in British Columbia, 1002, 1005
Conference of, ques. 875, 984
Department
Estimates, 829
Secretary to Minister, ques. 1129
Staff and salaries, 197
O'Connor, Mr. *See that title*
Employment
Offices, organization and co-ordination of, 841, 842, 1028, 2546
Victoria, B.C., at, ques. 1479, ques. 1978
Enlistments of, in overseas forces, 978
Exchanges
Appropriation for, 1028
Private and municipal, 1039
Fair wages and inspection officers, 831
Farm, scarcity of, 954, 2382
Fishermen, wages of, 2546
French Canadians, conscription of, for, 976
Gazette, 829-830
Halifax, claim of workmen at, ques. 2397
Reconstruction work, ques. 1362
Immigration department, and, 1040
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 831
Industries, in non-essential, 992
Man-power, 982, 988
Oriental, in Canada, 973-1026
Technical education, 1034
Trade unions, 1010, 2547
Strikes and difficulties
Montreal, Marine trades, 2314, 2385
Sydney mines, 203
Winnipeg, 2236, 2385, 2546

Lachine canal, 1967

Lady Grey, steamer, ques. 466

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques Cartier)
Budget, 1662

Lafortune, Mr. D. A.—*Con.*
Liberal party record, 1671
Montreal exhibition, 1667
Patronage, 1666
Prisoners, enlistment of, 1671
Tobacco, tax on, 1987, 1989

Lake Erie ports, 1167

Lalonde, Mr. Frederick, ques. 1842

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Halidmand)
Business profits tax, 1687

Lanark
Election. *See* War-time Elections
Vacancy in, 562

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Hay, inspection, 1078, 1095, 1134

Lanos, late Professor J. M., 2518

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Advances to provinces, ques. 208
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1858, 1905, 2134
Conservation Commission, 2288
Customs Department expenditure, 1065
Food Board, legal adviser to, ques. 466
Geodetic survey, 2220
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 677, 814, 827
High Commissioner's office, lack of French-speaking employees, 2541
Imperial Conference, 2539
Indian lands, 1047, 1054
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2283
Light-keepers' salaries, 371
Military service
Exemptions, 1252
Marriage after July 6, 1917, 1421
Quebec disturbances, 401
Ministers of the Crown, their number and responsibility, 844
Patriotic fund, 2203
Piuze, Colonel, 597
Post Office Department, administration, 2515
President of the Council, private secretary to, 2275
Rivière du Loup steamship service, 2214
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, experimental station, 2290
Seduction, 1701
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 628
Titles, 504
War-time Elections Act, 2496
Woman suffrage, 97
Yukon election, 2078, 2334, 2506
Amendment proposed, 2338

Lapointe, Mr. L. A. (St. James)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1885
Food controller, 52

Lapointe, Mr. L. A.—*Con.*
Fuel, 780
Jewellery, tax on, 2124
Military service, 964

Laprairie protection works, ques. 465, 1163

L'Assomption-Montcalm, returning officer, ques. 1302, ques. 1482, ques. 2238
Military service exemption tribunals, ques. 1838

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 11; Union Government, 13; War-time Elections Act, 14; general election, voting and returns, 14; military service, 19; war issues, 20
Banks, business hours of, 2383
Banks, excess circulation, 739
Belanger vs. The King, 2510
Bureau of Statistics, 809
Canadian Northern Railway, 1423, 1918
Censorship, 969
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1772
Daylight saving, 246
Deputy Speaker, election of, 74
Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts, 2066
Employment offices, 1041
Enlistments prior to June, 1917, 942
Farmers, delegation of, 1912
Farm tractors
Admission free of duty, 54
Government purchase of, 1693, 2388
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance, 2521
Food and Food Board, 208, 944
Regulations, 1207
Forest reserves and parks, private rights in, 85-88
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 677
Government railways, suspense account, 688
Hanna, the late Dr. A. E., M.P., 3
Hay, inspection, 78
House of Commons
Business of the House, 563, 1420, 1618, 2314, 2374
Votes and proceedings and Journals, proposed consolidation, 2388
Imperial Conference, 2244, 2554
Income tax, 2143
Lanark election. *See under this head,* War-times Elections
McMartin, the late John, M.P., 932
Marine trades strike, 2314, 2385
Meat inspection, 798
Military service, 19
Administration of Act, 1251, 2384
Exemptions, 1539
Leave of absence, 1076, 1175, 1475
Quebec disturbances, 238, 390

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Regulations, ages, 20-22, 878, 940
Treaty between Great Britain and United States, 52
Unlawful detentions, alleged, 1176
Voluntary enlistments, 943
Mortgages and hypothecs, 1077
National unity, 944
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., resignation of, 800
Orders in Council, concurrence in, 2382, 2479
Parliament buildings, new, 737
Parliamentary procedure
Members present to vote, 2384
Private Bills, suspension of rules, 1766, 1845
Privilege, question of, order in, 315-316
Penitentiaries, inspectors, 130
Postmaster General, position of, 2514
Quebec Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Railway equipment, 547
Railway situation, 2011. *See under this title,* Canadian Northern
Re-arrangement of departments, 77
Secret session of Parliament, 736
Alleged disclosure of proceedings, 2554
Securities, provincial and municipal, issue of, 125
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 611, 612
Soldiers' vote, 17, 2256, 2474
Speaker, election of, 2
Supply—interim vote, 84
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 522, 533
Titles, 499, 1984
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1198, 1478
Tractors. *See under this head,* Farm tractors
Union Government, 13
Victory loan, 632
War expenditure, 593, 610
Vote, $500,000,000, 571
War-time Elections Act, 14
Amendment, 2493
White, Sir Thomas, absence of, 50
Woman suffrage, 91, 102
Yukon Election, 1835, 2082

Lauzon dock, ques. 112
Paquet, J. B., dismissal of, ques. 2238

Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 385, 434, 737, 863, 889, 895

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Canadian Northern Railway, 2026
Champlain market site, ques. 1362
Northwest grain trade, ques. 1362
Quebec
Railway works at, 2188
Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Quebec bridge, 1975
Ross rifle factory, ques. 2397
St. Charles River works, 1119, 1969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E.—*Con.*
Seven Islands steamship service, 70
Transcontinental railway—Quebec shops, ques. 1362

Lead, bounty, 2263, 2477

Lebel, Mr. Nazaire, ques. 877

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henry)
Daylight saving, 179
Hay, inspection, 1082
Military service
Evasions, alleged, ques. 2399
Exemptions, 1540
Oleomargarine, ques. 286
War expenditure, 609

Leger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Buctouche public building, 1138
Daylight saving, 171
Intercolonial branch lines, 2184
Kent county public works, 1161, 1169

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve, Gaspe)
Aeroplanes, presentation, ques. 740
Alien labour, 979
Anse aux Beaufils, 1162
Anse aux Gascon, 1162
Anti-loafing, returned soldier in prison, 632
Aylesworth, Sir Allen, 913
Baie de Chaleur steamship service, 2213
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., release of, 1910
Belgium, immigration from, 2272
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1837
Correction, Mr. Richardson, 2195
Bernier, Capt., 152
Bird life, protection of, 2223
Budget, 1560; Orange Order in Canada, 1561; French in Canada, 1562; financial conditions, 1565; St. Charles river works, 1567; tariff, 1568; Union Government, 1569; Conscription of farmers, 1570; visit of Ministers to England, 1572
Cable rates, 356
Camp Borden, land purchases, 1937
Canadian Aviation Fund, ques. 1481
Canadian Northern Railway, 1426, 1428, 1716
Canadian Daily Record, 913
Caughnawaga reserve, 2235
Civil servants, enlisted, civil pay of, 864, 1886
Civil Service Act Amdt., 698, 701, 705, 1773, 1790, 1801, 1809, 1831, 1851, 1867, 1873
De Celles, Mr., 1767, 2519
Deep Waterway, 2219
Director of Public Information, 897
Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts, 2065
Dominions Royal Commission, 1074, 2265

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Electric power, export of, 1069
Employment offices, 841, 1033
Farm implements, duties on, ques. 50
Finance Department employees, 134
Financial conditions, 1565
Fishing bounties, 283
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance to, 2524
Forestry corps, 1175
France, trade with, 2257
French Canadian units, 1252
French in Canada, 1562
French treaty, ques. 1481
Fuel, 316, 758
Gaspé
Harbours, 359, 1162, 1165
Transportation, 66, 2185
Gouin, Lieut., 862
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 818
Halifax disaster
Avoidance of explosions elsewhere, 132
Relief Commission, 2196
House of Commons
Notices of motion postponed, 1027
Undue haste, 2528
Estimates, 2519
Private Bills, suspension of rules, 1846
Imperial Conference, 2259, 2540
Round Table Club, 2556
Imports and exports, control of, 81
Income tax, 240, 1686, 2245
Indians, money of bands, 1047
Industrial disputes, 836
Industrial Reconstruction Association, 1034
Intercolonial railway, case of Paradis, 2186
Judges' Act Amdt., 1836
King vs. Belanger, 1567, 2375, 2507
Labour
After-war conditions, 1033
Bureaus, 841
Department
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., 199
Laprairie wharf, 1164
Lightkeepers' salaries, 371
Long Sault power development, 732
Magdalen Islands
Harbours, 1165
Steamship service, 67, 283, 2212
Medical service and forestry corps, 1175, 1305
Military service
Exemptions, 1843
Farmers, conscription of, 1570, 1912
Tribunals, 2512
Milk supply, ques. 872
Ministers, visit of to England, 1572
Montreal and Quebec harbour commissioners, 152
Moving picture films, tariff on, 1675

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Naval discipline Bill, 843
Naval wrecking plants, 364
Navigation, aids to, telephones, 375
Newfoundland steamship service, 2210
Newsprint and mechanical wood pulp, export, ques. 57
Orange Order in Canada, 1561
Oyster culture, 271
Parliament buildings
Claims for fire damage, old buildings, 2548
Construction, 1103
Pictures for, 1104
Patriotic fund, 71, 2201, 2199
Pensions, 2520
Perce wharf, 1162
Postmaster General, position of, 2513
Prison reform, 131
Public works, economy in, 1140
Pulpwood limits on Dominion lands, 261
Quebec bridge, 1975
Quebec harbour, Champlain dock, 1116
Quebec (province) harbours in, 1165
Quebec public works, engineer, 1143
Railway equipment, 539, 547, 557, 559, 729
Refrigerator cars for fish, 278
Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay service, 360
Royal Flying Corps, 931
Enlistment in at Quebec, 1367
St. Charles river works, 1567, 2375, 2507
St. Lawrence route, insurance rates, 367
Salmon fishing, motor boats, ques. 970
Salt, shortage of, 1983
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 115
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1701
Sevigny, Hon. Mr., 1767
Shipbuilding, 344, 1118
Simcoe, steamer, 367
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 628
Soldiers' land settlement, 2228, 2230
Soldiers' votes, 914
Sorel, McCarthy estate, 370
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 241, 523, 531, 2198
Tariff, 1568
Technical education, 1034
Titles, 508
Tobacco, tax on, 1988
Toronto postmaster, 2527
Trade, foreign, 2259
Union Government, 1569
Victory loan, ques, 2398
War
Economy, and, 1140
Expenditure, 560, 902
Water power, development of, 1070
Long Sault, 732
Winnipeg strike, 2236, 2546

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Wireless telegraphy, 354
Woman suffrage, 652
Zwingle, Mrs. Wineas, claim of, 70

Lennoxville, farm, ques, 743, 2295

Lesage, Mr. J. E. (Hochelaga)
Belanger, Mr. J. A., ques. 630
Income tax, ques. 467
Military service
Medical examinations, ques. 564, 1540
Police inspector M.D. No. 4, 630
Reward for arrest of deserters, ques. 467
Woman suffrage, 671

LeSueur, Mr. W. S., ques. 1302

Lethbridge postmaster, ques. 1072

Letter carriers, salaries of, ques. 1302

Levis county
Hay, purchase of in, ques. 740
Military service officials, ques. 570

Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 1072

L'Heureux, Major J. T. N., ques. 2242

Library of Parliament. *See* Parliament

Life-saving, 357

Lighthouse service, 371

Lignite, experiments, 2546

Loafing, 377, 2237

Loans. *See also* Finance
Due dates of, ques. 741
Foreign and domestic, ques. 334

Lower Ardoise post office, ques. 1841

Loyal Orange Order, 460, 1434, 1553, 1561

Mackie, Mr. H. A. (Edmonton East)
Alien labour, 1004
Cigars, duties on, 1678
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1750, 1794, 1821, 1849, 1867, 1885
Moral protection of children (Criminal Code), 1706
Quebec disturbances, 418
Railway situation in Canada, 2021

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Martin, Col., 887

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Acting Minister of Finance)
Banks
Excess circulation, 738
Hours (Bills of Exchange), 2478
Budget, 1253; revenue, 1254; expenditure, 1254; war expenditure, public debt, trade, immigration, exchange, 1255; victory loan, 1256; financing war and trade, 1257; taxation, income tax, 1260
Business of the House, 2310
Business profits war tax, 1682, 2142
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 684, 690

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway, indebtedness, 1421, 1427, 1694, 1711, 1915, 2120
Civil service, war bonus to Outside, 2547
Civil Service Act Amdt., 694, 715, 1721, 1757, 1772, 1786, 1803, 1847, 2129, 2136, 2138, 2477
Customs tariff, 1675
Debt, 1255
De Celles, Mr., 2519
Exchange, 1255
Excise, revenue from, 1677
Finance Department
Estimates, 133
Government buildings, care and cleaning of, 133
Financing war and trade, 1257
Immigration, 1255
Income tax, 1685, 1689, 2143, 2245
Insurance Act Amdt., deposits, 867, 2476
Newspapers, payments to, 2128
Outside service, war bonus to 2547
Railway equipment, 541, 543
Revenue, 1254
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 123
Supply—interim vote, 84
Taxation, 1260
Tobacco, tax on, 1985
Trade, 1255
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2393
Victory loan, expenditure, 680, 920, 1256
War expenditure, 1255
War revenue, 1679, 1991, 2121
Zinc bounties, 2310, 2498, 2503

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Alien labour, 987
Canada and the war, 1951
Daylight saving, 171
Mail contracts, 2549
Military service—delegation of farmers, 1912

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Military service
Draftees, ques. 969
Enrolments and exemptions, ques. 564, ques. 1617
Railways, observation and private cars, ques. 335
War tax on farm implements ques. 1204

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (Kent, Ont.)
Animal contagious diseases, 801
Budget, 1310
Daylight saving, 162, 337
Farm implements, 1311
Meat and canned foods, 794
Production, 1312
Tariff questions, 1310
Tobacco, tax on, 1366, 1986, 1988

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 1525
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1899
Daylight saving, 184
Government advertising, ques. 1072
Industrial disputes, 837
Livestock industry, 2379
Military service, 1526
Newsprint, 1526
Public Works Department, overmanning of, 1141
Railway equipment, 553
Railway situation, 1533
St. Lawrence dredging, 370
Sherbrooke post office, employees, ques. 876

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment)
Alien labour, 997
Registration of man and woman power, 998
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 2516

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Civil servants, enlisted, civil pay of, 865
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2134
Daylight saving, 169
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 2516
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229
War
Expenditure, 610
Museum, national, ques. 1979

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Experimental farms, 2297

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Fuel, 776

McIntosh, Mr. J. C. (Nanaimo)
Alien labour, 1005

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Budget, 1368
Canada and the war, 1369
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 1373
Harbours, 2546
Position of, 1371
Railway, 1374, 2172
Steamship service, 1371
Trade and financial conditions, 1369

McKay, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977

McKellar, J. C., ques. 1129

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Alien labour, 1023
Arichat, judge at, 2517
Auditor General, 140
Bait, cold storage of, 279
Barrington's Cove wharf, 1154
Budget, 1375; trade and financial conditions, 1377; Victory loan, 1381; tariff changes under Liberal government,

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
1383; war profiteers, 1390; report of Mr. O'Connor, 1393.
Camp Borden, land purchases, 1959
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 1453
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1763, 1819, 1822, 1831, 1881, 1899
Conservation, Commission of, 2288
Daylight saving, 191, 245
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 250
Dry docks, 1117
Experimental farms, 2291
Finance Department, travelling expenses, 136
Firewood, inspection, 1220
Fisheries inspectors, 270, 273, 282
Fruit inspection, 2250
Fuel shortage, 324
Glace Bay harbour, 2545
Harbours, rights and responsibilities of Dominion in, 1121
Hay, inspection, 1097, 1133
Immigration and colonization, 103
Income tax, 2145
Judges' salaries, on, 2155, 2158
Intercolonial Railway, 2191
Branch lines and extensions, 2192
Jamesville breakwater, 1155
Liquors, illicit, 1989
Little Bras D'Or, dredging, 1169
Lobster hatcheries, 282
Lower Ardoise post office, ques. 1841
McGinnis, case of, 1972
O'Connor, Mr., report of, 1393
Patent Record, 2289
Pensions, 2491
Portland cement, 1223
Preventive officers, dismissal of, 151
Printing, public, 135
Public servants, conduct of, 2277
Public works
Caretakers, salaries, 1139
Upkeep, repairs necessary, 143
Railway situation, 1378
Ross Ferry wharf, 1158
St. John harbour, 1115
Supreme Court reports, printing of, ques. 1980
Sydney Mines, labour difficulty, 203
Tariff changes under Liberal government, 1383
Telegraphs and telephones, 1172
Trade and financial conditions, 1377
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2392
Victory loan, 1381
War, the, progress of, 1958
War profiteers, 1390
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 2495
Woman suffrage, 100

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Yukon election, 2070, 2324, 2505

McLennan, Dr., work of (Scientific Research), 2267

McMartin, John, M.P., the late, 932

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Alpine Club, 2227
Budget, 1265; taxation, 1266; trade and finance,1267; Canadian Northern Railway, 1269; national revenue and expenditure, 1269; business profits tax, 1271; production, 1272, 1280; free farm implements, 1274; Canadian military service, 1275; tariff issues, 1278
Canadian Government railways, 689
Civil Service Act Amdt., 697
Customs Department, overmanning, 1059
Daylight saving, 178, 246, 248
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 280
Flags on public buildings, 1065
Food packages, contents marked, 1058
Fruit classification, 2247, 2250, 2254
Fuel, 775
Soft coal, railway rates on, 1973
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 678, 828
Immigration agents, 2270
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2277
Milk products, prices, 2300
Mortgages and hypothecs, 1077
Naval Discipline Bill, 724
Patriotic fund, 2204
Public officials, conduct of, 2280
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1701
Ship building, 351
Soldiers, returned
Arrest as loafers, 2387
Homesteading, and, 254
Soldiers' votes, 2464
Taxation, 1266
Automobiles, on, 2122
Business profits, 1683
Cheques, on, 1067
Excise, ad valorem basis, 1985
Income, 1687, 2146, 2149
Matches, 1993
Parlor car seats, 1991
Patriotic fund, and, 2204
Playing cards, 1993
Tea, 2125
Titles, 486, 2348
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2393
Woman suffrage, 662

McMasterville munitions factory, 1099

McQuarrie, Mr. W. G. (New Westminster)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1828, 1849, 1853, 1858, 1864, 1869, 1877
Privilege, report in Journal-Press, 1910
Daylight saving, 169

Magdalen Islands
Harbours, 1165
Steamship service, 67, 283, 2212

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Budget, 1454
Canadian Northern Railway, 2106
Election results, 1459
Farmers, western, condition of, 1454
Fuel, 778
Hay, inspection, 1132
Natural resources, development of, 1460
Prices, 1458
Taxation
Income and land values, 1457
War, 1455
Woman suffrage, 673

Manion, Mr. R. J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Budget, 1324
Civil Service Act Amdt., 714, 1855, 1887, 2133
Daylight saving, 165
Hansard report, correction, 632
Martin, Colonel, 887
Mineral resources, development of, 1325
Oleomargarine 303
Railway equipment, 729
Railway situation, 2053
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 618
Soldiers' land settlement, 2231
Soldiers, returned, 1183, 1887
Titles, 2362
Trade and exchange, 1324

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Exemption tribunals, ques. 565
Bonaventure county, in, 2239

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Dupuis, Mr. J. A., ques. 109
St. Hyacinthe appeal representative, ques. 466

Margaree harbour, 1156

Marine
Benmore, barge, ques. 1617
Courcelette, steamer, ques. 286
Dredges and steamers at Quebec, ques. 868
Icebreakers, 358
Lighthouse and coast service, 371
Meteorological service, 376
Navigation
Obstructions to, 363
Telephones, as aid to, 375
Pilots, 373
Quebec, 1306
St. Lawrence river channel, 370
Ste. Anne de la Perade, beacon site, ques. 744
Shipbuilding. *See that title*
Ships, explosives on, ques. 1123

Marine—*Con.*
Simcoe, steamer, compassionate allowances, 367
Wharves, 375

Marine and Fisheries
Committee on, 106, 1692
Department, staff and salaries, 151, 270

Marine Trades strike in Montreal, 2314, 2385

Marjeson, Major J. W., ques. 970

Marshall, Mr. David (East Elgin)
Canned goods inspection, 793
Fruit imports, 2250
Rural mail contracts, 2535

Marshall, Mr. James Starrat, ques. 875, ques. 970, ques. 1072

Martin, Lieut. Col., 885

Matane, breakwater, 1165

Matches, tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Mattawin river dredging, ques. 568

Mayrand, Mr. H. (Maskinongé)
Hay, inspection, 1093, 1095

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 788. 1r., 800. 2r., Com., 1056. 3r., 1059

Medical service and forestry corps. *See* Army

Medicinal preparations, tax on, ques. 871. *See* Special War Revenue

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs)
Bird life, protection of, 2224
Canadian Northern Railway, 2027, 2121
Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, 1950
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1818
Crooked Lake Indian reserve, 2234
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 85-88, 241-244
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 818, 834, 932, 1046-1056
Doukhobors (Christian Community, etc.), 1950
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 812
Indian Act Amdt., 818, 834, 932, 1046-1056
Interior Department, salaries, 2216
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 835
Soldiers' land settlement, 2228
Yukon Act Amdt., 464, 682
Yukon election, 2072, 2330

Meteorological service, 376

Mewburn, Major-General S. C. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Army
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 864
Fifth Division, 1306
First contingent, furlough for, 883

Mewburn, Major-General S. C.—*Con.*
Army—*Con.*
French Canadian brigade and units, 927, 1935
Medical service and forestry corps, 1176, 1305
N. C. O's., promotion of, 865
Royal Flying Corps, 931
Labatt, Col., pension of, 1692
Military service
Ages 20-22, procedure in calling up, 1248
Exemptions, 1252, 1539
Farmers, of, 1027
Leave of absence
Seeding, for, 1366, 1475
Medical examinations, 1306, 1540, 1694
Men medically unfit, 1076, 1130
Militia Council, report, 563
Militia Department
Estimates—salaries, etc., 559, 850, 865, 2518
Quebec Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Ross rifle factory, 929
Royal Flying Corps, 931
Small-pox in Cape Island district, 1131
Soldiers
Returned, alleged imprisonment of, 1367
Treatment of on transports, 73
Separation allowance and assigned pay, 64, 888
Zwingle, Mrs., case of, 72
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 611, 619
War appropriation, general statement by Minister, 560
Expenditure, 578-593, 601-610

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Edmundston post office, 1138
Firewood export, ques. 113
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 811, 834
Indian, white widow of, 1047
Kent House as hospital, ques. 2102
Military service, Quebec officials, ques. 1978
Steamship services, 2213
Van Buren Bridge Company, 80, 268, 339, 518

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 815
Victoria Crosses to C.E.F., 288

Migratory Bird Act, administration, 2223

Military and Naval Defence Bill. *See* War Appropriation Act

Military Hospitals Commission. *See also* Army, Medical Service
Expense, 903
Incubators, purchase of, ques. 1301

Military Hospitals Commission—*Con.*
Kent House, use of as hospital, ques. 1843, ques. 2102
Laval No. 6, ques. 631
Orpington, ques. 971
Port Arthur, ques. 466
Quebec, lease of property, ques. 465
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1303
Soldiers, sick while on leave, ques. 971

Military Service. *See also* Army; War
Administration of Act, 2384
Limit of 100,000, ques. 1481
Prime Minister's statement, 24
Quebec, in, ques. 108
Allies, arrangements with, ques. 1071
United States, 33, 52
Amendments
General statement by Prime Minister, 1248
Appeals. *See under this head,* Exemptions
Bank clerks, leave, 2383
Classes, 938
Dental corps, 2398
Draftees and enlistments, ques. 464, ques. 564, ques. 969, ques. 1127, 1175
Enforcement
Arrests, ques. 287
Convictions, Brault and Swan, ques. 111, 1075
Desertions, 1248
Presumed deserter, arrest of, 1075
Detention, alleged unlawful, 1176, 1367
Draftees, alleged band of, 632
Evasions, 960, ques. 2399
Habeas Corpus writs in Montreal, ques. 739
Order in Council No. 3348, release of men under, ques. 111
Police, ques. 109
Military, 2387, 2517
Over-zealous action alleged, 1130
Quebec disturbances. *See that title*
Self-inflicted wounds, ques. 111
Soldiers, returned, alleged imprisonment, 1367
Enrolment, cost per man, ques. 1361
Exemptions, appeals and tribunals
Berthier, ques. 1843
Bonaventure, ques. 2239
Expenditure, ques. 331, ques. 565, ques. 1838
Exemptions, 564, 960, 1127, 1538, ques. 1617
Claims for, number of, ques. 1127
Temporary, 873
Judges, payment of, ques. 1073, 1839, 2512
Chicoutimi and Lake St. John, ques. 2397
St. Hyacinthe, ques. 466

Military Hospitals Commission—*Con.*
Exemptions—*Con.*
Papers, alleged confiscation of, 1367
Physical unfitness for, ques. 1617
Tribunals. *See also under this head*, Exemptions
Appointments to by Minister of Agriculture, ques. 111
Brockville, ques. 2238
Central Appeal Judge, ques. 1840
Office and staff of, 331
Quebec appeals to, ques. 1878
Local, ques. 740, 288
Pretended influencing of decisions of, 1843
Purported exemption by ages, 20-22, 1538
Vacancies on, ques. 630
Farmers, and, 943, 958, 1027, 1275, 2388, ques. 2398
Delegation of, 1837, 1911, 1936, 1984, 2196, 2550
Drafts, calling up of, 2315
Leave of absence. *See that title under this head*
Number exempted, ques. 564
Fishermen, and, 2314
Hardships under, 2128
Leave of absence, 1076, 1175
Appeals, ques. 56
Bank clerks, 2383
Boards, Tucker, Mr., appointment of, ques. 331, ques. 873
Seeding, for, 1365, 1475, 2384
Medical examinations, ques. 564, ques. 873, 1540, 1693
Boards, 1306
Pay of, 112
Officers, for overseas, of, 2101, ques.
Revision of, ques. 1071
Naval Service Department, application to, 2384
Officials
Kingston, deputy registrar, staff of, ques. 2238
Quebec, ques. 108, ques. 569, ques. 570, ques. 1841, ques. 1978
Registrars, rental of offices for, ques. 564, ques. 1073
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, employment of, ques. 111, ques. 1978, ques. 2398
Orders in Council
Calling up, ages 20-22, 1248
Men married after July 6th, 1917, 1421
Motion by Prime Minister approving, 933
Agreed to, 966
Amendment proposed
(1) Mr. Molloy, 956
(2) Mr. L. A. Lapointe, 964

Military Hospitals Commission—*Con.*
Orders in Council—*Con.*
Procedure under, statement by Minister of Militia, 1248
Physically unfit men, ques. 564, 1076, 1130, ques. 1617
Provinces
Enlistment and conscription, by, ques. 1127
Quebec, attitude of, 944
Regulations, 878, 933
Rural drafts, calling out of, 2315

Militia Act, power of Governor in Council under, 948

Militia and Defence
Active militia, allowance, 850
Defence works, engineer services, 853
Department
Auditor, 138
Estimates, 850-867
Salaries, 559
Record Branch, employees, ques. 113
Military buildings
Bury, Que., drill hall, ques. 743
Caretakers' salaries, 866
Quebec, leasing of properties at, ques. 465
Staffs, headquarters, divisional and district, 860

Militia Council, 563

Mill feeds. *See* Agriculture

Milling industry. *See* Flour milling; Agriculture

Miminegash harbour, 1160

Mindheim, Siefried H., internment of, ques. 207

Mines and Minerals
Coal. *See* Fuel
Committee on, 106
Copper mining in Northwest, 1546
Department, estimates, 2539
Iron, production, 1325, 1465
Lead, 2263, 2477
Petroleum, 1479, ques. 2263
Zinc
Bounties on. *See* Zinc
Smelters, 2311, 2502
Zinc-lead ores, experiments, 2546

Ministers of the Crown
French Canadian, appointment of, ques. 207
Need of election, 849
Visit to Washington and New York, 1176

Milk. *See* Agriculture

Missisquoi Bay, net fishing in, ques. 109, 275

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Animal contagious diseases, 801
Daylight saving, 192

Molloy, Mr. John P.—*Con.*
Emerson customs collector, 1065
Hay, inspection, 1080
Indians
Commissioner Graham, 1051
Lands, leasing of, 1048, 1050
Rights of, 1053
Military service
Agriculture, effect on, 954
Resolution in amendment, 956
Prince Rupert Journal, Government advertising in, ques. 1360

Moncton and Buctouche railway, 2542

Montcalm, steamer, 359-362, ques. 466

Montmagny, steamer, 362

Montreal post office, 1146

Montreal-Gaspé steamship service, 66

Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill. Res., 80. 1r., 81. 2r., Com., 132. 3r., 337

Moore, Rev. T. A., ques. 1362

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Assigned pay and separation allowance, 2387
Canadian Northern Railway, 1921
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1756, 1779, 1782, 1798, 1805, 1850, 1852, 1856, 1882, 1884, 1898
Daylight saving, 246
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, ques. 330, 1984, 2155
Food containers, 1211, 1213
Fruit classification, 2247
Hay, inspection, 1083
Income tax, 2149, 2156
Judges' salaries, on, 2155, 2159
Labour bureaus, provincial, 1032
Moral protection of children, 1705
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1202
Patriotic fund, 2200, 2202
Penitentiaries, returned soldiers as guards, 1182, 1186
Pensions, 2486
Portland cement, 1225
Quebec disturbances, 455
Rural mail contracts, 2532
Soldiers' land settlement, 2230
Soldiers' votes, 2402
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 521
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1199
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2390, 2394
Unmarried couple registering at hotel as married, 1703
Woman suffrage, 95

Mosher's Bay breakwater, 1158

Mount Royal City, ques. 1480

Moving-picture films. *See* Film
Tax on. *See* Customs

Mowat, Mr. Herbert M. (Parkdale)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 5
Agricultural exhibitions, 2378
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1722
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 825
McCallum, Prof., 1906
Moving picture films, tax on, 1676
Registration of man and woman power, 6
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229
Soldiers' vote, omission of candidates' names, 909
Standing Orders Committee, report, 2313
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 532
Union Government, 5
Yukon election, 2090

Mulgrave-Guysborough steamship service, 2212

Munitions, danger from explosion of, 1099. *See* War, Supplies

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 35
Army Medical Corps, ques. 2238
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1838
Bola Pasha, ques. 1071
Canadian Northern Railway, 1926, 2114
Branch lines, 2542
Christian Science Monitor, 37
Civil Service Act Amdt., 153, 696, 698, 717, 1764, 1811, 1819, 1851, 1883, 1899, 2130
Doukhobor lands, ques. 1072
French religious and the war, 43
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 1836
Harman, Mr. Charles, ques. 208
House of Commons, hours of sitting, 35
Meat inspection, 795
Military service
Bank clerks, 2383
Farmers, 1837
Mines Department, 2217
Ministers, visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Newspapers, payments to, 2128
Ontario Mining Tax Act, ques. 1361
Parliament buildings, new
Decoration, 1103
Heating, 1101
Speaker's residence, 1108
Patronage, 135
Prescott, Marine and Fisheries officials at, 153
Race and religious issues, 36
Rowell, Hon. Mr., 39
Shipbuilding, 345

Murphy, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Sifton, Sir Clifford and Grand Trunk, ques. 2242
Soldiers' vote, 2438
Southam Press, payments to, ques. 1480
Supply—interim vote, 84
Titles, 2366
Victory loan
Advertising, ques. 1203
Banks, payments to, ques. 2240
War expenditure, 559, 879
Publicity expenses, 1028
War-time Elections Act, 47
Winnipeg strike, 2385
Yukon Act Amdt., 682

Murphy, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977

Murray Bay wharf, 1165

Myers, Mr. Edward T. W. (Kindersley)
Dominion Lands, homesteading, buildings, 265

Narraway, Mrs., appointment, 1744

National Parks, 2223. *See* Dominion Forest

National Service Commission, 903

National Transcontinental Railway, 1994, 2003, 2188
Quebec shops, ques. 1362

National War Museum, ques. 1979

Naturalization Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 968. 2r., Com., 1077. 3r., 1131

Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 629. 2r., Com., 723. 3r., 724, 842

Naval Service
Buoy service, Maritime provinces, 366
Department, staff and salaries, 148
Dockyards, 344
H.M.C. SS. Niobe and Rainbow, 358
Life-saving, 357
Northern waters patrol, 357
Ocean and river service, 358, 366
Patrol boats and mine-sweepers, ques. 569
Radio-telegraph service, 354
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, 344
Royal Naval College, 344, 357
Steamers
Champlain and Bellechasse, 360
Montcalm and Lady Grey, 359, ques. 466
Wrecking plants, 364

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 464. 2r., 562., Com., 730. 3r., 735.
Senate amdts., 2476

Navy, Ottawa enlistments in, ques. 2398

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Canadian Northern Railway, 2119
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1728, 1877, 1885
Gasolene, price of, 2123
Hay, inspection, 1082
Homesteading, dower of widow, 254
Income tax, 2150
Oleomargarine, 297
Parliament buildings, 1109
Patriotic fund, 2205
Soldier candidates, 912
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229
Titles, 2355
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2391
Woman suffrage, 96

Newfoundland, steamship service, 2210

News, official, publisher of, 1976

News service, transatlantic, 356

Newspapers, Government advertising, ques. 115
Payments, 1072, 2128

Newhouse, Mr. P., account of, ques. 1302

Newsprint
Industry, history of, 1526
Inquiry, ques. 1364
Mechanical wood pulp, and, exportation of, ques. 57
Restraint of competition, 1343

New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, ques. 1364

Nichols, Mr. M. E. *See* Director of Public Information

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, ques. 1364

Nicholson, Mr. G. B. (Algoma East)
Alien labour, 981
Canadian Northern Railway, 2119
Children, moral protection of, 1709
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1752, 1770, 1804, 1809, 1818, 1861, 1874, 1892
Employment agencies, 1029, 1036
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2277
Manitoulin Island wharves, 1166
Organized labour, 984
Patriotic fund, 2204
Railway equipment, 546
Railway situation, 2041
Correction of Debates report, 2314
Rural mail contracts, 2531
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1700, 1702
Van Buren Bridge Company, 519

Nickle, Mr. W. F. (Kingston)
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 1749
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1743, 1801
Daylight saving, 170
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, ques. 2478
Flour milling, 2237, 2314
Income tax, 2146
Judges' salaries, 2158
Kingston post office, appointment of Mrs. Narraway, 1744
Milk, sale of, 1214
Oleomargarine, 298
Patriotic fund, 2208
Railway situation, 2049, 2056
Royal Flying Corps, transfer from to C.E. F., ques. 1842
Separation allowance, 64
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 615
Titles; motion, 468, 2355
War, Canada's control of Canadian army, 883
Woman suffrage, 94, 97

Norfolk county, customs inquiry in, ques. 287

Norman, Mark, reported as casualty, ques. 1842

Northern waters patrol, 357

Northrup, William Barton, M.A., K.C., appointed Clerk, 2

Northwest grain trade, ques. 1362

Northwest Territories, government of, 2221

Observatories, 2218

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 199, 633, 800, 1032, ques. 1129, ques. 1202, ques. 1303, ques. 1481

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Oil deposit development, ques. 1479

Oleomargarine. *See* Agriculture

Oliver, Hon. Frank, defeat in election, 17, 23, 47

Ontario
Federal loan to, ques. 742
Flax-growing in, 1236

Ontario Mining Tax Act, ques. 1361

Ontario-St. Lawrence canal, 1967

Orangemen. *See* Loyal Orange Order

Orders in Council
Concurrence in, 12, 2382, 2479
Military Service, 933
Summoning Parliament, 11, 22

Organization and Co-ordination of Employment Offices Bill. Res., 841. 1r., 842. 2r., 1028. Com., 1028, 1046. 3r., 1076

Ottawa
Astronomical observatory, 2218
Naval enlistments in, ques. 2398

Ottawa—*Con.*
Postmaster, 286
Public buildings, 1110, 1152
Rental of buildings by Government, ques. 740, ques. 874, 1112, 1147

Ottawa-Hull bridge, 146

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Mégantic)
Budget, 1593
Food Board, 227
Military service exemption tribunals, ques. 331
Production, 1594
Trade and financial conditions, 1593
Woman suffrage, 644

Panet, Mr. Louis Charles, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3, 329

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 971
Government leasing of buildings at Ottawa, ques. 740
High Commissioner, ques. 971
Incubators, ques. 1301
Newhouse, Mr. P., account of, ques. 1302
Orpington military hospital, ques. 971

Paquet, Mr. J. B., ques. 2238

Paradis, Mr., claim of (Intercolonial). 2186

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1755, 1822
Titles, 2370

Parasites. *See* The Parasites

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Agricultural pamphlets, 2379
Freight cars, Canadian, in United States, ques. 570
Furois, Mr. Philippe, 2375
Income tax, 2148
Military Service Act, ques. 1481
Quebec
Exhibition, 2377
Harbour, 1118
Union station, ques. 1980
Quebec and Saguenay railway, ques. 873
Quebec disturbances, 414
Royal Flying Corps, 931
St. Charles river works, 146
Transcontinental Railway, 2188-2190

Parks, 2223. *See* Dominion Forest

Parliament
Independence of. *See* Salaries Act
Library of, 1767, 2519
Committee, 107, 788
Prorogation of, 2549, 2557
Secret session, 735, 2554
Report of, 832
Summoning of, hour not stated, 2, 11

Parliament Buildings
New
Construction, 737, 1100
Committee on, 335
Decoration of, 1104
Fire protection, 1110
Heating, 1102
Speaker's apartments, 1105
Tower, 1101
Old
Fire claims, 2548

Parliamentary procedure. *See also* House of Commons; Speaker; Deputy Speaker
Adjournment motion for discussion of definite matter of urgent public importance, 380
Bills, printing of in both languages, 2396
Member to vote when in Chamber, 2384
Motions joined for discussion, 973
Privilege. *See that title*
Quorum, proceeding without, 2518

Patent Medicine stamp tax, ques. 871, 1991

Patent Record, 2289

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage, 32, 135, 1666. *See* Civil Service; Intercolonial
Canals, on, 1970

Peace River Crossing bridge, 2543

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E. (South Renfrew)
Agricultural fairs, 2377, 2380
Automobiles, tax on, 2124
Business profits tax, 2142
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 689
Carleton county, railway rights of way, 2169
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1798, 1800, 1806, 1813, 1822, 1824, 1899
Fruit marks, 2247
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 822
Income tax, 2149
Indians, rights of, 1050, 1055
Military service, vote on, pairs, 1475
Moving-picture films, 2127
Parliament buildings, construction, 1107
Postage to soldiers overseas, 2536
Renfrew, customs collector, 1062
Ross rifle, 852
South Renfrew election, 884
Theatre tickets, tax on, 2127
War taxes, and stamps, 1067, 2125
Weighing and measuring, mechanical, 1225

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Daylight saving, 188
Demonstration farms, 2295

Pelletier, Mr. F. J.—*Con.*
Food packages, 1216
Meat inspection, 794

Penitentiary Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 55, 129. 1r., 132. 2r., Com., 1176. 3r., 1205

Penitentiaries, annual report, ques. 2240

Pensions
Bradbury, Hon. Senator, ques. 1128, ques. 2397, 2520
Comparative tables of, 2482
Commissioners, ques. 51
Salaries and contingencies, 2520
Work, ques. 110
Committee, Special, 563, 735, 1071, 1175
Report, 2310, 2480, 2550
Fenian raid, 2519
Labatt, Col., ques. 1201, 1692, ques. 1981, 2520

Perce Rock, sea-birds, 2224

Perry, Commissioner, N. W. M. Police, resignation, ques. 877, 2286

Peterborough East registration, ques. 1480, ques. 2100

Petroleum, bounty on, 2263. *See* Mines

Pharmaceuticals, 1991

Pilots. *See* Marine

Pictou-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 68

Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp steamship service, 2215

Player pianos and organs. *See* Special War Revenue

Pointe a Elie wharf, 1167

Porter, Mr. E. Guss (West Hastings)
Soups for army use, 795
Tucker, Mr., apointment of, ques. 331, ques. 873

Port Arthur harbour, 1125

Port Hastings, customs collector, 1063

Port Hood, dredging, 1158

Ports, Lake Erie, on, 1167

Ports, use of for grain export, ques. 1362

Portland cement. *See* Inspection and Sale

Post Office
Deniger, Mr. J. A., ques. 1982
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 2513, 2527, 2548
Leases in Ottawa, ques. 874
Fowler, Mr. Robert, 1744, 1983, 2241
Hamilton, Mrs., ques. 1481
Letter carriers, salaries of, ques. 1302
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 1073

Post Office—*Con.*
Mail contracts
Dorchester county, ques. 115
Fir Grove-Frampton, ques. 2397
Fir Grove-St. Odilon, ques. 2397
Rigaud-St. Redempteur, 742, ques.
Rural, 58-66, 2528-2536
Parcel post for soldiers, 2535
Postmasters
Dorchester county, ques. 113
Dublin Shore, ques. 876
Indian Point, ques. 876
Lethbridge, ques. 1072
Ottawa, ques. 286
Postmaster-General, Hon. Col. Blondin, position of, 2513
Post offices
Granby, ques. 870
Kingston, appointment of Mrs. Narraway, 1744
Sherbrooke, ques. 876
Vacancies, promotion by merit, 2535

Power, Mr. Charles G. (Quebec South)
Army
Commissioned officers at Quebec, ques. 288, ques. 743
Montreal base depot battalions, ques. 332
N. C. O's, promotion of, 865
249th Battalion, ques. 466
Canadian Daily Record, 892, 918
Couillard, Capt., ques. 1841
Demobilization, 629
Grenier, Capt., ques. 1841
Marjeson, Major J. W., ques. 970
Marshall, Mr. James Starrat, ques. 875, ques. 970, ques. 1072
Militia organization, 851, 856, 860, 866
Militia Department, leases, ques. 465
Military Service Act in Quebec, ques. 108-109, ques. 564, ques. 1841
Mindheim, Seifried H., internment of, ques. 207
Quebec disturbances, 422
Quebec bridge, 1975
Returned soldiers
Officers, ques. 115
Employment of, ques. 333
Treatment of on transports, 73
Shipbuilding, 350
Steamers
Courcelette, ques. 286
Montcalm and Lady Grey, 359

Premiers, provincial, conference of, ques. 287

Press censorship, ques. 1842

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Budget, 1442
Election returns, 1450
Farm labour, shortage of, 1448
Food and food production, 1446

Prevost, Mr. Jules E.—*Con.*
Military service, 1444
Arrests of exempted men, 1130
Trade and financial conditions, 1443
Union Government, 1442
War contracts in Quebec, ques. 115
Woman suffrage, 645

Prices
Cheese and condensed milk, 1129
Fish, 2375
Milk, ques. 872

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 361, 362, 1373
Harbours, 2546
Maintenance of Public Works, 1160
Railway, 1374, 2170

Prince Rupert Journal, Government advertising in, 1360

Pringle, Mr. R. A., K.C., ques. 868

Printing
Government, Editorial Committee, ques. 972, 1099
Joint Committee on, 105
Report, 1691, 2478, 2549

Printing Bureau, appointments, ques. 1978

Private Bills
Miscellaneous, Committee on, 105, 1691
Suspension of rules relating to, 1766, 1845, 1950

Private Bills, discussed
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1837, 2195
Brazeau Collieries, 1691
British Canadian Insurance Company. *See under this head,* United Canadian Insurance Company
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 1453
Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, 1950
Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1950
Gospel Workers' Church in Canada, 1454, 1691
International Bridge and Terminal Company, 1732
Overbeck, O. G. C. L. J., patent, 739
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 1196, 1478
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2313, 2388
Western Power Company of Canada, 178

Private Secretaries, 2273. *See* Privy Council; Johnson, Mr. Main

Privilege, questions of
Blake, Mr.—Hansard report, 1366.
Currie, Mr.—Canadian Press Report, 1693
Duff, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 314
Edwards, Mr.—Ottawa Citizen, 1982

Privilege—*Con.*
McQuarrie, Mr.—Ottawa Citizen and Journal-Press, 1910
Manion, Mr.—Hansard report, 632
Mewburn, Major-General—Ottawa Citizen, 1692
Nicholson, Mr. G. B.—Hansard report, 2314
Pedlow, Mr.—Explanation as to pair, statement in Renfrew Mercury, 1475
Read, Mr. Joseph—Ottawa Citizen, 518
Richardson, Mr.—Daily Ontario, 2195

Privileges and Elections, Committee on, 104, 1835, 2067, 2315. *See* Yukon

Privy Council, Department of the
Hunt, Donald, employment of, ques. 1480, 2275
Johnson, Mr. Main. *See that title*
President of, special trains for, ques. 875
Staff and salaries, ques. 466, 2273

Production, increased. *See* Food

Prohibition, 30, ques. 1073
Dominion-wide, ques. 1362
Public revenues, effect of on, ques. 335
See Intoxicating liquors

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Army
Casualty reports, ques. 1842
Dental corps, ques. 1202
Beaufort, Mr. E., ques. 1364, ques. 1840
Civil Service Act Amdt., 714
De Wolf, Mr. Harry C., ques. 1071
Dillon, Capt. Gerald, ques. 568
Egg inspectors, ques. 1201
Farran's Point, canal employees, ques. 568
Gillespie, Lieut. Col. George, ques. 2239
Hay inspection, 79
Imperial Munitions Board, copying of lists, ques. 1201
Labatt, Col., pension to, ques. 1201
Lethbridge postmastership, ques. 1072
McKay, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977
Military service
Cost, ques. 1361
Farmers, exemption of, 1027
Oleomargarine, ques. 1201
Ottawa postmaster, ques. 286
Penitentiaries, officials, 1177
Port Arthur, soldiers' convalescent home, ques. 466
Rural mail contracts, 59
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1700
War Trade Board officials, ques. 1977, ques. 2396

Provincial and Municipal Debentures, 115, ques. 287

Provincial courts, jurisdiction in divorce cases, 2065

Provincial premiers, conference of, ques. 287

Public Accounts, Committee on, 105

Public Health, 2289

Public Information. *See* Director

Public Servants and war bonds, ques. 742

Public service. *See* Re-arrangement

Public Works. *See also* Parliament Buildings
Buildings, generally, 1137-1154
Alberta, 1151
British Columbia, 1151
Heating, 1154
Maritime provinces generally, 1139
New Brunswick, 1138
Nova Scotia, 1137, 1138
Ontario, 1110, 1151
Quebec, ques. 113, 1140, 1151
Rents, 1154
Yukon territory, 1152, 1154
Department
Estimates, 1099, 1137
Salaries and contingencies, 141
Dredging
Maritime provinces, 1169
Mattawin river, ques. 568
Ontario and Quebec, 1168, 2546
Port Hood, 1158
See under this title, Harbours and Rivers
Dry docks, 112, 1116, 1173
Harbours, expenditures on, ques. 970
Harbours and Rivers
Alberta, 1168
British Columbia, 1125, ques. 1126, 1168
Generally, 1163
Manitoba, 1168
New Brunswick, 1115, ques. 1126, 1162
Nova Scotia, ques. 1126, 1154, 1158, 2544
Ontario, 1120, 1166
Prince Edward Island, 1160, 2546
Quebec, 1116, 1120, 1163, 2544
Saskatchewan, 1168
Leases at Ottawa for Post Office Department, ques. 874
St. Barthelemi road, dyke at, ques. 569
St. Charles river. *See that title*
St. John harbour, 1115, ques. 1126, 2544
Toronto harbour, 1120, 2544
Slides and booms, 1173
Water storage dams on Ottawa river, 1173

Public Works Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 464. 2r., 562. Com., 733. 3r., 735

Pullman car seats. *See* Special War Revenue

Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 1145
Halifax, 1138

Quebec (city)
Champlain market site, ques. 1362
Commissioned officers at, ques. 743, ques. 288

Quebec (city)—*Con.*
Harbour works, 2544
Champlain dock, 1116
Dredges and steamers, ques. 868
St. Charles river works. *See that title*
Leases of for military service, ques. 564
Post office, ques. 113, 1149
Public buildings, 1142
Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Transcontinental shops, ques. 1362, 2188
Union station, ques. 1980

Quebec (province)
Breeding animals, shipments to, ques. 869
Coal, railway rates on, 1973
Flax-growing in, 1233

Quebec bridge, 1973

Quebec disturbances, 236, 284, 336, 378, 380, 680, 737

Quebec and Gaspé Basin steamship service, 2212

Quebec and Saguenay railway, ques. 873, 2543

Radiotelegraph. *See* Telegraphs

Railway situation, statement by Prime Minister, 1994

Railways. *For Equipment, and Stores Account, see Department of Railways and Canals Amdts.*
For Canadian Government Railways, see that title
For individual railways, see their titles
Cars
Canadian, in United States, ques. 569, ques. 570
Observation and private, ques. 335
Refrigerator, for fish, 278
Coal, purchase in United States, ques. 871
Equipment, additional, 32
Ocean terminals, 1126
Rates, coal, Maritime-Quebec, 1973
Removal of rails to France, 727
Special trains for President of Council, ques. 875

Railways and Canals, department of
Estimates, 1963, 2538, 2542
Staff and salaries, 147

Railway Act Amedment Bills
(1) Vessel Rates (No. 31, Mr. Armstrong). 1r., 330
(2) Consolidation (No. 70, Mr. J. D. Reid). 1r., 1247, 1909; Bill withdrawn, 2493

Railway Belt Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 737. 2r., Com., 3r., 835

Railway men's votes, 1193

Read, Mr. Joseph (Prince, P.E.I.)
Budget, 1335
Canadian Daily Record, 930

Read, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Government Railways, revenues, 690
Canadian Northern Railway, 1428
Canal system, abolition of tolls, 1964
Canning factories, inspection, 1058
Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, dredging, 1971, 2546
Civil Service Act Amdt., 710, 1778, 1797, 1823, 1869, 1903, 2137
Customs Department, collections, 1062
Daylight saving, 169
Eggs, inspection and sale, 1209
Farmers, conscription of, 1335
Fishery overseers and inspectors, 274
Fishing bounties, 283
Food production, 233
Fox-fur farming, 2296
Hay, inspection, 78, 1086, 1091, 1136
Imperial Conference, 2557
Income tax, 1690
Labour bureaus, 1044
License system, 233
Marine Department, Halifax Herald criticism, 352
Meat inspection, 796, 1056, 1058
Mining industry, 2311, 2502
Newspaper report, correction, 518
Northumberland, steamer, 69
Oleomargarine, 302
Pilots, 373
Potatoes, 1339
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 361
Public works, maintenance, 1160
Railway, 2170
Quebec disturbances, 460
Railway equipment, 548
Railway rates, 555, 1974
Seduction and age of consent, 1699
Shipbuilding, 353
Tariff reductions by Liberal government, 1336
Titles, 513
Van Buren Bridge Company, 343
Water-powers, 2217
Woman suffrage, 93, 667
Yukon election, 2096, 2339, 2505
Zinc and lead bounties, 2311, 2502

Rean, Mr. W. C., ques. 631, ques. 875

Re-arrangement and Transfers of duties in the Public Service Bill. 1r., 50. 2r., Com., 83. 3r., 88. *See* Salaries Act Amendment

Reconstruction, Committee on, 2289

Recruiting, 942. *See* Army; Military Service

Red Cross, violation of rules by enemy, 157

Redman, Mr. Daniel L. (East Calgary)
Budget, 1398

Redman, Mr. Daniel L.—*Con.*
Homesteading by soldiers, 256
Quebec disturbances, 448
Soldiers' votes, 910
Trade conditions, 1398
Woman suffrage, 95

Refrigeration Commission, ques. 875, ques. 1072

Registration. *See* Canada Registration Board

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Business of the House, 2382
Canals, estimates, 1963-1972
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, acquisition of, 2176, 2542
Intercolonial, 2539
Minister's annual statement, 2161
Operation, 2548
Patronage, 1904, 2539
Stores account, 829
Suspense account, 683
Canadian Northern Railway, 1920, 1924, 2107, 2111
Fish, refrigerator cars for, 278
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 281
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 677, 811-829
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2543
Railway equipment, 538-559, 725-730
Railways and Canals Department
Consulting engineer, 153
Staff and salaries, 147
Statistics, collection of, 830
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1196, 1476
Van Buren Bridge Company, 79, 267, 340, 518

Reid, Mr. John Flaws (Mackenzie)
Bank loans to farmers, 1334
Budget, 1333
Canada Food Board, salaries, ques. 335
Farm machinery, 1333
Duties and drawbacks, ques. 465, ques. 872, ques. 1203
Fuel, 787
Grain, milling values of, 2399
Indian lands, 1051
Production, 1333
Rideau canal, ques. 2241
Tomatoes, canned, 1058

Remounts, purchase, ques. 869, 904

Renfrew, South, election, 884

Reports, annual, publication of in French and English, 135, ques. 971

Representation Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 236

Retirement of Aged and Infirm Civil Servants Bill. Res., 1r., 2312

Returned soldiers. *See* Army

Revenue Bills. *See* Business Profits; Customs; Income; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker

Richardson, Mr. R. L. (Springfield)
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1837, 2195
Budget, 1342
Canadian Northern Railway, 1197, 1426, 1920
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1751, 1851, 1857, 1872, 2131, 2139
Daylight saving, 161
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance to, 2527
Newsprint production, 1343
Nichols, Mr. M. E., 704
Overbeck patent, 739
Public ownership of public utilities, 1354
Railway equipment, 555
Railway situation, 1349, 2027. *See, under this title,* Canadian Northern
Returned soldiers, 1888
Tariff reductions prior to 1918, 1347
Tobacco, tax on, 1988
Titles, 506
Amendment proposed, 2347, 2372
Woman suffrage, 640

Richibucto
Breakwater, 1161
Public buildings, 1140

Rideau canal, ques. 2241
Pretoria Avenue bridge, 1964

Rigaud-St. Redempteur mail, ques. 742

Rimouski harbour, 1165

River Port, N.S., customs officer, ques. 1200

Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and North Shore steamship service, 2214

Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay steamship service, ques. 112, 360

Robb, Mr. James A. (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Animal contagious diseases, 802
Dairying and feeds, 312, 2298-2306
Food containers, 1212
Food control, 224, 1216
Hay inspection, 1091, 1094
Immigration bulletins—atlas, 2272
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt., 1208
Meat and canned foods inspection, 798
Military service, leave of absence, 1076
Nichols, Mr. M. E., 900
Portland cement, 1225
Power, exportation of, 1070
Privy Council expenditures, 2283
Railway equipment, 539, 727

Ross, Mr. D. C. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 1492
Financial conditions, 1497
Pensions, 2487
Production and free farming implements, 1494
Railway situation, 1493
Remounts, ques. 869, 904
Timber, protection of, 2222
War, taxation, 1498

Ross Ferry wharf, 1158

Ross rifles and factory, 852, 926, 929, ques. 1072, 1360, ques. 2397

Round Table Club, ques. 1841, 2556

Rowell, Hon. N. W. (President of the Privy Council)
Civil servants overseas, civil pay of, 2385, 2388
Civil Service Act Amdt., 696, 701-703
Director of Public Information, 57, 703, 891, 916
French-Canadians and the war, 953
Johnson, Mr. Main, private secretary, 2274-2285
Military Service regulations, 946
Militia Act, power of Governor in Council under, 948
Pensions, 1071, 2310, 2480
Privy Council office, salaries, 2273
Royal North West Mounted Police, 2285
Soldiers' votes, omission of candidates' names from lists, 908
Titles, 500
War
Canada's contribution to, 950
Lecture Bureau, 893
Women in Britain, services of, 951

Royal Assent, The, 104, 700, 2557

Royal Flying Corps. *See* Army

Royal Military College, 1151

Royal Naval College, 357

Royal North West Mounted Police
Army, in, 2285
Commissioner Perry and Assistant Commissioner Wilson, resignation of, ques. 877
Salaries and contingencies, 2285

Rural mail contracts, 2528
Burnham, Mr., motion of, 58-66

Russell, Mr. E. M., ques. 1977

Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital, ques. 1303

Ste. Anne de la Perade, purchase of land at, ques. 744

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, experimental station, 2290

St. Barthelemi dyke, ques. 569

St. Charles river improvements, ques. 112, 146, 1118, 1567, 1969, 2544
Land expropriation case (Belanger vs. The King), ques. 1479, 2507

St. John Harbour, 1115, ques. 1126, 2544

St. John Dipper Harbour, Chance Harbour and Mace's Bay steamship service, 2216

St. John river and tributaries, 1162

St. Lambert postmaster, ques. 1127

St. Lawrence river ship channel, 367-371, 1169

St. Martin's Railway, acquirement, 2542

St. Nicholas quarry, ques. 868

St. Peter's canal, 1967

Salaries Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 76, 683. 1r., 77. 2r., 844. Com., 846-878. 3r., 1028

Salisbury and Albert Railway, acquirement, 2542

Salt, shortage of, 1983

Salvation Army, members of in Government employ, ques. 1844, ques. 1980

Saskatchewan, federal loan to, ques. 742

Saucier, Captain, ques. 740

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
L'Heureux, Major J. T. N., ques. 2242
Military service
Chicoutimi exemption tribunals, ques. 2397
Farmers, exemption of, ques. 2398
159th and 227th battalions, ques. 2398

Schaffner, Hon. Senator, ques. 2240

Schuster, Capt. W. E., ques. 1074, ques. 1128

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Oleomargarine, 306

Secret Session of Parliament, 735, 2554

Secretary of State, Department of
Staff and salaries, 2512
War expenditure, 902

Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 115, ques. 287

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Séguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Foisy, Dr. L. A., pay of, ques. 2238
Kent House, use of as hospital, ques. 1843
L'Assomption-Montcalm returning officer, ques. 1302, ques. 1482
Military service, exemption tribunals, ques. 1838
Printing, Editorial Committee, ques. 972

Senate, 2517

Sergeant-at-Arms, 3

Seven Islands steamship service, 70

Sevigny, Hon. Mr., ques. 206, ques. 1618, 1767
Resignation of, 155

Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Bran and shorts, 2306, 2309
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1774, 1783, 1786
East Peterborough registration, ques. 1480, ques. 2100
Eggs, sale by weight, 1207
Food prices, 1208
Hay inspection, 1079, 1081
Milk, bottling of, 1215
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2295
Wood, inspection and sale, 1219, 1220

Shawinigan Falls, bridge, 731

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Auditor General, 1753
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1753, 1809, 1815, 1883, 1909
Fruit classification, 2248
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2277
Railway equipment, 540
Toronto harbour improvements, 1121

Sheguindah wharf, 1166

Sherbrooke
Breeding animals at, ques. 870
Post office employees, ques. 876

Shipbuilding, 28, 1116, 1329
Labour for, 1118, 1472
Marine trades strike in Montreal, 2314, 2385
Minister of Naval Affairs, statement, 345-354
Ships' plates for, 347, ques. 744

Sifton, Hon. Arthur L. (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Customs Department
Appointments, 1064
Staff and salaries, 148, 1059
Electric power, export of, 1069
Inland Revenue Department, salaries, 149, 1066
Securities, provincial and municipal, 127
Soldiers' votes, 2470
Titles, 2351
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2393
Woman suffrage, 100

Sifton, Sir Clifford, and Grand Trunk, ques. 2242

Silver money in circulation, ques. 334

Simcoe, Canadian Government steamer, loss of
Compassionate allowances, 366, 376

Simpson, Mr. Thomas E. (West Algoma)
Budget, 1465
Iron and steel industry, development of, 1465
Newsprint situation, 1466
Sault Ste. Marie canal employees, 1971
Taxation of alien enemies, 1467

Sinclair, Mr. J. H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Amherst, regiment at during election, ques. 335
Canadian Northern Railway, claims against, ques. 970
Canadian War Records office, staff of, ques. 2241
Censors and decoders, ques. 874
Civil servants, conduct of, 2278
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1815, 1855, 1871, 2133, 2290, 2535
Experimental farms, 2290
Fishermen, conscription of, 2314
Food control, expenses of, ques. 971
Fruit grading and marking, 2249
Gordon, Rev. C. W., ques. 2240
Government railways, employees, ques. 206
Heatherton, N.S., Indian agent, 2235
Helena, motor-boat, ques. 2101, ques. 2241
Ice contract at Mulgrave, ques. 876
Imperial Conference, titles, 2556
Imports and exports, temporary control of, 81
Income and profits, taxes on, 2145, 2147
Intercolonial railway, patronage, 2538
Interior Department, salaries, 2216
Lobster industry, ques. 630
Mail contracts, 2529
Naval patrol boats and mine sweepers, ques. 569
Patriotic fund, 2208
Pensions Board, 2520
Refrigeration Commission, ques. 875, ques. 1072
Returning officers, payment of, 2512
Steamship services, 2212, 2216
Taxation, cigars, 1990
Tea, 2125
Water-powers, 2269
Woman suffrage, 94

Sioux Lookout, 2175

Sleeping car berths. *See* Special War Revenue

Smallpox. 1131

Smelters. *See* Mines

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Animal contagious diseases, 801
British embargo on Canadian cattle, ques. 565
Daylight saving, 181, 249

Soldiers. *See* Army

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, 31, 2515

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Bill. 1r., 56. 2r., Com., 610-629. 3r., 634

Soldiers' land settlement, 32, 2228. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.

South Africa steamship service, 2211

Southam Press, payments to, ques. 1480

South Ingonish, 1159

Speaker, (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Election of, 1
Residence, new Parliament building, 737, 1105-1110.
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Replacing on order paper, 2313
Withdrawal of, motion for, not debatable, 2493
Business of the House
Proposals for economy in Parliamentary printing, 562
Returns, avoidable duplications of, 283
Delegations, status of, 1911-1912, 1984, 2550
Interruptions, 2417
Irrelevancy, 70, 380, 384, 1253
Language
Decorum in, 2459
Reflecting on Chair, to be withdrawn, 1619
Members
Mover of resolution exhausts his right to speak, 2131
Right to refrain from voting, ruling reserved, 2385
Motions
Adjournment, for, to discuss definite matter of urgent public importance, 380
Committee report, to adopt, not amendable in form proposed, 2313
Involving charge upon public revenues, 2138
Joined for discussion, by agreement, 973
Negative, ruling reserved, 2070
Seconder may not move amendment, 2137
Supply, amendment to, form of, 2435
Notice of motion, dropping of, procedure in, 2385
Orders in Council, procedure in expressing disapproval by House, 1910
Orders of the day, on, questions and discussion, 1252-1253
Petition, form of, 2550
Privilege, procedure in, 314-316
Returns, avoidance of duplication, 283
Soldiers, impugnment of—no rule covering, 2417

Speaker—*Con.*
Rulings and statement of—*Con.*
Yukon election, special return ordered to be printed, 236

Special War Revenue Act, 1915 Amdt. Bill. Res. 1264, 1679. 1r., 1691. 2r., Com., 1991, 2064, 2121. 3r., 2127

Specie, amount of, ques. 741

Spirit Lake detention camp, ques. 744, 2293

Stacey, Mr. F. B. (Westminster district)
Alien labour, 1015
Eggs, inspection, 1206
Hay, inspection, 1087
Seduction and age of consent, 1698
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 628
Titles, 515
Western Power Company, 178
Westminster district, proposed change of name to Fraser Valley, 236
Woman suffrage, 661

Standing Orders Committee, 105

Statistics, 2264. *See* Dominion Bureau

Steamers, and ice-breakers
Bellechasse, 360
Champlain, ques. 112, 360
Courcelette, ques. 286
Helena, ques. 2101, ques. 2241
Lady Grey, 359-362, ques. 466
Montcalm, 359-362, 366, ques. 466
Montmagny, 362
Northumberland, 69

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 2211
Canada
Halifax, Canso and Guysborough, 2211
Magdalen Islands, 67, 283, 2212
Montreal-Gaspé, 66
Mulgrave and Guysborough, 2212
Nova Scotia, 2211, 2215
Pictou-Magdalen Islands, 67
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 2215
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 2212
Rivière du Loup, 2214
Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay, 112, 360
St. John Dipper Harbour, 2216
Seven Islands, 70
China and Japan, 2211
Great Britain, 2210
Newfoundland, 2210
South Africa, 2211
West Indies and South America, 2211

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Medicinal preparations, tax on, 1991
Oleomargarine, 294
Private Bills, Committee report, 1846

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1771, 1810, 1865
Daylight saving, 185

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Labatt, Col., pension of, 2489
Officers for overseas, medical examinations, ques. 2101
Quebec disturbances, 388
Woman suffrage, 91

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton West)
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 1453
Moving-picture films, tax on, 1682

Strikes. *See* Labour

Summerside breakwater, 1160

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service; Retirement

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, committee of, 84, 133-155, 197-205, 270-283, 343-364, 366-377, 559-562, 829-832, 850-867, 1059-1071, 1099-1125, 1137-1175, 1963-1976, 2161-2194, 2210-2236, 2256-2310, 2375-2382, 2507-2549
For details see titles of departments and subjects

Supreme Court Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 240. 1r., 241. 2r., Com., 520. 3r., 537
Amendment Bill. 1r., 2065. 2r., Com., 3r., 2198

Supreme Court reports, ques. 1980

Surface rights for miners, 242

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1740, 1776, 1802, 1810, 1858, 1887, 2134
Civil Service, Outside service, provisional allowance, 2547
Daylight saving, 182, 247
Fifth division, commanding officers, 1306
Labour, placing of, system in, 1032
Live-stock industry, 2380
Military service tribunals, ques. 630
Oleomargarine, 303
Ottawa naval enlistments, ques. 2398
Pensions, ques. 110, 2520-2521
Rural mail contracts, 1984, 2530
Soldier candidates in election, 910
Soldiers' land settlement, 2231
Titles, 2369

Sydney Mines
Labour difficulty, 203
Wharf, 1154

Sweet, Major Edmund, ques. 2399

Talbot, Col., Ex-M.P., letter to Canada Food Board, 2376

Talking machines. *See* Special War Revenue

Tariff. *See* Customs

Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 111, ques. 1978, ques. 2398

Taxation. *See* Budget, *also titles of taxes and taxation measures*

Taylor, Mr., Indian Agent, 2232

Tea, taxes on. *See* Customs; Special War Revenue

Technical education, 1034. *See* Labour

Telegraphs, telephones and radiotelegraphs
British Columbia, 1174
Government telephones, 1153
Lower St. Lawrence and Maritime Provinces, 1174
Navigation, telephones as aids to, 375
Nova Scotia, 1170
Radiotelegraph service, 354
West India cable, 2266

"The Parasites," circulation of forbidden, ques. 1203, ques. 1839

Thompson, Lieut.-Col. A. T., ques. 2399

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Military service, calling out of men in rural districts, 1253

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1785, 1791
Crooked Lake Indian reserve, 2232
Titles, 507, 2365

Three Rivers
Ordnance lands at, 2227
Public buildings, 1149
Public works employees, 141

Timber berths on Dominion lands, 262

Titles, proposed abolition of, 2556
Address to His Majesty, motion for, (Mr. Nickle), 468, 1984, 2065, 2237, 2342
Amendment, (Mr. Richardson), 506
Amendment to the Amendment, (Sir Robert Borden), 2342; agreed to on div., 2374

Tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, snuff. *See* Customs, Inland Revenue

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Belford, Major J. F., ques. 870
Breeding animals, 2301
Shipments of in Quebec, ques. 869
Cigars, tax on, 1985
Military service
Exemptions, ques. 873
Medical examinations, ques. 873
Military service council, barristers employed by, ques. 1202
Minister of Labour, private secretary, 1129
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1303

Tolmie, Mr. S. F. (Victoria City)
Alien labour, 1002
Daylight saving, 184
Meat inspection, 791
Portland cement, 1226, 1331

Toronto
Aliens in, 1000
Arms, seizure of by police, ques. 970
Harbour, 1120, 2544

Toronto Secretarial Fund, ques. 875

Tractors. *See* Farm Tractors

Trades unions. *See* Labour

Trade and Commerce
Department
Agents and commissioners, 2257
Estimates, staff and salaries, 343, 2210
Foreign trade, 2257
France, treaty with, ques. 1481
Mail subsidies and steamships, 2210

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Advances, Federal, to provinces, ques. 741
Ontario and Saskatchewan, ques. 742
Banks
Government deposits in, ques. 742
Subscriptions to war loans, ques. 741
Bonds, market value, ques. 335
Budget, 1318
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1826
Conference of provincial premiers, ques. 287
Dominion notes, circulation, ques. 334
Financial conditions, 1321
Gold reserve, ques. 334
Central, banks' deposit with, ques. 741
Loans, due dates, ques. 741
Foreign and domestic, ques. 334
Military service
Arrests, ques. 287
Enlistments, ques. 464
Farmers, conscription of, 1320
Prohibition and revenue, ques. 335
Provincial and municipal debentures, 122, ques. 287
Silver money, ques. 334
Specie, amount of, ques. 741
Treasury bonds, ques. 741
Victory loan committee, ques. 333
War bonds, purchase of by public servants, ques. 742
War expenditure, ques. 335, 1322
War purposes, use of deposits for, ques. 741
West, Mr. St. Clair, ques. 1618
Wounded soldiers, return to front, ques. 332
Woman suffrage, 648

Trains. *See* Railways

Transatlantic News Service, 356

Transatlantic telegraph rates, 355

Transcontinental. *See* National Transcontinental

Treasury bonds, ques. 741

Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., ques. 1129

Trent canal, 1964, 1967
Harman, Mr. Charles, ques. 208

Trower, Mr. W. K., ques. 1977, 2400

Tucker, Mr., ques. 331, ques. 873

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Budget, 1293
Caraquet and Gulf shore railway, 2173, 2177
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2141
Conscription of farmers and fishermen, 1296
Farm implements, 1294
Shipbuilding, 1295

Turiff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1861
Patriotic Fund, 2201, 2206
Soldiers' land settlement, 2230
Zinc bounties, 2498

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas M. M. (West Calgary)
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 2315
Civil Service Act Amdt., 713, 1784, 1792, 1891
Customs Department, officers and salaries, 1060
Daylight saving, 187
Fuel, 326
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 678, 816, 825
Indian lands, 1051
Sarcee reserve, 1054
Separation allowances, 65, 602
Soliders' civil re-establishment, 623
Supreme Court, 523
Titles, 2371
Yukon election, 2067

Unmarried couple registering at hotel as married. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

United States. *See* Allies
Exchange rate with Canada, ques. 465
Military service convention with, 33, 52
Munitions, manufacture for, in Canada, 1099

Valcartier camp, 866

Van Buren Bridge Company Agreement Bill. Res., 79. 1r., 80. 2r., 267. Com., 339. 3r., 518

Vancouver harbour, 1125, ques. 1126

Vegetables. *See* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale

Verigin, Mr. Peter, 1950

Verrett, Col. H. B., 864

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Canadian Northern Railway
Directors, ques. 109
Physical assets, ques. 570
Chinese entering Canada, ques. 115
Daylight saving, 186
Fair wage officers, 198

Vice. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Victoria, B.C.
Astrophysical observatory, 2218
Employment at, ques. 1479, ques. 1978
Harbour, ques. 1126
Old post office, 1151

Victory loan, 632
Expenses, 680
Advertising, ques. 1203, 2128
Banks, payments to, ques. 2240
Report on, 1766
Southam Press, payments to, ques. 1480
Special Names Committee, ques. 2398
Special Committee, ques. 333

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Canadian Associated Press, payments to, ques. 631
Canadian Northern Railway, 1921, 1925
Children, moral protection of, 1704, 1708
Demonstration farms, 2293
Farm labour, shortage of, 2306
Military service and enlistments, ques. 1127
Delegation of farmers, 1911, 1936, 1984, 2196, 2550
Quebec disturbances, 440, 2517
Rural drafts, 2315
Militia Department expenditure, 854
Overseas, 881, 926
Ross rifle, 929
Seduction (Criminal Code), 1700
Soldiers' uniforms, etc., prices, 602, 603
War, forces of the Allies, 2194
Yukon election, 2505
Zinc bounties, 2311

Votes for soldiers. *See* Army

War
Allies
Military service arrangements with, ques. 1071
United States, 33, 52, 1071, 2194
Camps and training areas, 866, 867, 1937, 1959, ques. 2240
Canada and, 1951
Canadian Daily Record, 891, 915, 920
Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, 2006
Canadian War Records office, 2127, ques. 2241
Casualties, 34
Consultation with Imperial Government before outbreak of, 928
Contracts
Province of Quebec, in, ques. 115
Deserters
Reward for arrest of, 467
Expenditure, 559, 879. *See also* War Appropriation Act
Statement of by Minister of Militia and Defence, 578

War—*Con.*
Expenditure—*Con.*
Estimate of, for 1918-1919, statement by Prime Minister, 571
Finance
Bank deposits, use of, ques. 741
Bonds, purchase of by public servants, ques. 742
Loans, 335
Bank subscriptions to, ques. 741
Revenue. *See* Special War Revenue
Forces
Canadian overseas, strength of, 576
French Canadian Brigade and units. *See* Army
French religious, part in, 43
German offensive, 83
Statement by Prime Minister as to progress of, 107
Heroism of Canadians, 157, 238
Human energy of Canada
Idleness, prohibition of, Order in Council, 377
Imperial War Conference
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 565
Insurance premiums, ques. 1361
Military Service. *See that title*
Ministers' general summaries
Minister of Militia, 578
Prime Minister, 571
Official news, arrangements for, 1976
Patriot, young, desires to enlist, 1125
Pensions. *See that title*
Permanent militia force, enlisted, pay of, 863, 1737
Railway War Board, 2006
Recruiting, leasing of properties for, ques. 465, ques. 1202
Red Cross rules, violation by enemy, 157
Supplies
Munitions
Danger from explosion of, 1099
Inspection, ques. 465, 1099
On ships, ques. 1128
T.N.T., storage at Beloeil, 1099
Printing overseas, ques. 874
Remounts, ques. 869, 904
Taxation. *See* Budget and Inland Revenue
Transport and freight, 866

War Appropriation Act, 1918, ($500,000,000 for 1918-1919). Res., 463. 1r., 464. 2r., 571. Com., 879, 1027. 3r., 1076

War Council, members of, ques. 2239

War Graves Commission, Imperial, ques. 331

War Lecture Bureau, 893

War Memorial Fund, 1195

War Mission, 31, 54, 905

War Purchasing Commission, 32

War-time Elections Act. *See* Yukon Election; Army; Soldiers, votes for

War-time Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1475. 2r., 2477, 2493. Com., 2494. 3r., 2498
Amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 2494,
Amendment, (Mr. Bureau), 2496

War Trade Board, 32, 54,
Officers of, ques. 1977, ques. 2396
McKay, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977
Rean, Mr. W. C., ques. 631, ques. 875
Trower, Mr. W. K., ques. 2400

Water-powers, 2267
Development of, 1069

Ways and Means, Committee of, 85, 1253, 1306, 1368, 1429, 1454, 1482, 1541, 1620, 1674

Wealth, taxation of. *See* Income tax

Webster, Mr. W. V., 467

Welland canal, 1963, 1969
Paymaster, ques. 2397

Wendover wharf, 1166

West, Mr. St. Clair, ques, 1618

West Indies steamship service, 2211

Whidden, Mr. Howard P. (Brandon)
Alien labour, 1003
Titles, 2371

White, Mr. W. H. (Victoria, Alta.)
Military service, ques. 288

White, Hon. Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Absence of, statements by Prime Minister, 50, 55, 736
Return of, to House, 2259

Wigmore, Mr. R. W. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1886
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 826
St. John-Dipper Harbour steamship service, 2216
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 615

Wilkie, Mr. J. H., ques. 1977

Wilson, Mr. J. R. (Saskatoon)
Animal contagious diseases, 802
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1762
Hay, inspection, 1091

Wilson, Miss M., ques. 1302

Wilson, Asistant Commissioner, R.N.W.M.P., resignation of, ques. 877

Winnipeg strike, 2236, 2385, 2546

Wireless telegraphs. *See* Telegraphs

Woman suffrage, 22, 33

Woman Suffrage Bill. 1r., 50. 2r., Com., 91, 364, 634. 3r., 723. Senate amdts., 1691

Woman and the War, 951

Women's Conference, ques. 875

Yamaska dam, 1165

Yeigh, Mr. Frank, ques. 1302

Y. M. C. A., members of in Government employ, ques. 1844, 1980

York and Carleton railway, purchase of, 2542

Yukon
Government of, 2221
Public buildings, 1152, 1154

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 464. 2r., Com., 682. 3r., 834

Yukon Election
Special report of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 236
Referred to Privileges and Elections Committee, 735
Second report, 1835, 2067
Referred back, 2097-2100
Third report, 2209
Adopted, 2315-2241
Recount, report of, 2194
Return of Mr. Thompson, 2382

Yukon Territory Election Bill. 1r., 2383. 2r., 2504. Com., 2505. 3r., 2507

Zinc Bounties Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2310. 1r., 2312. 2r., 2477, 2498. Com., 2498. 3r., 2504

Zwingle, Mrs. Wineas, claim of, 70